



# Comparison of Risk Factors, Safety, and Efficacy Outcomes of Mechanical Thrombectomy in Posterior vs. Anterior Circulation Large Vessel Occlusion

Joshua Mbroh<sup>1,2</sup>, Khouloud Poli<sup>1,2</sup>, Johannes Tünnerhoff<sup>1,2</sup>, Alexandra Gomez-Exposito<sup>1,2</sup>, Yi Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Benjamin Bender<sup>3</sup>, Johann-Martin Hempel<sup>3</sup>, Florian Hennersdorf<sup>3</sup>, Katharina Feil<sup>1,2</sup>, Annerose Mengel<sup>1,2</sup>, Ulf Ziemann<sup>1,2</sup> and Sven Poli<sup>1,2\*</sup>

### OPEN ACCESS

#### Edited by:

Simon Nagel, Heidelberg University Hospital, Germany

#### Reviewed by:

Dennis John Cordato, University of New South Wales, Australia Georgios Tsivgoulis, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

> \***Correspondence:** Sven Poli sven.poli@uni-tuebingen.de

#### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Stroke, a section of the journal Frontiers in Neurology

Received: 29 March 2021 Accepted: 14 May 2021 Published: 22 June 2021

#### Citation:

Mbroh J, Poli K, Tünnerhoff J, Gomez-Exposito A, Wang Y, Bender B, Hempel J-M, Hennersdorf F, Feil K, Mengel A, Ziemann U and Poli S (2021) Comparison of Risk Factors, Safety, and Efficacy Outcomes of Mechanical Thrombectomy in Posterior vs. Anterior Circulation Large Vessel Occlusion. Front. Neurol. 12:687134. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2021.687134 <sup>1</sup> Department of Neurology & Stroke, Eberhard-Karls University, Tübingen, Germany, <sup>2</sup> Hertie Institute for Clinical Brain Research, Eberhard-Karls University, Tübingen, Germany, <sup>3</sup> Department of Neuroradiology, Eberhard-Karls University, Tübingen, Germany

**Background and Purpose:** It is believed that stroke occurring due to posterior circulation large vessel occlusion (PCLVO) and that occurring due to anterior circulation large vessel occlusion (ACLVO) differ in terms of their pathophysiology and the outcome of their acute management in relation to endovascular mechanical thrombectomy (MT). Limited sample size and few randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with respect to PCLVO make the safety and efficacy of MT, which has been confirmed in ACLVO, difficult to assess in the posterior circulation. We therefore conducted a meta-analysis to study to which extent MT in PCLVO differs from ACLVO.

**Materials and Methods:** We searched the databases PubMed, Cochrane, and EMBASE for studies published between 2010 and January 2021, with information on risk factors, safety, and efficacy outcomes of MT in PCLVO vs. ACLVO and conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis; we compared baseline characteristics, reperfusion treatment profiles [including rates of intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) and onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times], recanalization success [Thrombolysis In Cerebral Infarction scale (TICI) 2b/3], symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage (sICH), and favorable functional outcome [modified Rankin Score (mRS) 0–2] and mortality at 90 days.

**Results:** Sixteen studies with MT PCLVO (1,172 patients) and ACLVO (7,726 patients) were obtained from the search. The pooled estimates showed higher baseline National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score (SMD 0.32, 95% CI 0.15–0.48) in the PCLVO group. PCLVO patients received less often IVT (OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.53–0.79). Onset-to-IVT time (SMD 0.86, 95% CI 0.45–1.26) and onset-to-groin puncture time (SMD 0.59, 95% CI 0.33–0.85) were longer in the PCLVO group. The likelihood of obtaining successful recanalization and favorable functional outcome at 90 days was comparable between the two groups. PCLVO was, however, associated with less sICH (OR 0.56, 95% CI 0.37–0.85) but higher mortality (OR 1.92, 95% CI 1.46–2.53).

1

**Conclusions:** This meta-analysis indicates that MT in PCLVO may be comparably efficient in obtaining successful recanalization and 90 day favorable functional outcome just as in ACLVO. Less sICH in MT-treated PCLVO patients might be the result of the lower IVT rate in this group. Higher baseline NIHSS and longer onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times may have contributed to a higher 90 day mortality in PCLVO patients.

Keywords: acute ischemic stroke, mechanical thrombectomy, endovascular stroke treatment, endovascular thrombectomy, posterior circulation, anterior circulation, large vessel occlusion

Subject Terms: Mechanical Thrombectomy/Endovascular treatment, Ischemic Stroke, Large Vessel Occlusion

## INTRODUCTION

Intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) has become the mainstay of acute intervention in ischemic stroke presenting within 4.5 h of symptom onset when other contraindications have been excluded (1). However, IVT has been shown to be less effective in proximal large vessel occlusion (LVO), mainly in the terminal internal carotid artery, proximal middle cerebral artery, and basilar artery, than in more distal occlusion (2). Therefore, clinical worsening is to be expected in many cases of LVO unless endovascular mechanical thrombectomy (MT) is initiated (2).

The second-generation MT devices that were introduced in the last decade have shown superiority to first-generation MT devices and, hence, have been widely used in MT since then (3–5). Consequently, it could be argued that most studies on MT conducted before the surge of second-generation MT devices could have been compromised by the inferiority of first-generation MT devices. Nowadays, MT in LVO may be conducted up to 24 h without waiting for IVT outcome (6–8).

To date, many randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have reported the safety and efficacy of MT in acute ischemic stroke due to anterior circulation LVO (ACLVO). However, there is lack of substantial data on the safety and efficacy of MT in posterior circulation LVO (PCLVO) (5, 6, 9).

Posterior circulation stroke is defined as the development of ischemic lesions occurring in the vascular territories supplied by branches of the vertebrobasilar arterial system (10). It occurs in about 20–25% of all ischemic strokes (11, 12), and neurological deficits caused by PCLVO have been described as catastrophic with severe disability and death occurring in about 68% of patients (13, 14). The rarity of PCLVO poses the challenge of obtaining a significant sample size for conducting observational and controlled trials in comparison to anterior circulation stroke.

MT in ACLVO has been accepted in most clinical settings as the best way for obtaining recanalization, and therefore, the randomization of patients with PCLVO into groups including no-MT is considered mostly unethical. Among the very few RCTs that focused on posterior circulation stroke, the Basilar Artery Occlusion Endovascular Intervention vs. Standard medical Treatment (BEST) RCT was terminated due to loss of equipoise, which resulted from a high crossover rate and was topped by a small sample size. This trial, however, reported no difference in favorable outcomes of MT patients and those receiving only standard medical treatment including IVT (15). On the other hand, a larger non-randomized cohort study, the Endovascular Treatment for Acute Basilar Artery Occlusion (BASILAR) study, reported that MT within 24 h of estimated occlusion time in basilar artery occlusion patients is associated with better functional outcomes and reduced mortality (16). Data on the safety and efficacy of MT in PCLVO from the randomized controlled Basilar Artery International Cooperation Study (BASICS) and Basilar Artery Occlusion Chines Endovascular Trial (BAOCHE) trials are pending (17, 18). Available data show a strong probability of differences in MT in PCLVO and ACLVO, which may contribute to their safety and efficacy outcomes (19, 20). An improved functional outcome and reduced mortality in moderate-to-severe ACLVO stroke patients have been shown to be dependent on a small infarct core, moderateto-good collateral circulation, and rapid MT (21). Some PCLVO studies have associated MT with a poor outcome despite having a high recanalization rate, and this has raised interest in possible predicting factors of outcome in PCLVO such as initial stroke symptom severity, collateral status, age, infarct volume, stroke etiology, respiratory insufficiency, and other comorbidities (22-26). Bad outcome could also be a consequence of a delayed treatment since symptoms of posterior circulation stroke are known to be often fluctuating with about 55-63% cases of prodromal transient ischemic attack in spite of a persistent vessel occlusion (14).

Due to the conflicting nature of available studies, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis on studies published from 2010 to January 2021 with data comparing MT in PCLVO vs. ACLVO in order to assess the differences of risk factors, as well as safety and efficacy outcomes between both circulations.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted in accordance with the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Item for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) (27).

### **Data Source and Searching**

We conducted a database search in PubMed, Cochrane library, and EMBASE before January 23, 2021, for literature from 2010 to 2021 using the following medical search heading (MeSH) and keywords: "acute stroke," "mechanical thrombectomy," "endovascular treatment," "posterior circulation," "vertebrobasilar occlusion," "anterior circulation," and "large vessel occlusion" (see **Supplementary Methods**). The PubMed search strategy was adapted for use in Cochrane library and EMBASE search databases. No restrictions were made in relation to literature type and text availability. Literature was however screened for study suitability based on title and abstract. Only subject-relevant studies were therefore assessed for eligibility.

## **Study Selection and Data Extraction**

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (1) retrospective or prospective observational studies with a combined sample size for PCLVO and ACLVO of at least 40, (2) comparison of baseline characteristics and at least two reperfusion treatment profile parameters (i.e., rate of IVT, onset-to-IVT time, onset-to-groin puncture time, onset-torecanalization time, and number of passages) in PCLVO and ACLVO as main and/or subgroup analysis, and (3) outcome defined by at least two of the following: Thrombolysis In Cerebral Infarction scale (TICI) 2b/3 (28), symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage (sICH), modified Rankin Scale score (mRS) 0-2 at 90 days, and mortality at 90 days. Exclusion criteria included the following: (1) non-English literature, (2) no MT conducted, (3) duplicate literature, (4) insufficient data for comparison purposes, and (5) same datasets used by multiple studies. Duplicates were identified and eliminated using EndNote X9 citation manager software (Clarivate, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

Data extracted from the included studies were patient age, sex, comorbidities/cardiovascular risk factors, stroke etiology, baseline NIHSS, site of LVO, reperfusion treatment profile (rate of IVT, onset-to-IVT time, onset-to-groin puncture time, onset-to-recanalization time, and number of passages), TICI 2b/3, sICH, 90 day mRS 0–2 and mortality.

## **Quality Assessment**

Quality assessment by means of Risk of Bias Assessment tool for Non-randomized Studies (RoBANS) was performed to assess the methodological quality of all included studies under which studies were rated as having either a high, a low, or an uncertain risk of bias (29).

Data search, eligibility assessment, selection, and extraction as well as quality assessment were conducted and crosschecked by two independent investigators and contentions were resolved through a consensus between the two. Publication bias was assessed by means of a funnel plot asymmetry.

# **Statistical Analysis**

Statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program], version 5.4.1 (30). We used the Mantel–Haenszel statistical method and a random or fixed effects analysis model for studies with moderate/high and low heterogeneity, respectively, to estimate the pooled effect size. Cochrane  $I^2$  statistics was used to assess heterogeneity. We defined high heterogeneity as  $I^2 > 75\%$ , moderate heterogeneity as  $25\% < I^2 < 75\%$ , and low heterogeneity as  $I^2 < 25\%$  (31).



PCLVO and ACLVO were the comparison groups, and the corresponding meta-analysis was performed for each outcome of interest.

Sensitivity analysis was performed for baseline characteristics and recanalization treatment profiles in which retrospective studies were excluded due to higher risk of selection bias (29). We furthermore conducted subgroup analyses in which we excluded studies with <20 patients with PCLVO due to a possible risk of lack of representation of PCLVO with low sample sizes in the real world and studies that primarily recruited patients who received MT until 2012, with the presumption that results could have been compromised by the use of first-generation MT devices (32).

Odds ratios (ORs) and standardized mean difference (SMD) were calculated with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and p < 0.05 was considered significant. For continuous data, the corresponding estimated mean and estimated standard deviation were calculated (33).

# RESULTS

## Search Results and Study Characteristics

The database search yielded 6,777 citations of literature published between January 1, 2010 and January 23, 2021. A total of 535 duplicate studies were excluded. A total of 6,242 studies were screened, out of which 6,189 were eliminated on the basis of subject and study irrelevance. The remaining 53 studies were individually assessed for eligibility by means of full-text review

TABLE 1	Baseline	characteristics	reported in	included	studies.

			Posterior ci	rculation				Anterior ci	rculation	
Publication	N	Age, years	Female sex	Baseline NIHSS	Occluded vessel	N	Age, years	Female sex	Baseline NIHSS	Occluded vessel
Mourand et al. (44)	15	_	_	21 (3–38)	14 BA, 1 VA	25	_	_	17 (9–23)	16 MCA, 9 ICA
Abilleira et al. (34)	65	$64 \pm 14$	21	16 (8–27)	-	471	$68 \pm 13$	221	18 (14–21)	-
Lefevre et al. (45)	26	-	-	-	25 BA, 1 PCA	36	-	-	-	20 ICA, 16 MCA
Fockaert et al. (35)	15	56 (22–86)	2	33 (7–42)	15 PCA	65	64 (22–86)	43	15 (6–42)	47 MCA, 18 ICA
Serles et al. (36)	43	72 (63–77)	19	19 (13–30)	40 BA, 3 VA	258	70 (60–77)	133	17 (13–20)	189 MCA, 65 ICA, 1 ACA
Alonso De Lecinana et al. (26)	52	64 (50–74)	17	11 (6–23)	52 VBA	427	70 (60–77)	214	18 (14–21)	284 MCA, 100 ICA, 43 tandem occlusion
Hu et al. (46)	24	66 (32–85)	11	14 (2–34)	24 VBA	137	66 (22–87)	59	10 (3–26)	94 MCA, 42 ICA, 1 ACA
Khoury et al. (37)	5	-	-	-	5 VBA	35	-	-	-	29 MCA, 6 ICA
Singh et al. (38)	25	$56\pm9$	9	$19\pm9$	25 BA	112	$58\pm13$	41	$16 \pm 13$	61 MCA, 51 ICA
Alawieh et al. (47)	56	$27\pm48$	8	$17 \pm 11$	_	380	$67 \pm 15$	192	$15 \pm 7$	-
Meinel et al. (39)	165	70 (59–80)	69	18 (8–30)*	-	1,574	73 (61–82)	810	17 (12–20)**	-
Weber et al. (40)	139	$65\pm16$	-	12 (6–21)	-	961	$69 \pm 14$	-	15 (12–19)	-
Wollenweber et al. (41)	303	-	-	-	250 BA, 69 PCA, 59 VA	2,265	-	-	-	1,890 MCA, 666 ICA, 86 ACA
Uno et al. (48)	50	73 (65–79)	17	25 (13–32)	_	295	77 (69–84)	151	18 (13–22)	-
Renieri et al. (43)	44	-	-	-	38 BA, 4 VA, 2 PCA	90	-	-	-	53 MCA, 37 ICA
Huo et al. (42)	145	$64\pm13$	37	20 (11–26)	-	596	$64 \pm 14$	216	16 (12–21)	-

\*n = 155, \*\*n = 1,558; - = not available, ACA, anterior cerebral artery; BA, basilar artery; ICA, internal carotid artery; MCA, middle cerebral artery; N, number of patients; n, reference number of patients; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale score; PCA, posterior cerebral artery; VA, vertebral artery; VBA, vertebrobasilar arteries.

with 37 studies being excluded due to lack of sufficient data. Sixteen eligible studies that met the study inclusion criteria were therefore included in our meta-analysis (**Figure 1**). Data from 11 studies (26, 34–43) were acquired from multiple centers and data from 5 studies (44–48) were acquired from single centers. Among these studies, 6 were retrospective (35, 39, 44–47) and 10 were prospective studies (26, 34, 36–38, 40–43, 48). This study comprised a total of 8,898 patients with 1,172 belonging to PCLVO and 7,726 belonging to ACLVO.

### **Risk of Bias Assessment**

Data on risk of bias are shown in **Supplementary Figure 1**; generally, there was a high risk of bias with respect to patient selection, confounding variables, and outcome reporting and a lower risk of incomplete data across all studies.

The funnel plots showed no asymmetry with respect to sICH, indicating a low probability of publication bias across the included studies for sICH. Asymmetry was, however, observed for recanalization success, favorable functional outcome, and mortality (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

# **Baseline Characteristics**

Results of age, sex, baseline NIHSS, and site of LVO for the included studies are reported in **Table 1**. PCLVO patients were younger than ACLVO [SMD = -0.31 (95% CI 0.59–0.03), p = 0.03] ( $I^2 = 92\%$ , p < 0.00001) (**Figure 2**). Further results showed

less females in the PCLVO group [OR = 0.54 (95% CI 0.39-0.73), p < 0.0001] ( $I^2 = 59\%$ , p = 0.008) (Figure 3).

predominant Hypertension seemed to be the comorbidity in both PCLCO (56.0%) and ACLVO (62.6%) (Supplementary Table 1). Although the pooled results showed hypertension to be comparable in both circulations, there seemed to be a tendency of fewer cases of hypertension as a comorbidity in PCLVO [OR = 0.76 (95% CI 0.54-1.09), p = 0.14]  $(I^2 = 76\%, p < 0.0001)$  (Supplementary Figure 3). In addition, atrial fibrillation [OR = 0.62 (95% CI 0.50-0.77), p <0.00001] ( $I^2 = 0\%$ , p = 0.71) and hyperlipidemia [OR = 0.73] (95% CI 0.61–0.89), p = 0.001] ( $I^2 = 9\%$ , p = 0.36) were less likely comorbidities of PCLVO, with smoking being a more likely comorbidity of PCLVO [OR = 1.22 (95% CI 1.01–1.48), p = 0.004] ( $I^2 = 0\%$ , p = 0.47) (Supplementary Figures 4-6, respectively). Diabetes mellitus [OR = 0.98 (95% CI 0.72-1.34), p = 0.91] ( $I^2 = 51\%$ , p = 0.04), coronary artery disease [OR = 0.64 (95% CI 0.36–1.27), p = 0.22] ( $I^2 = 62\%$ , p = 0.02), and previous stroke/TIA [OR = 1.21 (95% CI 0.96-1.53), p = 0.11]  $(I^2 = 17\%, p = 0.30)$  were, however, comparable between both groups (Supplementary Figures 7-9, respectively).

The average baseline NIHSS was higher in PCLVO [SMD = 0.32 (95% CI 0.15–0.48), p = 0.0001] ( $I^2 = 75\%$ , p < 0.00001) (**Figure 4**). In ACLVO, middle cerebral artery occlusion was the most prevalent site of LVO (31.0%) followed by internal carotid artery (13.1%). Basilar artery occlusion was the predominant

		PC			AC		:	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	r IV, Random, 95% CI
Abilleira 2014	63.9	14.3	65	68.1	13.2	471	9.5%	-0.31 [-0.57, -0.05]	2014	. <del></del>
Fockaert 2016	54.67	47.44	15	57.33	47.44	65	7.3%	-0.06 [-0.62, 0.51]	2016	;
Serles 2016	70.15	10.53	43	68.48	12.59	258	9.1%	0.14 [-0.19, 0.46]	2016	; +
Alonso 2017	62.4	17.25	52	68.35	12.59	427	9.3%	-0.45 [-0.74, -0.16]	2017	·
Hu 2017	60.9	39.29	24	58.17	48.18	136	8.3%	0.06 [-0.38, 0.49]	2017	·
Singh 2017	56.4	9.19	25	57.85	12.52	112	8.3%	-0.12 [-0.55, 0.31]	2017	·
Alawieh 2018	27	48.2	56	67.3	14.9	380	9.2%	-1.82 [-2.13, -1.51]	2018	3
Weber 2019	65.4	15.8	139	69	13.9	961	9.9%	-0.25 [-0.43, -0.08]	2019	, –
Meinel 2019	69.1	15.36	165	71.39	15.38	1574	10.0%	-0.15 [-0.31, 0.01]	2019	
Huo 2020	64.3	12.8	145	63.7	14	596	9.9%	0.04 [-0.14, 0.23]	2020	) +
Uno 2020	71.23	10.35	50	75.93	11.27	295	9.2%	-0.42 [-0.72, -0.12]	2020	)
Total (95% CI)			779			5275	100.0%	-0.31 [-0.59, -0.03]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.20; Cł	ni² = 124	4.35, df	= 10 (F	< 0.000	001); l²	= 92%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.16	(P = 0.	03)							-4 -2 0 2 2 Favours PC Favours AC

**FIGURE 2** | Forest plot comparing "age" of patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; *I*<sup>2</sup>, *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; IV, weighted mean difference; *P*, *p*-value; SD, standard deviation; Std., standardized; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random. 95% Cl	IV. Random. 95% CI
Abilleira 2014	19.43	15.02	65	17.61	5.02	471	9.5%	0.26 [-0.00, 0.52]	
Alawieh 2018	17.4	11	56	15.3	7	380	9.1%	0.27 [-0.01, 0.56]	
Alonso 2017	19.51	27.23	52	17.61	5.02	427	9.0%	0.19 [-0.10, 0.48]	+
Fockaert 2016	27.33	25.95	15	46.78	135.1	65	5.0%	-0.16 [-0.72, 0.41]	
Hu 2017	25.15	32.38	24	19.01	23.74	136	6.6%	0.24 [-0.19, 0.68]	
Huo 2020	23.17	14.08	50	17.67	6.67	295	8.7%	0.67 [0.37, 0.98]	
Meinel 2019	18.67	16.31	165	16.33	5.93	1574	11.2%	0.31 [0.15, 0.47]	
Mourand 2011	20.67	25.95	15	16.33	10.38	25	4.3%	0.24 [-0.40, 0.88]	
Serles 2016	23.48	16.74	43	16.64	5.01	258	8.3%	0.87 [0.54, 1.20]	
Singh 2017	19	5.5	25	15.5	4.32	112	6.5%	0.76 [0.32, 1.21]	
Uno 2020	19	11.12	145	16.97	6.88	596	10.8%	0.26 [0.08, 0.44]	
Weber 2019	15.31	12.72	139	15.97	5.63	961	10.9%	-0.10 [-0.27, 0.08]	
Total (95% CI)			794			5300	100.0%	0.32 [0.15, 0.48]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.06; Cł	ni² = 43.	37, df =	= 11 (P ·	< 0.000	01); l² =	75%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.82	(P = 0.	0001)			,.			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours PC Favours AC

**FIGURE 3** Forest plot comparing the baseline characteristic "female sex" of patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy.  $Chi^2$ , chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom;  $l^2$ , *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; *P*, *p*-value; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

lesion location in the PCLVO (33.5%) followed by posterior cerebral artery (7.4%).

Large artery atherosclerosis was a more likely stroke etiology in PCLVO [OR = 1.55 (95% CI 1.26-1.91), p < [0.0001]  $(I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.76)$  in comparison to ACLVO (Supplementary Figure 10). On the other hand, cardiac embolism was a less likely stroke etiology in PCLVO [OR  $= 0.63 (95\% \text{ CI } 0.52-0.75), p < 0.0001] (I^2 = 0\%, p =$ 0.67) in comparison to ACLVO (Supplementary Figure 11). Results obtained from sensitivity analyses conducted for the baseline characteristics age, sex, admission NIHSS, stroke etiology, and all comorbidities except "prior stroke or transient ischemic attack" had no influence on their (Supplementary Figures 3-8, 10-14). respective results However, sensitivity analysis showed "prior stroke or transient ischemic attack" being more likely in PCLVO  $[OR = 1.39 (95\% \text{ CI } 1.06-1.82), p = 0.02] (I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.51)$ (Supplementary Figure 9).

### **Recanalization Treatment Profiles**

Studies that reported number of IVT showed moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 27\%$ , p < 0.0001). The pooled results indicated a lower frequency of IVT in PCLVO patients [OR = 0.65 (95% CI 0.53–0.79), p < 0.0001] (Figure 5).

With a high heterogeneity across the studies reporting onset to IVT ( $I^2 = 79\%$ , p = 0.008), the pooled estimates showed a longer onset to IVT in PCLVO [SMD = 0.86 (95% CI 0.45– 1.26), p < 0.0001] (**Figure 6**). Further analyses also showed a longer onset-to-groin puncture time in PCLVO [SMD = 0.59 (95% CI 0.33–0.85), p < 0.00001] ( $I^2 = 86\%$ , p < 0.00001) (**Figure 7**). Results from onset-to-recanalization time in PCLVO, however, did not show any difference compared to ACLVO [SMD

Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year	M	H, Rando	m, 95% Cl	
Abilleira 2014	21	65	221	471	11.8%	0.54 [0.31, 0.94]	2014				
Fockaert 2016	2	15	43	65	3.2%	0.08 [0.02, 0.38]	2016		_		
Serles 2016	19	43	133	258	10.3%	0.74 [0.39, 1.42]	2016				
Alonso 2017	17	52	214	427	10.9%	0.48 [0.26, 0.89]	2017				
Hu 2017	11	24	59	136	7.6%	1.10 [0.46, 2.64]	2017		-		
Singh 2017	9	25	41	112	7.2%	0.97 [0.39, 2.40]	2017				
Alawieh 2018	8	56	192	380	8.6%	0.16 [0.08, 0.35]	2018		_		
Meinel 2019	69	165	810	1574	15.6%	0.68 [0.49, 0.94]	2019				
Huo 2020	37	145	216	596	14.2%	0.60 [0.40, 0.91]	2020				
Uno 2020	17	50	151	295	10.6%	0.49 [0.26, 0.92]	2020				
Total (95% CI)		640		4314	100.0%	0.54 [0.39, 0.73]			•		
Total events	210		2080								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 22.1	5, df = 9 (	P = 0.0	008); l² = 59	9%				10	100
Test for overall effect:	7 - 3.04 (		001)					0.01 0.1	1	10	100

**FIGURE 4** Forest plot comparing "admission NIHSS" of patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; Cl, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; *I*<sup>2</sup>, *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; IV, weighted mean difference; *P*, *p*-value; SD, standard deviation; Std., standardized; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

PC		AC			Odds Ratio			Odds Ra	io	
Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	Year		M-H, Random	95% CI	
24	65	261	471	10.0%	0.47 [0.28, 0.80]	2014				
6	15	39	65	2.8%	0.44 [0.14, 1.40]	2016				
31	43	162	258	6.4%	1.53 [0.75, 3.12]	2016		+-	_	
9	24	64	136	4.4%	0.68 [0.28, 1.65]	2017				
7	25	62	112	3.9%	0.31 [0.12, 0.81]	2017				
20	52	220	427	8.6%	0.59 [0.33, 1.06]	2017				
19	56	153	380	8.6%	0.76 [0.42, 1.37]	2018				
71	165	779	1574	18.3%	0.77 [0.56, 1.07]	2019				
58	139	505	961	16.4%	0.65 [0.45, 0.93]	2019				
25	145	187	596	12.1%	0.46 [0.29, 0.72]	2020				
26	50	170	295	8.4%	0.80 [0.44, 1.45]	2020				
	779		5275	100.0%	0.65 [0.53, 0.79]			•		
296		2602								
0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 13.78	8, df = 10	(P = 0)	.18); l² = 27	%				10	100
z = 4.28 (I	> < 0.00	001)					0.01	U.1 1 Equoure PC Eq		100
	PC Events 24 6 31 9 7 20 19 71 58 25 26 296 0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> 2 = 4.28 (I	PC           Events         Total           24         65           6         15           31         43           9         24           7         25           20         52           19         56           71         165           58         139           25         145           26         50           779           296         0.03; Chi² = 13.74           24.28 (P < 0.00	PC         Iotal         Events           24         65         261           6         15         39           31         43         162           9         24         64           7         25         62           20         52         220           19         56         153           71         165         779           58         139         505           25         145         187           26         50         170 <b>779</b> 286         2602           0.03; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 13.78. df = 10         2602           203; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 13.78. df = 10         2602	PC         AC           Image: Straig str	PC         AC           total         Events         Total         Weight           24         65         261         471         10.0%           6         15         39         65         2.8%           31         43         162         258         6.4%           9         24         64         136         4.4%           7         25         62         112         3.9%           20         52         220         427         8.6%           19         56         153         380         8.6%           71         165         779         1574         18.3%           58         139         505         961         16.4%           25         145         187         596         12.1%           26         50         170         295         8.4%           2602           2602           203; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 13.78, df = 10         (P = 0.18); l <sup>2</sup> = 27	PC         AC         Odds Ratio           Events         Total         Events         Total         Weight         M-H, Random, 95% CI           24         65         261         471         10.0%         0.47 [0.28, 0.80]           6         15         39         65         2.8%         0.44 [0.14, 1.40]           31         43         162         258         6.4%         1.53 [0.75, 3.12]           9         24         64         136         4.4%         0.68 [0.28, 1.65]           7         25         62         112         3.9%         0.31 [0.12, 0.81]           20         52         220         427         8.6%         0.59 [0.33, 1.06]           19         56         153         380         8.6%         0.76 [0.42, 1.37]           71         165         779         1574         18.3%         0.77 [0.56, 1.07]           58         139         505         961         16.4%         0.65 [0.45, 0.93]           25         145         187         596         12.1%         0.46 [0.29, 0.72]           26         50         170         295         8.4%         0.80 [0.44, 1.45]           296         2	PC         AC         Odds Ratio           Events         Total         Events         Total         Meight         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year           24         65         261         471         10.0%         0.47 [0.28, 0.80]         2014           6         15         39         65         2.8%         0.44 [0.14, 1.40]         2016           31         43         162         258         6.4%         1.53 [0.75, 3.12]         2017           7         25         62         112         3.9%         0.31 [0.12, 0.81]         2017           7         25         62         112         3.9%         0.31 [0.12, 0.81]         2017           9         54         153         380         8.6%         0.59 [0.33, 1.06]         2017           9         56         153         380         8.6%         0.76 [0.42, 1.37]         2018           71         165         779         1574         18.3%         0.77 [0.56, 1.07]         2019           58         139         505         961         16.4%         0.65 [0.45, 0.93]         2019           25         145         187         596         12.1%         0.46 [0.29, 0.72] <t< td=""><td>PC         AC         Odds Ratio           Image: Probability of the stress of the stres</td><td>PC         AC         Odds Ratio         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year           24         65         261         471         10.0%         0.47 [0.28, 0.80]         2014         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year           31         43         162         258         6.4%         1.53 [0.75, 3.12]         2016         Image: 100 (P = 0.18); P = 27%         &lt;</td><td>PC         AC         Odds Ratio         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl         M-H, Random, 95% Cl&lt;</td></t<>	PC         AC         Odds Ratio           Image: Probability of the stress of the stres	PC         AC         Odds Ratio         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year           24         65         261         471         10.0%         0.47 [0.28, 0.80]         2014         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year           31         43         162         258         6.4%         1.53 [0.75, 3.12]         2016         Image: 100 (P = 0.18); P = 27%         <	PC         AC         Odds Ratio         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl Year         M-H, Random, 95% Cl         M-H, Random, 95% Cl<

**FIGURE 5** | Forest plot comparing rate of intravenous thrombolysis in patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; Cl, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; *I*<sup>2</sup>, *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; *P*, *p*-value; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

		PC			AC			std. Wean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Serles 2016	158.2	64.64	43	104.67	36.32	258	32.5%	1.29 [0.95, 1.63] 2016	-
Alonso 2017	152.49	44.02	52	124.84	41.47	427	34.6%	0.66 [0.37, 0.95] 2017	+
Meinel 2019	170.05	72.38	39	129.64	62.73	437	32.9%	0.63 [0.30, 0.96] 2019	*
Total (95% CI)			134			1122	100.0%	0.86 [0.45, 1.26]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0 10 <sup>.</sup> Chi	$^{2} = 9.62$	df = 2	(P = 0.0)	08): l <sup>2</sup> =	79%			

**FIGURE 6** | Forest plot comparing "onset-to-intravenous thrombolysis time" in patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; l<sup>2</sup>, *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; IV, weighted mean difference; *P*, *p*-value; SD, standard deviation; Std., standardized; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

= 0.29 (95% CI -0.04-0.60), p = 0.08] ( $I^2 = 90\%$ , p < 0.00001) (**Supplementary Figure 15**). Pooled results for the number of passages did not reveal a difference between PCLVO and ACLVO [SMD = 0.21 (95% CI -0.05-0.46), p = 0.11] ( $I^2 = 79\%$ , p = 0.0008) (**Supplementary Figure 16**).

Sensitivity analyses performed for rates of IVT, onsetto-IVT time, onset-to-groin puncture time, and number of passages had no influence on their respective results (**Supplementary Figures 16–19**). However, sensitivity analysis showed PCLVO to be associated with a longer onset-torecanalization time [SMD = 0.43 (95% CI 0.10–0.77), p = 0.01] ( $I^2 = 89\%$ , p < 0.00001) (**Supplementary Figure 15**).

### **Outcomes of Study**

Results of TICI 2b/3, sICH, mRS 0-2 at 90 days, and mortality for the included studies are reported in **Table 2**.

#### Successful Recanalization

Studies that reported successful recanalization (i.e., TICI 2b/3) showed moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 50\%$ , p = 0.01). The pooled estimates showed no difference in outcomes in both PCLVO and ACLVO [OR = 1.07 (95% CI 0.81–1.42), p = 0.44]. In a subgroup analysis in which three studies were excluded on the basis of <20 PCLVO patients and patient recruitment primarily until 2012, the remaining studies showed similar results [OR

		PC			AC		:	Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Abilleira 2014	464.8	386.75	65	291.43	137.1	471	16.4%	0.93 [0.67, 1.20]	2014	
Serles 2016	251.87	83.13	43	199.05	74.31	258	15.1%	0.70 [0.37, 1.02]	2016	-
Alonso 2017	402.39	286.48	52	302.18	126.22	427	15.9%	0.66 [0.37, 0.95]	2017	-
Alawieh 2018	480.3	845.6	56	491.7	812.5	380	16.1%	-0.01 [-0.29, 0.27]	2018	+
leinel 2019	379.86	266.93	165	254.99	130.87	1574	18.4%	0.84 [0.67, 1.00]	2019	
luo 2020	347.22	155.39	145	286.28	135.76	596	18.1%	0.44 [0.25, 0.62]	2020	
otal (95% CI)			526			3706	100.0%	0.59 [0.33, 0.85]		•
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.09; Chi	² = 35.96	, df = 5	(P < 0.0	0001); l²	= 86%			-	
est for overall effect:	Z = 4.47	(P < 0.00	001)	10 C						-4 $-2$ $0$ $2$ $4$

**FIGURE 7** | Forest plot comparing "onset-to-groin puncture time" in patients with large vessel occlusion in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; Cl, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; l<sup>2</sup>, l-square heterogeneity statistic; IV, weighted mean difference; *P*, *p*-value; SD, standard deviation; Std., standardized; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

		Po	osterior cir	rculation			An	terior circ	ulation	
Publication	N	Successful recanalization	sICH	mRS 0–2 at 90 days	Mortality	N	Successful recanalization	sICH	mRS 0–2 at 90 days	Mortality
Mourand et al. (44)	15	11	_	5*	7	25	15	_	9	8‡
Abilleira et al. (34)	65	48	5	25	22	471	348	25	207	97
Lefevre et al. (45)	26	23	-	14	-	36	23	-	11	-
Fockaert et al. (35)	15	15	2	-	7	65	47	2	-	14
Serles et al. (36)	43	35	0	-	10	258	207	18	-	24
Alonso De Lecinana et al. (26)	52	39	1	21	17	427	359	23	237	48
Hu et al. (46)	24	19	1	-	4	137	110	12	-	8
Khoury et al. (37)	5	-	-	1	4	35	-	-	19	7
Singh et al. (38)	25	21	-	-	2	112	104	-	-	7
Alawieh et al. (47)	56	54	3	24	16	380	351	20	164	68
Meinel et al. (39)	165	149	8	55**	55**	1,574	1,299 <sup>‡‡</sup>	98‡‡‡	604 <sup>§§</sup>	344 <sup>§§</sup>
Weber et al. (40)	139	96#	0	35***	31***	961	719 <sup>§</sup>	29	281 <sup>§§§</sup>	203 <sup>§§§</sup>
Wollenweber et al. (41)	303	246	-	100##	82##	2,265	1,857	-	732 <sup>†</sup>	570 <sup>†</sup>
Uno et al. (48)	50	50	0	27###	4###	295	250	38†††	105 <sup>††</sup>	22 <sup>††</sup>
Renieri et al. (43)	44	33	-	-	-	90	65	-	-	-
Huo et al. (42)	145	119	4	-	49	596	520	44	-	98

#### TABLE 2 | Outcomes reported in included studies.

\*n = 14, \*\*n = 152, \*\*\*n = 92, #n = 134, ##n = 265, ###n = 42, #n = 1571, ##n = 1,562, \$ n = 964, \$\$ n = 1,409, \$\$ n = 660, † n = 1,997, #† n = 213, ##† n = 290; - = not available, sICH, symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage; mRS, modified ranking score; N, number of patients; n, reference number of patients.

Churcher an Curle and	PC		_ AC			Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
3.1.1 Included studie	es for outo	omes						
Lefevre 2014	23	26	23	36	3.3%	4.33 [1.09, 17.26]	2014	
Serles 2016	35	43	207	258	6.8%	1.08 [0.47, 2.46]	2016	
Alonso 2017	39	52	359	427	8.5%	0.57 [0.29, 1.12]	2017	
Hu 2017	19	24	110	137	4.9%	0.93 [0.32, 2.72]	2017	
Singh 2017	21	25	104	112	3.7%	0.40 [0.11, 1.46]	2017	· · · · ·
Alawieh 2018	54	56	351	380	3.0%	2.23 [0.52, 9.62]	2018	
Meinel 2019	149	165	1299	1571	10.5%	1.95 [1.15, 3.32]	2019	
Weber 2019	96	134	719	964	12.5%	0.86 [0.58, 1.29]	2019	
Wollenweber 2019	246	303	1857	2265	14.0%	0.95 [0.70, 1.29]	2019	
Uno 2020	50	50	250	295	0.9%	18.35 [1.11, 302.69]	2020	
Renieri 2020	33	44	65	89	6.8%	1.11 [0.48, 2.53]	2020	<b>-</b> _
Huo 2020	119	145	520	596	11.2%	0.67 [0.41, 1.09]	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1067		7130	86.2%	1.03 [0.76, 1.41]		•
Total events	884		5864					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	- 0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 24.2	4, df = 11	(P = 0.	01); l² = 5	5%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.21 (	P = 0.8	3)					
3.1.2 Studies meetin	a exclusio	on crite	ria for oi	tcome	s			
	9 0/010010			05	2 2 2 0/	1 83 [0 45 7 41]	2011	
Mourand 2011	11	15	15		3 3 7/6		2011	
Mourand 2011	11	15 65	15 348	25 171	3.3% 0.7%		2014	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Eockaert 2016	11 48 15	15 65 15	15 348 47	25 471 65	9.7% 0.9%	1.00 [0.55, 1.80]	2014	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	11 48 15	15 65 15 <b>95</b>	15 348 47	471 65 561	9.7% 0.9% 13.8%	1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	11 48 15 74	15 65 15 <b>95</b>	15 348 47 410	471 65 <b>561</b>	9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b>	1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] <b>1.55 [0.57, 4.21</b> ]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	11 48 15 74	15 65 15 <b>95</b>	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (E	471 65 <b>561</b>	9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b>	1.00 [0.16, 1.14] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] <b>1.55 [0.57, 4.21</b> ]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	11 48 15 74 • 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> 7 = 0.87 (/	15 65 15 <b>95</b> = 3.42	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (F	471 65 <b>561</b> = 0.18	9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b>	1.00 [0.16, 7.14] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21]	2014 2016	-
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 <b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	11 48 15 74 : 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 0.87 (l	15 65 15 <b>95</b> = 3.42 P = 0.3	15 348 47 410 , df = 2 (F 9)	471 65 <b>561</b> = 0.18	9.7% 9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b>	1.00 [0.16, 7.14] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI)	11 48 15 74 = 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> ; Z = 0.87 (I	15 65 15 <b>95</b> = 3.42 P = 0.3 <b>1162</b>	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (F 9)	471 65 561 = 0.18 7691	3.3% 9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b> ); I <sup>2</sup> = 42% <b>100.0%</b>	1.00 [0.16, 7.14] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events	11 48 15 74 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 0.87 (f 958	15 65 15 <b>95</b> = 3.42 P = 0.3 <b>1162</b>	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (F 9) 6274	471 65 561 = 0.18 7691	3.3% 9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b> ); I <sup>2</sup> = 42%	1.00 [0.16, 7.14] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21]	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	11 48 15 74 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 0.87 (l 958 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup>	15 65 15 <b>95</b> = 3.42 P = 0.3 <b>1162</b> = 28.1	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (F 9) 6274 6, df = 14	25 471 65 <b>561</b> * = 0.18 <b>7691</b> (P = 0.	9.7% 9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b> ); l <sup>2</sup> = 42% <b>100.0%</b> 01); l <sup>2</sup> = 5	1.00 [0.16, 7.44] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21] 	2014 2016	
Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 <b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:	11 48 15 74 0.34; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 0.87 (i 958 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 0.48 (i	$15 \\ 65 \\ 15 \\ 95 \\ P = 0.32 \\ 1162 \\ P = 0.62 \\ P = $	15 348 47 410 df = 2 (F 9) 6274 6, df = 14 3)	25 471 65 <b>561</b> 7691 (P = 0.	9.7% 9.7% 0.9% <b>13.8%</b> ); l <sup>2</sup> = 42% <b>100.0%</b> 01); l <sup>2</sup> = 5	1.00 [0.16, 7.44] 1.00 [0.55, 1.80] 12.07 [0.69, 212.29] 1.55 [0.57, 4.21] 	2014 2016	

**FIGURE 8** Forest plot of main and subgroup analyses comparing "successful recanalization" defined as thrombolysis in cerebral infarction scale (TICI) 2/3 in patients with large vessel occlusion (LVO) in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Three studies with <20 PCLVO patients and/or patient recruitment primarily until 2012 were excluded from subgroup analysis. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; *l*<sup>2</sup>, *l*-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; *P*, *p*-value; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

= 1.03 (95% CI 0.76–1.41), p = 0.83] ( $I^2 = 55\%$ , p = 0.01) (Figure 8).

#### Symptomatic Intracerebral Hemorrhage

Studies that reported sICH showed moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 42\%$ , p = 0.08). Our results indicated a lower likelihood of sICH in PCLVO [OR = 0.56 (95% CI 0.37–0.85), p = 0.006]. In our subgroup analysis (exclusion of two studies based on <20 PCLVO patients and patient recruitment primarily until 2012), the studies showed a rather reduced heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 19\%$ , p = 0.28). The pooled estimates once again indicated a lower likelihood of sICH in PCLVO compared to ACLVO [OR = 0.44 (95% CI 0.27–0.71), p = 0.0008] (**Figure 9**).

#### Favorable Functional Outcome at 90 Days

Studies that reported favorable functional outcome, defined by mRS  $\leq$  2 at 90 days, showed a moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 41\%$ , p = 0.08) with comparable likelihood of favorable functional outcome in both PCLVO and ACLVO [OR = 0.92 (95% CI 0.73–1.16), p = 0.48]. The subgroup analysis (after exclusion of three

studies based on <20 PCLVO patients and patient recruitment primarily until 2012) showed similar findings ( $I^2 = 55\%$ , p = 0.04) [OR = 0.97 (95% CI 0.73–1.27), p = 0.80] (Figure 10).

#### Mortality

Studies reporting mortality showed a moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 57\%$ , p = 0.004). MT in PCLVO was associated with a higher likelihood of mortality as compared to ACLVO [OR = 1.92 (95% CI 1.46–2.53), p < 0.00001]. The subgroup analysis (after exclusion of four studies due to <20 PCLVO patients and patient recruitment primarily until 2012) likewise showed a higher likelihood of mortality in PCLVO patients [OR = 1.82 (95% CI 1.33–2.48), p = 0.0002] ( $I^2 = 65\%$ , p = 0.003) (**Figure 11**).

# DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, until the conduction of this metaanalysis, there had been two prior meta-analyses comparing MT in anterior and posterior circulation stroke with both

	FU		AC			Ouus Ralio				oudon	ano		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Year		M-	H, Fixed	, 95% Cl		
4.1.1 Included studies	for outco	omes											
Serles 2016	0	43	18	258	7.1%	0.15 [0.01, 2.53]	2016	•	•				
Alonso 2017	1	52	5	427	1.4%	1.65 [0.19, 14.44]	2017						
Hu 2017	1	24	12	137	4.6%	0.45 [0.06, 3.65]	2017			-			
Alawieh 2018	3	56	20	380	6.5%	1.02 [0.29, 3.55]	2018						
Meinel 2019	8	165	98	1562	24.0%	0.76 [0.36, 1.59]	2019				-		
Weber 2019	0	139	29	961	10.0%	0.11 [0.01, 1.86]	2019	←	•		_		
Huo 2020	4	145	44	596	22.5%	0.36 [0.13, 1.01]	2020			-			
Uno 2020	0	50	38	290	15.3%	0.06 [0.00, 1.07]	2020	←					
Subtotal (95% CI)		674		4611	91.6%	0.44 [0.27, 0.71]			ŀ	◆			
Total events	17		264										
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8.	.64, df = 7	7 (P = 0	.28); l <sup>2</sup> =	19%									
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z	.64, df = 7 : = 3.34 (F	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00	0.28); l² = 008)	19%									
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8. Test for overall effect: Z	.64, df = 7 : = 3.34 (F	P = 0.00	1.28); l² = 208)	19%	<b>c</b>								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8. Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting	.64, df = 7 2 = 3.34 (F exclusio	P = 0.00 P = 0.00 n crite	1.28); l² = 208) ria for ou	19% Itcome	S	1 40 10 55 4 021	2014						
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8. Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014	.64, df = 7 2 = 3.34 (F exclusio	r (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65	1.28); I <sup>2</sup> = 208) ria for ou 25	19% Itcome 471	s 7.5%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03]	2014				<u> </u>		
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8. Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtote (05% Cl)	.64, df = 7 ∷ = 3.34 (F <b>exclusio</b> 5 2	r (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65 15	0.28); I <sup>2</sup> = 008) ria for ou 25 2	19% Itcome 471 65	s 7.5% 0.9%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60]	2014 2016						_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI)	.64, df = 7 : = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65 15 80	1.28); l <sup>2</sup> = 208) ria for ou 25 2	19% itcome 471 65 <b>536</b>	s 7.5% 0.9% <b>8.4%</b>	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 <b>[0.77, 4.39]</b>	2014 2016						_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events	.64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 02, df = 4	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65 15 80	228); l <sup>2</sup> = 208) ria for ou 25 2 27	19% itcome 471 65 <b>536</b>	s 7.5% 0.9% <b>8.4%</b>	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 <b>[0.77, 4.39</b> ]	2014 2016				►.		
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.64, df = 7 E = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 .03, df = 1	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65 15 80	1.28); l <sup>2</sup> = 208) ria for ou 25 2 27 1.31); l <sup>2</sup> =	19% <b>itcome</b> 471 65 <b>536</b> 3%	s 7.5% 0.9% <b>8.4%</b>	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] <b>1.84 [0.77, 4.39</b> ]	2014 2016						_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1 Test for overall effect: Z	.64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 .03, df = 1 : = 1.36 (F	P (P = 0) P = 0.00 n  criter 65 15 80 I (P = 0) P = 0.17	1.28); l <sup>2</sup> = 2008) ria for ou 25 2 27 1.31); l <sup>2</sup> = 7)	19% Itcome 471 65 <b>536</b> 3%	s 7.5% 0.9% <b>8.4%</b>	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 <b>[0.77, 4.39</b> ]	2014 2016				►		_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% Cl)	.64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 .03, df = 1 = 1.36 (F	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00 n crite 65 15 80 I (P = 0 P = 0.17 754	1.28);   <sup>2</sup> = 2008) ria for ou 25 2 2 27 1.31);   <sup>2</sup> = 7)	19% itcome 471 65 <b>536</b> 3% <b>5147</b>	s 7.5% 0.9% 8.4% 100.0%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 [0.77, 4.39] 0.56 [0.37, 0.85]	2014 2016			•	►		_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% Cl) Total events	64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 .03, df = 1 = 1.36 (F 24	7 (P = 0 P = 0.00 65 15 80 I (P = 0 P = 0.17 754	1.28);   <sup>2</sup> = 2008) ria for ou 25 2 27 1.31);   <sup>2</sup> = 7) 291	19% itcome 471 65 <b>536</b> 3% <b>5147</b>	s 7.5% 0.9% 8.4% 100.0%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 [0.77, 4.39] 0.56 [0.37, 0.85]	2014 2016			•	►		_
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z 4.1.2 Studies meeting Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1. Test for overall effect: Z Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.	.64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 .03, df = 1 = 1.36 (F 24 5.57, df =	7 (P = 0.00) P = 0.00 n crite 65 15 80 I (P = 0.12) 754 9 (P = 100)	1.28); I <sup>2</sup> = 008) ria for ou 25 2 27 1.31); I <sup>2</sup> = 7) 291 0.08); I <sup>2</sup>	19% <b>itcome</b> 471 65 <b>536</b> 3% <b>5147</b> = 42%	s 7.5% 0.9% 8.4% 100.0%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 [0.77, 4.39] 0.56 [0.37, 0.85]	2014 2016			•	►		
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 8$ Test for overall effect: Z <b>4.1.2 Studies meeting</b> Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 <b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1$ . Test for overall effect: Z <b>Total (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1$ . Test for overall effect: Z	64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 03, df = 1 = 1.36 (F 24 5.57, df = = 2.76 (F	P (P = 0) P = 0.00 P = 0.00 P = 0.00 P = 0.00 P = 0.00 P = 0.00 P = 0.00	1.28); I <sup>2</sup> = 008) ria for ou 25 2 27 1.31); I <sup>2</sup> = 7) 291 0.08); I <sup>2</sup> 06)	19% <b>itcome</b> 471 65 <b>536</b> 3% <b>5147</b> = 42%	s 7.5% 0.9% 8.4%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 [0.77, 4.39] 0.56 [0.37, 0.85]	2014 2016	H 0.01				10	- 100
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8 Test for overall effect: Z <b>4.1.2 Studies meeting</b> Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 <b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1. Test for overall effect: Z <b>Total (95% CI)</b> Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.2 Test for overall effect: Z Test for overall effect: Z	64, df = 7 = 3.34 (F exclusio 5 2 7 .03, df = 1 = 1.36 (F 24 5.57, df = = 2.76 (F ences: Ch	P = (P = 0.00) n crite 65 15 80 1 (P = 0.17) 754 9 (P = 0.00) ni <sup>2</sup> = 7.8	1.28); I <sup>2</sup> = 108) <b>ria for ou</b> 25 2 27 1.31); I <sup>2</sup> = 7) 291 0.08); I <sup>2</sup> : 06) 34, df = 1	19% <b>itcome</b> 471 65 <b>536</b> 3% <b>5147</b> = 42% (P = 0.	s 7.5% 0.9% 8.4% 100.0%	1.49 [0.55, 4.03] 4.85 [0.62, 37.60] 1.84 [0.77, 4.39] 0.56 [0.37, 0.85] 87.3%	2014 2016	H 0.01	l 0.1 Favou	+ 1 rs PC F	Favours A	- <u> </u> 10 AC	

circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Two studies with <20 PCLVO patients and/or patient recruitment primarily until 2012 were excluded from subgroup analysis. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom; l<sup>2</sup>, *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; *P*, *p*-value; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

studies, however, focusing on MT safety and efficacy outcomes (19, 20). This study, conducted independently from previous studies, included more recent literature on MT in PCLVO and ACLVO and, in a detailed meta-analysis, further sought to compare demographics and baseline characteristics, risk factors, as well as recanalization treatment profiles between the two brain circulations. Hence, this study presents at the time of publication the most current data on MT in PCLVO vs. ACLVO.

Results on etiology of LVO in our meta-analysis show large artery atherosclerosis (36.7% and 23.1%) and cardiac embolism (34.8 and 47.0%) to be the most common causes of PCLVO and ACLVO, respectively (**Supplementary Table 2**), with large artery atherosclerosis and cardiac embolism being an equally likely etiology in PCLVO. This was consistent with reports from previous literature that reported 26–36% for large artery atherosclerosis and 30–35% for cardiac embolism in PCLVO, although this was based only on basilar artery occlusion (14). The difference in stroke etiologies for the other classification groups such as other determined LVO etiologies (dissection, thrombophilia, paraneoplastic, etc.) and unknown causes, might, however, be inconclusive due to a possible lack of standardized classification of etiology across studies (49).

It is thought that NIHSS gives more weight to neurological deficits in anterior circulation stroke due to factors such as

aphasia, facial palsy, and hemiparesis as opposed to limb ataxia, oculomotor disorders, and hemianopia in posterior circulation stroke. However, depending on the level of occlusion, some cases of PCLVO are accompanied by hemiparesis, facial palsy, and dysarthria. It could therefore be argued that a substantial overlap in clinical characteristics exists in both anterior and posterior circulation strokes (14, 50). Contrary to the presumption that NIHSS gives more weight to neurological deficits in anterior circulation strokes, our study detected a higher admission NIHSS in PCLVO than in ACLVO (**Figure 4**). This could be due to more PCLVO patients with reduced consciousness on admission although we do not have data to support this presumption.

Our meta-analysis showed that fewer PCLVO patients are likely to receive IVT in comparison to ACLVO (**Figure 5**). Previous literature have reported prodromal symptoms in up to 60% cases of PCLVO, which, in most cases, is a reason for misdiagnosis and wrong specialty consultation (17, 51). As a result, PCLVO patients may not succeed presenting within the widely accepted 4.5-h time window to receive IVT (52).

Furthermore, the delay in neurological intervention in patients with posterior circulation stroke was reflected in the longer onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times in PCLVO (**Figures 6**, **7**). This association is supported by previous studies (53). In spite of the longer onset-to-IVT and

	PC		AC			Odds Ratio		ouus nullo
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
2.1.1 Included studies	s for outc	omes						
Lefevre 2014	14	26	11	36	4.2%	2.65 [0.93, 7.56] 2	2014	
Alonso 2017	21	52	237	427	10.2%	0.54 [0.30, 0.98] 2	2017	
Alawieh 2018	24	56	164	380	10.6%	0.99 [0.56, 1.74] 2	2018	
Meinel 2019	55	152	604	1409	17.3%	0.76 [0.53, 1.07] 2	2019	
Weber 2019	35	92	281	660	13.8%	0.83 [0.53, 1.30] 2	2019	
Wollenweber 2019	100	265	732	1997	20.6%	1.05 [0.80, 1.36] 2	2019	
Uno 2020	27	42	105	213	8.2%	1.85 [0.93, 3.68] 2	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		685		5122	85.0%	0.97 [0.73, 1.27]		•
Total events	276		2134					
Hotorogonoity: $Tau^2 = ($	0.07: Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 13.3	B, df = 6 (	P = 0.0	4); l <sup>2</sup> = 55	%		
rieleiogeneity. rau = t	,							
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.25 (I	P = 0.8	0)					
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.25 (I	P = 0.8	0)					
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio	P = 0.80	o) ria for ou	utcome	s			
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5	P = 0.80 on crite 14	0) ria for ou 9	itcome 22	s 2.6%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2	2011	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65	0) ria for ou 9 207	1 <b>tcome</b> 22 471	s 2.6% 11.4%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2	2011 2014	
<b>2.1.2 Studies meeting</b> Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5	0) ria for ou 9 207 19	utcome 22 471 35	2.6% 11.4% 1.0%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2	2011 2014 2017 ←──	
2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 <b>84</b>	0) <b>ria for ou</b> 9 207 19	1tcome 22 471 35 <b>528</b>	2.6% 11.4% 1.0% <b>15.0%</b>	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 <b>0.75 [0.46, 1.22]</b>	2011 2014 2017 ←──	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1 31	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84	0) ria for ou 9 207 19 235	utcome 22 471 35 <b>528</b>	s 2.6% 11.4% 1.0% <b>15.0%</b>	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22]	2011 2014 2017 ←───	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup>	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25	0) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 , df = 2 (F	utcome 22 471 35 <b>528</b> P = 0.54	2.6% 11.4% 1.0% <b>15.0%</b>	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22]	2011 2014 2017 ←	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.15 (I	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25, P = 0.23	0) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 df = 2 (F 5)	22 471 35 <b>528</b> 9 = 0.54	2.6% 11.4% 1.0% <b>15.0%</b> 4); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22]	2011 2014 2017 ←	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0 Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI)	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.15 (I	P = 0.80 n crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25 P = 0.23 769	0) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 df = 2 (F 5)	22 471 35 <b>528</b> ₽ = 0.54 <b>5650</b>	s 2.6% 11.4% 1.0% 15.0% 4); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22] 0.92 [0.73, 1.16]	2011 2014 2017 ←	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( Test for overall effect: 2 Total (95% CI) Total events	Z = 0.25 (I exclusio 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.15 (I 307	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25, P = 0.25 769	o) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 df = 2 (F 5) 2369	471 35 <b>528</b> • = 0.54 <b>5650</b>	s 2.6% 11.4% 1.0% 15.0% 4); I <sup>2</sup> = 0% 100.0%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22] 0.92 [0.73, 1.16]	2011 2014 2017 ←	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0	Z = 0.25 (f exclusio 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.15 (f 307 0.05; Chi <sup>2</sup>	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25, P = 0.23 769 = 15.30	0) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 df = 2 (F 5) 2369 6 df = 9 (	utcome 22 471 35 <b>528</b> 2 = 0.54 <b>5650</b> ₽ = 0.0	s 2.6% 11.4% 1.0% 15.0% 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% 100.0%	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22] 0.92 [0.73, 1.16]	2011 2014 2017 ← 	
Test for overall effect: 2 2.1.2 Studies meeting Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = ( Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = (	Z = 0.25 (I) <b>exclusio</b> 5 25 1 31 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 1.15 (I) 307 0.05; Chi <sup>2</sup> 7 = 0, 70 (I)	P = 0.80 on crite 14 65 5 84 = 1.25, P = 0.25 769 = 15.30 P = 0.45	) ria for ou 9 207 19 235 df = 2 (F 5) 2369 6, df = 9 ( 8)	22 471 35 <b>528</b> P = 0.54 <b>5650</b> P = 0.0	s 2.6% 11.4% 1.0% <b>15.0%</b> 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 0% <b>100.0%</b> 8); l <sup>2</sup> = 41	0.80 [0.20, 3.20] 2 0.80 [0.47, 1.36] 2 0.21 [0.02, 2.08] 2 0.75 [0.46, 1.22] 0.92 [0.73, 1.16]	2011 2014 2017 ← 	

**FIGURE 10** [Forest plot comparing "favorable functional outcome (defined as modified Rankin Scale score 0–2) at 90 days" in patients with large vessel occlusion (LVO) in the posterior circulation (PC) vs. anterior circulation (AC) who were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Three studies with <20 PCLVO patients and/or patient recruitment primarily until 2012 were excluded from subgroup analysis. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom;  $l^2$ , l-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; P, p-value; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; Z, Z statistic.

onset-to-groin puncture times in PCLVO, a favorable 90 day functional outcome in PCLVO is, however, equally possible just as in ACLVO (**Figure 10**). This could support the hypothesis that salvageable brain tissue in posterior circulation stroke persists for a longer time as compared to anterior circulation stroke possibly due to a better collateralization in the brainstem (54). Shorter onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times could therefore influence a better functional MT outcome in PCLVO. Although onset-to-recanalization time and number of passages were comparable between PCLVO and ACLVO, they tended to be increased in PCLVO patients (**Supplementary Figures 7, 8**). MT in PCLVO was, however, shown to be associated with longer onset-to-recanalization times in the sensitivity analysis, which was not surprising due to the known delays in hospital admission and intervention of PCLVO patients (14, 53).

In our study, we found lower likelihood of sICH in PCLVO (**Figure 9**). Previous literature has attributed the scarcity of sICH in posterior circulation stroke to relatively smaller infarct volumes and the anatomically smaller nature of vessels that supply the brainstem and cerebellum (55, 56). However, this could also be attributed to the lower number of PCLVO patients who receive IVT (**Figure 5**). Several other studies have shown IVT in posterior circulation stroke to be associated with lower occurrence of sICH than IVT in anterior circulation stroke (57, 58). Similar results have been demonstrated by a more

recent meta-analysis that indicated a lower likelihood of sICH after IVT in posterior circulation stroke (59). On the other hand, a randomized clinical trial that enrolled 656 patients showed no significant difference in sICH in IVT and non-IVT patients although this study included patients with either ACLVO or PCLVO (60). This raises the question as to whether sICH after MT in PCLVO could therefore be independent of IVT administration. In the anterior circulation, however, MT in addition to IVT has been identified as a significant independent predictor of ICH (56, 61).

Studies by previous meta-analyses showed no statistical difference between PCLVO and ACLVO in both recanalization success and 90 day functional outcome (19, 20). A comparable likelihood of obtaining successful recanalization (**Figure 8**) and 90 day favorable functional outcome (**Figure 10**) was also found in our meta-analysis that included more recent studies. A successful recanalization could therefore influence a good functional outcome irrespective of the circulation involved. Although this study makes a comparison between MT in PCLVO vs. ACLVO, we believe that RCTs are warranted to study if MT in PCLVO is generally efficient.

The incidence of higher mortality in PCLVO has been discussed in numerous previous studies (19, 20). Our study likewise provided data to support the claim that MT in PCLVO is associated with a higher mortality as compared to ACLVO

	FU		AC			Ouus Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.1.1 Included studies	s for outc	omes						
Serles 2016	10	43	24	258	6.5%	2.95 [1.30, 6.73] 2	2016	
Alonso 2017	17	52	48	427	8.3%	3.84 [2.00, 7.37] 2	2017	
łu 2017	2	25	7	112	2.4%	1.30 [0.25, 6.69] 2	2017	
Singh 2017	4	24	8	137	3.5%	3.23 [0.89, 11.71] 2	2017	
lawieh 2018	16	56	68	380	8.5%	1.84 [0.97, 3.47] 2	2018	
leinel 2019	55	152	344	1409	12.5%	1.76 [1.23, 2.50] 2	2019	
Veber 2019	31	92	203	660	10.8%	1.14 [0.72, 1.82] 2	2019	
Vollenweber 2019	82	265	570	1997	13.6%	1.12 [0.85, 1.48] 2	2019	
Jno 2020	4	42	22	213	4.3%	0.91 [0.30, 2.80] 2	2020	
łuo 2020	49	145	98	596	11.7%	2.59 [1.73, 3.90] 2	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		896		6189	81.9%	1.82 [1.33, 2.48]		•
otal avanta	270		1392					
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = est for overall effect: 2	0.13; Chi² Z = 3.79 (I	= 25.4 P = 0.0	0, df = 9 ( 002)	P = 0.0	003); l² = 6	5%		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: 1 .1.2 Studies meeting	0.13; Chi² Z = 3.79 (l g exclusio	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for o</b> u	P = 0.0	003); I <sup>2</sup> = 6	5%		
Aleterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Fest for overall effect: Aleterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = .1.2 Studies meeting Alourand 2011	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g exclusio 7	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8	P = 0.0 utcome 25	003); I <sup>2</sup> = 6 9 <b>s</b> 3.4%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2	2011	
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = est for overall effect: .1.2 Studies meeting /lourand 2011 .billeira 2014	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g exclusic 7 22	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471	003); I <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2	2011 2014	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect: A <b>1.2 Studies meeting</b> Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Tockaert 2016	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (I g exclusic 7 22 4	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35	003); I <sup>2</sup> = 6 9 <b>s</b> 3.4% 9.5% 1.2%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2	2011 2014 2016	 
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Fest for overall effect: Aourand 2011 Volleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (I g <b>exclusic</b> 7 22 4 7	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35 65 <b>596</b>	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 <b>2.37 [1.40, 4.03]</b>	2011 2014 2016 2017	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Fest for overall effect: : I. <b>1.2 Studies meeting</b> Mourand 2011 Abilleira 2014 Fockaert 2016 Khoury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Fest for overall effect: :	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g exclusic 7 22 4 7 40 0.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.20 (l	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100 = 3.33 P = 0.0	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14 126 , df = 3 (F 01)	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35 65 <b>596</b> P = 0.34	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1% l); l <sup>2</sup> = 10%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 2.37 [1.40, 4.03]	2011 2014 2016 2017	
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 'est for overall effect: : .1.2 Studies meeting Aourand 2011 billeira 2014 fockaert 2016 Choury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 'est for overall effect: : 'otal (95% CI)	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g <b>exclusic</b> 7 22 4 7 40 0.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.20 (l	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100 = 3.33 P = 0.0 <b>996</b>	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14 126 , df = 3 (F 01)	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35 65 <b>596</b> P = 0.34 <b>6785</b>	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1% 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 10% 100.0%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 2.37 [1.40, 4.03] 5 1.92 [1.46, 2.53]	2011 2014 2016 2017	• •
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 'est for overall effect: : .1.2 Studies meeting Aourand 2011 .billeira 2014 iockaert 2016 Choury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 'est for overall effect: : 'otal (95% CI) Total events	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g <b>exclusic</b> 7 22 4 7 40 0.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.20 (l 310	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100 = 3.33 P = 0.0 <b>996</b>	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14 126 , df = 3 (F 01) 1518	P = 0.0 <b>utcome</b> 25 471 35 <b>596</b> P = 0.34 <b>6785</b>	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1% 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 10% 100.0%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 2.37 [1.40, 4.03] 1.92 [1.46, 2.53]	2011 2014 2016 2017	•
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = est for overall effect: .1.2 Studies meeting Aourand 2011 billeira 2014 ockaert 2016 Choury 2017 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Total (95% CI) Total events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g exclusic 7 22 4 7 40 0.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.20 (l 310 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100 = 3.33 P = 0.0 996 = 30.5	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14 126 , df = 3 (F 01) 1518 5, df = 13	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35 65 <b>596</b> P = 0.34 <b>6785</b> (P = 0.	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1% 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 10% 100.0% .004); l <sup>2</sup> =	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 2.37 [1.40, 4.03] 57%	2011 2014 2016 2017	
leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = est for overall effect: .1.2 Studies meeting Aourand 2011 billeira 2014 fockaert 2016 choury 2017 Gubtotal (95% CI) fotal events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = fotal (95% CI) fotal events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = fotal events leterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.13; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.79 (l g exclusic 7 22 4 7 40 0.04; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 3.20 (l 310 0.12; Chi <sup>2</sup> Z = 4.70 (l	= 25.4 P = 0.0 on crite 15 65 5 15 100 = 3.33 P = 0.0 996 = 30.5 P < 0.0	0, df = 9 ( 002) <b>ria for ou</b> 8 97 7 14 126 , df = 3 (F 01) 1518 5, df = 13 0001)	P = 0.0 utcome 25 471 35 65 <b>596</b> P = 0.34 <b>6785</b> (P = 0.	003); l <sup>2</sup> = 6 s 3.4% 9.5% 1.2% 4.0% 18.1% 4); l <sup>2</sup> = 10% 100.0%	5% 1.86 [0.50, 6.94] 2 1.97 [1.13, 3.45] 2 16.00 [1.54, 166.53] 2 3.19 [0.99, 10.31] 2 2.37 [1.40, 4.03] 1.92 [1.46, 2.53] 57%	2011 2014 2016 2017	0.1 1 10 100 Favours PC Favours AC

were treated with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Four studies with age vessel occlusion (LVO) in the posterior circulation (LVO) with endovascular mechanical thrombectomy. Four studies with <20 PCLVO patients and/or patient recruitment primarily until 2012 were excluded from subgroup analysis. Chi<sup>2</sup>, chi-square statistic; CI, confidence interval; df, degrees of freedom;  $l^2$ , *I*-square heterogeneity statistic; M-H, Mantel–Haenszel statistic; *P*, *p*-value; Tau<sup>2</sup>, estimated variance of underlying effects across studies; *Z*, *Z* statistic.

(**Figure 11**). Although it is believed that younger patients tend to have a better stroke outcome in comparison to older patients (55, 56), this study shows that PCLVO patients are younger but yet are still associated with a higher mortality than ACLVO patients.

Futile recanalization, a phenomenon defined as poor functional outcome with mRS 4–6, despite successful recanalization by MT, have been reported in individual studies as being significantly higher in PCLVO than ACLVO [OR = 2.15 (95% CI 1.27–3.63)] (39).

Due to the higher probability of futile recanalization, physicians may be more conservative and may not attempt MT in older PCLVO patients, hence creating a selection bias with higher numbers of younger patients being considered for MT. It is, however, worth mentioning that this study does not include data on futile recanalization and physicians' patient management.

The higher rate of mortality in PCLVO compared to ACLVO could be partly due to the relatively higher NIHSS on admission and, hence, stroke severity in posterior circulation stroke (**Figure 4**). This is in line with previous suggestions that stroke severity on admission is an important predictor of stroke

outcome, especially in the posterior circulation, and that higher baseline NIHSS in PCLVO is associated with a poor outcome (24, 62).

In addition, stroke due to basilar artery occlusion has been described as severe in relation to other occlusion sites in PCLVO (63). We reported basilar artery occlusion as the most frequent site of PCLVO (33.5%) (Table 1), which may also have contributed to the higher mortality. This study therefore suggests onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times, NIHSS, and basilar artery occlusion as factors that could influence outcome in PCLVO. As a reason for high mortality in PCLVO, we propose a subtle progressive-over-time damage or a non-life supporting damage in the posterior circulation, possibly due to the gravity and irreversible nature of the damage to support life despite neurorehabilitation. Such damages have been described as a comatose state or locked-in syndrome, dysphagia, tracheostomy, hypostatic pneumonia, and complications as a result of being long-term bedridden (42). However, this hypothesis cannot be supported by the present study and we therefore encourage further studies to detect causes of higher mortality of MT in PCLVO.

## Limitations

Although we implemented measures to limit setbacks in this study, we were nonetheless posed with a couple of challenges. Firstly, such a meta-analysis with several studies over such long duration faces the problem of high heterogeneity with respect to stroke management across studies. Secondly, although efforts were made to exclude the possible effects of the use of firstgeneration MT devices, there was no 100% guarantee that all remaining studies included in our subgroup analyses exclusively used second-generation MT devices. Thirdly, there was a huge disparity in number of PCLVO and ACLVO patients. Finally, the lack of RCT in both groups introduces selection bias.

# CONCLUSION

Although MT in PCLVO differs characteristically and also in terms of outcome from ACLVO, our meta-analysis indicates that MT in PCLVO may be equally efficient just as in ACLVO in achieving successful recanalization and a favorable 90 day functional outcome. Although MT in PCLVO is associated with lower likelihood of sICH, possibly due to fewer PCLVO patients receiving IVT because of late recognition and presentation, PCLVO is associated with a higher occurrence of mortality. This higher mortality could be explained through the high baseline NIHSS, longer onset-to-IVT and onset-to-groin puncture times, and basilar artery occlusion being the most predominant site of PCLVO.

# REFERENCES

- Hacke W, Kaste M, Bluhmki E, Brozman M, Davalos A, Guidetti D, et al. Thrombolysis with alteplase 3 to 4.5 hours after acute ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med.* (2008) 359:1317–29. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0804656
- Bhatia R, Hill MD, Shobha N, Menon B, Bal S, Kochar P, et al. Low rates of acute recanalization with intravenous recombinant tissue plasminogen activator in ischemic stroke: real-world experience and a call for action. *Stroke*. (2010) 41:2254–8. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.592535
- Nogueira RG, Lutsep HL, Gupta R, Jovin TG, Albers GW, Walker GA, et al. Trevo versus Merci retrievers for thrombectomy revascularisation of large vessel occlusions in acute ischaemic stroke (TREVO 2): a randomised trial. *Lancet*. (2012) 380:1231–40. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61299-9
- Saver JL, Jahan R, Levy EI, Jovin TG, Baxter B, Nogueira RG, et al. Solitaire flow restoration device versus the Merci Retriever in patients with acute ischaemic stroke (SWIFT): a randomised, parallel-group, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. (2012) 380:1241–9. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61384-1
- Goyal M, Menon BK, Van Zwam WH, Dippel DW, Mitchell PJ, Demchuk AM, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy after large-vessel ischaemic stroke: a metaanalysis of individual patient data from five randomised trials. *Lancet.* (2016) 387:1723–31. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00163-X
- Nogueira RG, Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, Bonafe A, Budzik RF, Bhuva P, et al. Thrombectomy 6 to 24 hours after stroke with a mismatch between deficit and infarct. *N Engl J Med.* (2018) 378:11–21. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1706442
- Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, et al. Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: 2019 update to the 2018 guidelines for the early management of acute ischemic stroke: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke.* (2019) 50:e344–418. doi: 10.1161/STR.00000000000211
- 8. Turc G, Bhogal P, Fischer U, Khatri P, Lobotesis K, Mazighi M, et al. European Stroke Organisation (ESO) - European Society for Minimally Invasive

# DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/**Supplementary Material**, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author/s.

# **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

JM and SP conceived and designed the study, undertook data extraction, analyzed the data, and drafted the manuscript. KP and JT independently rechecked all extracted data and analysis. AG-E, YW, KF, and AM helped with data analysis. UZ helped interpret the data. SP had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

# FUNDING

We acknowledge support by Open Access Publishing Fund of University of Tübingen.

# SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fneur. 2021.687134/full#supplementary-material

Neurological Therapy (ESMINT) guidelines on mechanical thrombectomy in acute ischaemic stroke endorsed by stroke alliance for Europe (SAFE). *Eur Stroke J.* (2019) 4:6–12. doi: 10.1177/2396987319832140

- Yang P, Zhang Y, Zhang L, Zhang Y, Treurniet KM, Chen W, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy with or without intravenous alteplase in acute stroke. N Engl J Med. (2020) 382:1981–93. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2001123
- Nouh A, Remke J, Ruland S. Ischemic posterior circulation stroke: a review of anatomy, clinical presentations, diagnosis, and current management. *Front Neurol.* (2014) 5:30. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2014.00030
- Tao WD, Liu M, Fisher M, Wang DR, Li J, Furie KL, et al. Posterior versus anterior circulation infarction: how different are the neurological deficits? *Stroke*. (2012) 43:2060–5. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.112.652420
- Merwick A, Werring D. Posterior circulation ischaemic stroke. *BMJ*. (2014) 348:g3175. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g3175
- Schonewille WJ, Wijman CA, Michel P, Rueckert CM, Weimar C, Mattle HP, et al. Treatment and outcomes of acute basilar artery occlusion in the Basilar Artery International Cooperation Study (BASICS): a prospective registry study. *Lancet Neurol.* (2009) 8:724–30. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(09)70173-5
- Mattle HP, Arnold M, Lindsberg PJ, Schonewille WJ, Schroth G. Basilar artery occlusion. *Lancet Neurol.* (2011) 10:1002–14. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(11)70229-0
- Liu X, Dai Q, Ye R, Zi W, Liu Y, Wang H, et al. Endovascular treatment versus standard medical treatment for vertebrobasilar artery occlusion (BEST): an open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol.* (2020) 19:115–22. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30395-3
- Zi W, Qiu Z, Wu D, Li F, Liu H, Liu W, et al. Assessment of endovascular treatment for acute basilar artery occlusion via a nationwide prospective registry. JAMA Neurol. (2020) 77:561–73. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.0156
- Van Der Hoeven EJ, Schonewille WJ, Vos JA, Algra A, Audebert HJ, Berge E, et al. The Basilar Artery International Cooperation Study (BASICS): study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. (2013) 14:200. doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-14-200

- Ji X, Jovin TG. Basilar Artery Occlusion Chinese Endovascular (BAOCHE) Trial. ClinicalTrials.gov. Available online at: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/ show/NCT02737189 (accessed January 20, 2021).
- Wang F, Wang J, He Q, Wang L, Cao Y, Zhang H, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for posterior circulation occlusion: a comparison of outcomes with the anterior circulation occlusion - a meta-analysis. *J Atheroscler Thromb.* (2020) 27:1325–39. doi: 10.5551/jat.54221
- Zhao W, Ma P, Zhao W, Yang B, Zhang Y, Song J, et al. The safety and efficacy of mechanical thrombectomy in posterior vs. anterior emergent large vessel occlusion: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. (2020) 29:104545. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2019.104545
- Goyal M, Demchuk AM, Menon BK, Eesa M, Rempel JL, Thornton J, et al. Randomized assessment of rapid endovascular treatment of ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med.* (2015) 372:1019–30. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1414905
- 22. Nagel S, Herweh C, Kohrmann M, Huttner HB, Poli S, Hartmann M, et al. MRI in patients with acute basilar artery occlusion DWI lesion scoring is an independent predictor of outcome. *Int J Stroke*. (2012) 7:282–8. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-4949.2011.00705.x
- Singer OC, Berkefeld J, Nolte CH, Bohner G, Haring HP, Trenkler J, et al. Mechanical recanalization in basilar artery occlusion: the ENDOSTROKE study. Ann Neurol. (2015) 77:415–24. doi: 10.1002/ana.24336
- Gory B, Eldesouky I, Sivan-Hoffmann R, Rabilloud M, Ong E, Riva R, et al. Outcomes of stent retriever thrombectomy in basilar artery occlusion: an observational study and systematic review. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr. (2016) 87:520–5. doi: 10.1136/jnnp-2014-310250
- Mokin M, Sonig A, Sivakanthan S, Ren Z, Elijovich L, Arthur A, et al. Clinical and procedural predictors of outcomes from the endovascular treatment of posterior circulation strokes. *Stroke*. (2016) 47:782–8. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.011598
- 26. Alonso De Lecinana M, Kawiorski MM, Ximenez-Carrillo A, Cruz-Culebras A, Garcia-Pastor A, Martinez-Sanchez P, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for basilar artery thrombosis: a comparison of outcomes with anterior circulation occlusions. *J Neurointerv Surg.* (2017) 9:1173–8. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2016-012797
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* (2009) 6:e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
- Higashida RT, Furlan AJ, Roberts H, Tomsick T, Connors B, Barr J, et al. Trial design and reporting standards for intra-arterial cerebral thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke. *Stroke*. (2003) 34:e109–37. doi: 10.1161/01
- Kim SY, Park JE, Lee YJ, Seo HJ, Sheen SS, Hahn S, et al. Testing a tool for assessing the risk of bias for nonrandomized studies showed moderate reliability and promising validity. *J Clin Epidemiol*. (2013) 66:408– 14. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.09.016
- 30. The Cochrane Collaboration. London (2020).
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*. (2003) 327:557–60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- Spiotta AM, Chaudry MI, Hui FK, Turner RD, Kellogg RT, Turk AS. Evolution of thrombectomy approaches and devices for acute stroke: a technical review. J Neurointerv Surg. (2015) 7:2–7. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2013-011022
- Mcgrath S, Zhao X, Steele R, Thombs BD, Benedetti A, Collaboration DESD. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly reported quantiles in meta-analysis. *Stat Methods Med Res.* (2020) 29:2520–37. doi: 10.1177/0962280219889080
- Abilleira S, Cardona P, Ribo M, Millan M, Obach V, Roquer J, et al. Outcomes of a contemporary cohort of 536 consecutive patients with acute ischemic stroke treated with endovascular therapy. *Stroke*. (2014) 45:1046–52. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.113.003489
- 35. Fockaert N, Coninckx M, Heye S, Defreyne L, Brisbois D, Goffette P, et al. Mechanical endovascular thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke: a retrospective multicenter study in Belgium. *Acta Neurol Belg.* (2016) 116:7–14. doi: 10.1007/s13760-015-0552-7
- Serles W, Gattringer T, Mutzenbach S, Seyfang L, Trenkler J, Killer-Oberpfalzer M, et al. Endovascular stroke therapy in Austria: a nationwide 1-year experience. *Eur J Neurol.* (2016) 23:906–11. doi: 10.1111/ene.12958
- 37. Khoury NN, Darsaut TE, Ghostine J, Deschaintre Y, Daneault N, Durocher A, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy and medical therapy versus medical

therapy alone in acute stroke: a randomized care trial. J Neuroradiol. (2017) 44:198-202. doi: 10.1016/j.neurad.2017.01.126

- Singh RK, Chafale VA, Lalla RS, Panchal KC, Karapurkar AP, Khadilkar SV, et al. Acute ischemic stroke treatment using mechanical thrombectomy: a study of 137 patients. *Ann Indian Acad Neurol.* (2017) 20:211–6. doi: 10.4103/aian.AIAN\_158\_17
- 39. Meinel TR, Kaesmacher J, Chaloulos-Iakovidis P, Panos L, Mordasini P, Mosimann PJ, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for basilar artery occlusion: efficacy, outcomes, and futile recanalization in comparison with the anterior circulation. *J Neurointerv Surg.* (2019) 11:1174–80. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2018-014516
- Weber R, Minnerup J, Nordmeyer H, Eyding J, Krogias C, Hadisurya J, et al. Thrombectomy in posterior circulation stroke: differences in procedures and outcome compared to anterior circulation stroke in the prospective multicentre REVASK registry. *Eur J Neurol.* (2019) 26:299–305. doi: 10.1111/ene.13809
- Wollenweber FA, Tiedt S, Alegiani A, Alber B, Bangard C, Berrouschot J, et al. Functional outcome following stroke thrombectomy in clinical practice. *Stroke.* (2019) 50:2500–6. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.026005
- 42. Huo X, Raynald, G.ao F, Ma N, Mo D, Sun X, et al. Characteristic and prognosis of acute large vessel occlusion in anterior and posterior circulation after endovascular treatment: the ANGEL registry real world experience. J Thromb Thrombolysis. (2020) 49:527–32. doi: 10.1007/s11239-020-02054-2
- Renieri L, Saia V, Pereira VM, Pracucci G, Limbucci N, Nappini S, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy in patients with proximal occlusions and low NIHSS: results from a large prospective registry. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis. (2020) 29:105091. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2020.105091
- Mourand I, Brunel H, Costalat V, Riquelme C, Lobotesis K, Milhaud D, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke: catch device. *Am J Neuroradiol.* (2011) 32:1381–5. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A2563
- 45. Lefevre PH, Lainay C, Thouant P, Chavent A, Kazemi A, Ricolfi F. Solitaire FR as a first-line device in acute intracerebral occlusion: a single-centre retrospective analysis. J Neuroradiol. (2014) 41:80–6. doi: 10.1016/j.neurad.2013.10.002
- Hu SY, Yi HJ, Lee DH, Hong JT, Sung JH, Lee SW. Effectiveness and safety of mechanical thrombectomy with stent retrievers in basilar artery occlusion: comparison with anterior circulation occlusions. *J Korean Neurosurg Soc.* (2017) 60:635–43. doi: 10.3340/jkns.2017.0404.008
- 47. Alawieh A, Vargas J, Turner RD, Turk AS, Chaudry MI, Lena J, et al. Equivalent favorable outcomes possible after thrombectomy for posterior circulation large vessel occlusion compared with the anterior circulation: the MUSC experience. J Neurointerv Surg. (2018) 10:735–40. doi: 10.1136/neurintsurg-2017-013420
- Uno J, Kameda K, Otsuji R, Ren N, Nagaoka S, Maeda K, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for basilar artery occlusion compared with anterior circulation stroke. World Neurosurg. (2020) 134:e469–75. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2019.10.097
- Adams HP Jr., Bendixen BH, Kappelle LJ, Biller J, Love BB, et al. Classification of subtype of acute ischemic stroke. Definitions for use in a multicenter clinical trial. TOAST. Trial of Org 10172 in acute stroke treatment. *Stroke*. (1993) 24:35–41. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.24.1.35
- Kasner SE. Clinical interpretation and use of stroke scales. Lancet Neurol. (2006) 5:603-12. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(06)70495-1
- Baird TA, Muir KW, Bone I. Basilar artery occlusion. Neurocrit Care. (2004) 1:319–29. doi: 10.1385/NCC:1:3:319
- Wardlaw JM, Murray V, Berge E, Del Zoppo GJ. Thrombolysis for acute ischaemic stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2014) 2014:CD000213. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD000213.pub3
- Sarraj A, Medrek S, Albright K, Martin-Schild S, Bibars W, Vahidy F, et al. Posterior circulation stroke is associated with prolonged door-to-needle time. *Int J Stroke*. (2015) 10:672–8. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-4949.2012.00952.x
- Lindsberg PJ, Pekkola J, Strbian D, Sairanen T, Mattle HP, Schroth G. Time window for recanalization in basilar artery occlusion: speculative synthesis. *Neurology*. (2015) 85:1806–15. doi: 10.1212/WNL.00000000000 02129
- Lindgren A, Norrving B, Rudling O, Johansson BB. Comparison of clinical and neuroradiological findings in first-ever stroke. A population-based study. *Stroke*. (1994) 25:1371–7. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.25.7.1371

- Dornak T, Kral M, Hazlinger M, Herzig R, Veverka T, Burval S, et al. Posterior vs. anterior circulation infarction: demography, outcomes, and frequency of hemorrhage after thrombolysis. *Int J Stroke*. (2015) 10:1224–8. doi: 10.1111/ijs.12626
- Sarikaya H, Arnold M, Engelter ST, Lyrer PA, Mattle HP, Georgiadis D, et al. Outcomes of intravenous thrombolysis in posterior versus anterior circulation stroke. Stroke. (2011) 42:2498–502. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.607614
- Keselman B, Gdovinova Z, Jatuzis D, Melo TPE, Vilionskis A, Cavallo R, et al. Safety and outcomes of intravenous thrombolysis in posterior versus anterior circulation stroke: results from the safe implementation of treatments in stroke registry and meta-analysis. *Stroke*. (2020) 51:876–82. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.027071
- Lee SH, Han JH, Jung I, Jung JM. Do thrombolysis outcomes differ between anterior circulation stroke and posterior circulation stroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Stroke*. (2020) 15:849–57. doi: 10.1177/1747493020909634
- Broderick JP, Palesch YY, Demchuk AM, Yeatts SD, Khatri P, Hill MD, et al. Endovascular therapy after intravenous t-PA versus t-PA alone for stroke. N Engl J Med. (2013) 368:893–903. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1214300
- 61. Nogueira RG. Systemic thrombolysis randomization in endovascular stroke therapy (SHRINE) collaboration. In: *International Stroke Conference* 2021 (2021).
- 62. Szmygin M, Sojka M, Pyra K, Tarkowski P, Luchowski P, Wojczal J, et al. Mechanical thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke in the posterior circulation: assessment of efficacy and outcome and identification of prognostic factors. *Acta Radiol.* (2020) doi: 10.1177/0284185120962735

 Demel SL, Broderick JP. Basilar occlusion syndromes: an update. Neurohospitalist. (2015) 5:142–50. doi: 10.1177/19418744155 83847

**Conflict of Interest:** UZ received research grants from BMS, European Research Council, German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, German Research Foundation, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, and Takeda, and personal consulting fees from Bayer, CorTec, and Pfizer. SP received research grants from BMS/Pfizer, Daiichi Sankyo, European Union, German Federal Joint Committee Innovation Fund, and German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, and speakers' honoraria/consulting fees from AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer-Ingelheim, BMS/Pfizer, Daiichi Sankyo, Portola, and Werfen.

The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2021 Mbroh, Poli, Tünnerhoff, Gomez-Exposito, Wang, Bender, Hempel, Hennersdorf, Feil, Mengel, Ziemann and Poli. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.