

1 **Comparison of prehospital assessment by paramedics and in-hospital assessment by**
2 **physicians in suspected stroke patients**

3

4 Luuk Dekker (MD)^{1*}, Jasper D. Daems (MD)^{2,3*}, Martijne H.C. Duvekot (MD)^{2,4}, T. Truc
5 My Nguyen (MD, PhD)¹, Esmee Venema (MD, PhD)^{3,5}, Adriaan C.G.M. van Es (MD,
6 PhD)⁶, Anouk D. Rozeman (MD, PhD)⁴, Walid Moudrous (MD)⁷, Kirsten R.I.S. Dorresteijn
7 (MD)⁸, Jan-Hein J. Hensen (MD)⁹, Jan Bosch (MSc)¹⁰, Erik W. van Zwet (PhD)¹¹, Els
8 L.L.M. de Schryver (MD, PhD)¹², Loet M.H. Kloos (MD)¹³, Karlijn F. de Laat (MD, PhD)¹⁴,
9 Leo A.M. Aerden, (MD, PhD)¹⁵, Ido R. van den Wijngaard (MD, PhD)¹, Diederik W.J.
10 Dippel (MD, PhD)², Henk Kerkhoff (MD, PhD)⁴, Marieke J.H. Wermer (MD, PhD)¹, Bob
11 Roozenbeek (MD, PhD)^{2**}, Nyika D. Kruyt (MD, PhD)^{1**}

12 On behalf of the PRESTO and LPSS investigators

13

14 * both authors contributed equally to the manuscript

15 ** both authors contributed equally to the manuscript

16

17 **Author affiliations:**

18 1. Department of Neurology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

19 2. Department of Neurology, Erasmus MC University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the
20 Netherlands

21 3. Department of Public Health, Erasmus MC University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the
22 Netherlands

23 4. Department of Neurology, Albert Schweitzer Hospital, Dordrecht, the Netherlands

24 5. Department of Emergency Medicine, Erasmus MC University Medical Center, Rotterdam,
25 the Netherlands

- 26 6. Department of Radiology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands
- 27 7. Department of Neurology, Maasstad Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- 28 8. Department of Neurology, Franciscus Gasthuis & Vlietland, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- 29 9. Department of Radiology, Maasstad Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- 30 10. Emergency Medical Services Hollands–Midden, Leiden, the Netherlands
- 31 11. Department of Medical Statistics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the
- 32 Netherlands
- 33 12. Department of Neurology, Alrijne Hospital, Leiderdorp, the Netherlands
- 34 13. Department of Neurology, Groene Hart Hospital, Gouda, the Netherlands
- 35 14. Department of Neurology, Haga Hospital, The Hague, the Netherlands
- 36 15. Department of Neurology, Reinier de Graaf Gasthuis Hospital, Delft, the Netherlands

37

38 **Corresponding author:**

39 Luuk Dekker, MD, Department of Neurology, Leiden University Medical Center,
40 Albinusdreef 2, P.O. Box 9600, 2300 RC, Leiden, the Netherlands.

41 Email: l.dekker@lumc.nl

42 Phone: +31 (0)71 - 526 2197

43 ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0958-2081>

44

45 **Article type:** Original Article

46 **Title character count:** 106

47 **Short title:** Paramedic stroke assessment compared to physicians

48 **Tables:** 3

49 **Figures:** 1

50 **Supplementary tables:** 3

51 **Supplementary figures:** 1

52 **Number of references:** 20

53 **Keywords:** Stroke, prehospital triage, prehospital assessment, NIHSS, neurologic

54 examination, emergency medical services, cohort studies, cerebrovascular disorders

55 **Abstract word count:** 297

56 **Manuscript word count:** 4757

57

58 **ABSTRACT**

59 **Background:** It is unknown if ambulance paramedics adequately assess neurological deficits

60 used for prehospital stroke scales to detect anterior large-vessel occlusions. We aimed to

61 compare prehospital assessment of these stroke-related deficits by paramedics with in-

62 hospital assessment by physicians.

63 **Methods:** We used data from two prospective cohort studies: the Leiden Prehospital Stroke

64 Study (LPSS) and PREhospital triage of patients with suspected STroKe (PRESTO) study. In

65 both studies, paramedics scored 9 neurological deficits in stroke code patients in the field.

66 Trained physicians scored the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) at hospital

67 presentation. Patients with transient ischemic attack were excluded because of the transient

68 nature of symptoms. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r_s) was used to assess

69 correlation between the total prehospital assessment score, defined as the sum of all

70 prehospital items, and the total NIHSS score. Correlation, sensitivity and specificity were

71 calculated for each prehospital item with the corresponding NIHSS item as reference.

72 **Results:** We included 2850 stroke code patients. Of these, 1528 had ischemic stroke, 243

73 intracranial hemorrhage, and 1079 stroke mimics. Correlation between the total prehospital

74 assessment score and NIHSS score was strong ($r_s=0.70$; 95%CI: 0.68-0.72). Concerning

75 individual items, prehospital assessment of arm ($r_s=0.68$) and leg ($r_s=0.64$) motor function

76 correlated strongest with corresponding NIHSS items, and had highest sensitivity (arm 95%,
77 leg 93%) and moderate specificity (arm 71%, leg 70%). Neglect ($r_s=0.31$), abnormal speech
78 ($r_s=0.50$) and gaze deviation ($r_s=0.51$) had weakest correlations. Neglect and gaze deviation
79 had lowest sensitivity (52% and 66%) but high specificity (84% and 89%), whilst abnormal
80 speech had high sensitivity (85%) but lowest specificity (65%).

81 **Conclusions:** The overall prehospital assessment of stroke code patients correlates strongly
82 with in-hospital assessment. Prehospital assessment of neglect, abnormal speech and gaze
83 deviation differed most from in-hospital assessment. Focused training on these deficits may
84 improve prehospital triage.

85

86 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms**

87 aLVO = anterior large-vessel occlusion

88 CI = confidence interval

89 EVT = endovascular thrombectomy

90 FAST = Face-Arm-Speech-Time

91 IVT = intravenous thrombolysis

92 IQR = interquartile range

93 LPSS = Leiden Prehospital Stroke Study

94 NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale

95 PSC = primary stroke center

96 PRESTO = PREhospital triage of patients with suspected STrOke study

97 RACE = Rapid Arterial occlusion Evaluation

98 r_s = Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

99 SD = standard deviation

100 TIA = transient ischemic attack

101 TSC = thrombectomy-capable stroke center

102

103 **INTRODUCTION**

104 In order to prevent delays in treatment of patients with ischemic stroke due to anterior
105 circulation large vessel occlusion (aLVO), the AHA/ASA stroke triage algorithm
106 recommends the use of prehospital aLVO stroke scales to help ambulance paramedics
107 identify aLVO patients for direct transportation to a thrombectomy-capable stroke center
108 (TSC).¹ However, sensitivity of these scales is relatively low, ranging between 38% and
109 67%.^{2,3} A possible explanation for this is that neurological deficits are not adequately
110 recognized by ambulance paramedics in the field. Ambulance paramedics only encounter
111 stroke code patients sporadically during their shifts and adequate assessment of neurological
112 deficits could require more extensive training. Meanwhile, neurological deficits are routinely
113 assessed with the standardized National Institute of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) by
114 experienced physicians upon arrival at the hospital.⁴ Some studies have compared the overall
115 prehospital assessment of aLVO stroke scales by paramedics with assessment of physicians,
116 but focused on total scores of a single scale and did not evaluate separate items.⁵⁻⁸ Only four
117 small studies have evaluated to what extent examination of individual neurological deficits by
118 paramedics matches the in-hospital assessment by physicians.⁹⁻¹² Furthermore, only two of
119 these studies included all stroke code patients, including patients with a stroke mimic, and in
120 only one the paramedical assessment was performed on-site in the prehospital setting.^{9,10}
121 Further knowledge of the level of agreement could guide training programs for paramedics
122 and improve prehospital aLVO triage by focusing training on the more challenging
123 neurological deficits. Therefore, we aimed to compare prehospital assessment of stroke code
124 patients by paramedics with in-hospital assessment by physicians.

125

126 **METHODS**

127 **Patients**

128 We used data from stroke code patients included in the Leiden Prehospital Stroke Study
129 (LPSS) and the PREhospital triage of patients with suspected STrOke (PRESTO) study.^{2,3}
130 LPSS and PRESTO were both prospective multiregional observational cohort studies that
131 included stroke code patients from four ambulance regions in the Netherlands. Together these
132 regions serve roughly 3.7 million inhabitants with 10 PSCs and 5 TSCs, including 13
133 ambulance posts with approximately 600 paramedics. Both studies included all patients aged
134 ≥ 18 years in whom an acute stroke code was activated by ambulance paramedics. A stroke
135 code was activated in case of a positive Face-Arm-Speech-Time (FAST) test (PRESTO) or
136 other acute neurological deficits at the insight of the individual paramedic (LPSS). The final
137 diagnosis was made by local clinicians either at discharge (PRESTO) or after 3 months
138 (LPSS). In PRESTO an imaging core laboratory committee re-assessed CT angiographies for
139 presence of aLVO. The complete study designs, procedures and results of the PRESTO and
140 LPSS studies can be found elsewhere.^{2,3,13} For this study, we excluded patients with a final
141 diagnosis of transient ischemic attack (TIA) since the transient nature of symptoms would
142 hamper a fair comparison. We used the STROBE guidelines for reporting this observational
143 study.¹⁴

144

145 **Prehospital and in-hospital assessment**

146 Paramedics scored 9-11 neurological deficits from the NIHSS on-site upon arrival at the
147 patient and stored these in a web-based application (**Table S1**). In PRESTO, the following
148 nine items were assessed: answering questions, following commands, abnormal speech, gaze
149 deviation, facial palsy, arm motor function, leg motor function, grip strength, and agnosia
150 (recognition of own arm and/or impairment). In the LPSS, the same items were assessed with

151 the addition of sensory deficits and tactile extinction. Completing all items was required in
152 PRESTO. In the LPSS paramedics could score the items abnormal speech, grip strength, arm
153 and leg motor function, and tactile extinction as ‘untestable’, e.g. if the patient had a
154 decreased level of consciousness or was fixed for transport. For this study, all untestable
155 items were scored as missing. In the Netherlands, ambulance paramedics are registered
156 nurses, who generally completed an additional 2-year training in either intensive, cardiac,
157 anesthetic or emergency medical care, plus a one-year training in ambulance care. Prior to the
158 initiation of each study, they received a brief introductory session (30-45 minutes) focusing
159 on the use of the application and assessment of the clinical items required for the studied
160 prehospital aLVO scales. At the emergency department, the NIHSS was assessed as part of
161 routine work-up by a trained neurologist, neurology resident or emergency physician from
162 the stroke team. In case NIHSS items were not documented these were reconstructed using a
163 standardized scoring chart (PRESTO) or validated algorithm (LPSS) based on neurological
164 examination reports.¹⁵ The time between ambulance arrival at the patient location and
165 hospital arrival (ambulance-arrival-to-door time) was used to estimate the time-interval
166 between the prehospital and in-hospital assessment.

167

168 **Statistical analysis**

169 We analyzed the correlation between the total prehospital assessment score (range 0-15) and
170 the total in-hospital NIHSS score (range 0-42) using Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient
171 (r_s) and constructed 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using Fisher’s Z transformation. The total
172 prehospital assessment score was defined as the summation of all scores of the 9 stroke items
173 that were assessed in both the LPSS and PRESTO. Patients with incomplete prehospital or
174 NIHSS assessments were excluded from this analysis. To evaluate possible differences in
175 assessment between diagnoses, this analysis was repeated after stratifying by final diagnosis.

176 Similarly, since spontaneous clinical improvement or deterioration might occur especially in
177 the first few hours after onset, we also assessed Spearman's correlation after dividing the
178 cohort in quartiles based upon the time between onset and ambulance arrival.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ A
179 Spearman's coefficient of 0-0.19 was regarded as very weak, 0.2-0.39 as weak, 0.40-0.59 as
180 moderate, 0.6-0.79 as strong and 0.8-1 as very strong correlation.¹⁹

181 Second, to identify more challenging items, we calculated the correlation, sensitivity
182 and specificity of each prehospital item compared to its corresponding in-hospital item from
183 the NIHSS. To calculate sensitivity and specificity, we dichotomized all prehospital and in-
184 hospital findings as either normal or abnormal, using the in-hospital NIHSS as reference. We
185 constructed 95% CIs for sensitivity and specificity using the normal approximation method
186 based on estimated standard errors. If LPSS and PRESTO used different scoring methods for
187 the same item, scores were combined and adjusted to match the NIHSS (**Table S1**). For
188 correlation, the combined score of LPSS and PRESTO was compared with the NIHSS.
189 Because prehospital assessment of arm motor function did not include an isolated drift
190 without paresis in PRESTO, a drift on the LPSS and NIHSS item arm motor function was
191 scored as normal. Similarly, since both PRESTO and LPSS did not score a drift without
192 paresis for leg motor function, a drift on this NIHSS item was also scored as normal. The
193 prehospital item abnormal speech was compared to any symptoms on the language or
194 dysarthria items on the NIHSS. Prehospital assessment of agnosia was compared with the
195 NIHSS item neglect. In PRESTO, agnosia was only scored in patients with left sided
196 hemiparesis, according to the Rapid Arterial occlusion Evaluation (RACE) scale.²⁰
197 Additionally, because tactile extinction was also assessed in the LPSS and since the NIHSS
198 item neglect encompasses more modalities than only agnosia, we also compared neglect with
199 the combined prehospital assessment of agnosia and tactile extinction in the LPSS cohort.
200 Patients with missing prehospital or NIHSS assessments were excluded on a per item basis

201 for these comparisons. Lastly, grip strength was excluded from the analysis of individual
202 items, since there is no corresponding item on the NIHSS.

203 Statistical analyses were performed using R (version 4.1.2) and R Studio (version
204 2022.2.0.443).

205

206 **RESULTS**

207 Of the 3320 included stroke code patients, 470 had a TIA and were excluded (**Figure 1**). Of
208 the remaining 2850 patients, 1528 (53.6%) had an ischemic stroke (295 with aLVO), 243
209 (8.5%) had an intracranial hemorrhage and 1079 (37.9%) a stroke mimic. Median age was 73
210 years and 49% were female (**Table 1**). Median ambulance-arrival-to-door time was 29
211 minutes (interquartile range (IQR) 23-36 minutes). Median total prehospital assessment score
212 was 2 and in-hospital NIHSS score was 3. These were higher for aLVO ischemic stroke
213 patients (median prehospital assessment score: 8, NIHSS score: 12) and patients with an
214 intracranial hemorrhage (prehospital assessment score: 6, NIHSS score: 10) (**Table S2**).

215 Spearman's correlation coefficient between the total prehospital assessment score and
216 in-hospital NIHSS score was strong (0.70; 95% CI: 0.68-0.72) (**Table 2, Figure S1**). After
217 stratification by final diagnosis, correlation was moderate for patients with a stroke mimic
218 (0.55, 95% CI: 0.49-0.59), strong for patients with non-aLVO ischemic stroke (0.61, 95% CI:
219 0.56-0.64), stronger for aLVO ischemic stroke (0.76, 95% CI: 0.69-0.81), and very strong for
220 intracranial hemorrhage (0.83, 95% CI: 0.77-0.87) (**Table 2**). As can be seen in **Table S3**, the
221 correlation was highest in the first quartile, but fluctuated throughout the entire onset-to-
222 ambulance-arrival time range.

223 Concerning comparison of the prehospital and in-hospital items, Spearman's
224 coefficient was highest for arm motor function (0.68, 95% CI: 0.66-0.70) and leg motor
225 function (0.64, 95% CI: 0.61-0.66). In contrast, correlation was poorest for neglect (0.31,

226 95% CI: 0.27-0.35), followed by abnormal speech (0.50, 95% CI: 0.47-0.53) and gaze
227 deviation (0.51, 95% CI: 0.48-0.54) (**Table 3**). Sensitivity was highest for arm motor function
228 (95%, 95% CI: 93-97) and leg motor function (93%, 95% CI: 91-96), and lowest for neglect
229 (52%, 95% CI: 45-59) and gaze deviation (66%, 95% CI: 61-70). Whilst specificity was
230 highest for gaze deviation (89%, 95% CI: 88-90), answering questions (87%, 95% CI: 85-
231 88), and following commands (85%, 95% CI: 84-87), and lowest for abnormal speech (65%,
232 95% CI: 62-67). Furthermore, in patients with neglect on the NIHSS, the prehospital
233 assessment of neglect was frequently missing (72/269; 27%) (**Table S4**). Also, the number of
234 false-positive patients (n=252) was higher than true-positive patients (n=102), resulting in a
235 very low positive predictive value ($102/354 = 29\%$) of neglect. A complete overview of
236 prehospital and in-hospital observations per item can be found in **Table S4**.

237 The additional analysis of the extended definition of neglect (agnosia with the
238 addition of tactile extinction) in the LPSS cohort showed an increase in sensitivity of neglect
239 from 52% to 64%, with a specificity of 79% (95% CI: 77-82). However, due to the low
240 prevalence of abnormal findings (7%) and low number of complete cases (89/168), the 95%
241 confidence interval of sensitivity of the extended definition of neglect was wide (54-74%)
242 (**Table 3 and Table S4**). Furthermore, 47% of patients with neglect on the NIHSS had a
243 missing or untestable prehospital assessment of either agnosia or tactile extinction (79/168).

244

245 **DISCUSSION**

246 We found that the overall prehospital assessment of stroke code patients by paramedics
247 correlates strongly with in-hospital examination by physicians, indicating that paramedics
248 adequately assess stroke-related neurological deficits in the prehospital setting. Correlation
249 was strongest in patients with a final diagnosis of aLVO ischemic stroke or intracranial
250 hemorrhage. Concerning individual items, prehospital assessment of arm and leg motor

251 function correlated best with in-hospital findings and had the highest sensitivity. In contrast,
252 neglect, abnormal speech and gaze deviation had weakest correlation. Neglect and gaze
253 deviation had lowest sensitivity, whilst abnormal speech had lowest specificity.

254 The most recent AHA/ASA stroke triage algorithm for ambulance paramedics
255 recommends the use of a prehospital aLVO stroke scale.¹ However, the quality of assessment
256 of individual stroke-related deficits by paramedics was only studied in four small (n<190)
257 studies and often in cohorts including only stroke patients rather than in unselected stroke
258 code patients.⁹⁻¹² A few other studies evaluated prehospital assessment of complete aLVO
259 stroke scales by paramedics with assessment by physicians.⁵⁻⁸ One small study found very
260 good agreement in assessment of the RACE scale by ambulance paramedics on-site and
261 stroke neurologists using video telemedicine in 31 stroke code patients.⁵ Three other studies
262 found that paramedics scored the Field Assessment Stroke Triage for Emergency Destination
263 (FAST-ED) and Los Angeles Motor Scale (LAMS) similarly to emergency physicians and
264 vascular neurologists.⁶⁻⁸ However, these studies had smaller sample sizes than our study and
265 did not investigate separate clinical items. Additionally, the times between both assessments
266 were generally longer than in our study, and one study compared LAMS assessment only in
267 selected patients with a final diagnosis of stroke.⁶

268 Stratified by final diagnosis, we found that overall correlation was strongest for
269 patients with an intracranial hemorrhage or aLVO ischemic stroke, who also had highest
270 NIHSS scores. This indicates that the prehospital assessment by paramedics is especially
271 adequate in case of severe neurological deficits, which is often the case in patients who
272 require direct transportation to a TSC. Correlation was poorest in patients with a stroke
273 mimic, possibly due to more prevalent fluctuations of symptoms in certain mimics, such as
274 seizures or functional neurological disorders.

275 Our findings suggest that neglect is the most challenging item for paramedics to
276 assess. In almost half of patients in whom neglect was observed in the hospital, this was
277 missed at prehospital assessment. Furthermore, the positive predictive value of the
278 prehospital assessment of neglect was very low. These findings are in line with a previous
279 study in a small subgroup of patients with suspected stroke, in which neglect had the lowest
280 inter-rater agreement between paramedics and the hospital stroke team.¹⁰ Following neglect,
281 sensitivity was lowest for gaze deviation. Of note, these are both cortical symptoms and
282 sensitive for aLVO ischemic stroke when assessed by an experienced neurologist, further
283 emphasizing the importance of correct prehospital assessment of these symptoms for aLVO
284 detection.²¹ Our findings suggest that in a setting with relatively well-trained paramedics the
285 assessment of neurological deficits can still be enhanced, which might improve the value of
286 the use of aLVO scales in prehospital stroke triage. Future research should address this,
287 ideally also taking into account efficacy of other aLVO triage modalities, such as mobile
288 stroke units, telemedicine, dry-electrode electroencephalography or transcranial doppler
289 systems.²²

290 Strengths of this study include the large sample size of unselected stroke code patients
291 from multiple ambulance regions with several PSCs and TSCs. In addition, prehospital
292 assessments were performed by paramedics in the field and implemented in regular
293 workflow, representing the real-world setting and making results well generalizable for
294 routine practice. Furthermore, due to the prospective designs, the amount of missing data was
295 limited. This allowed for extensive evaluation of the separate clinical items, which enabled
296 identification of the items that are most challenging for paramedics.

297 Limitations of this study include that subtle motor deficits could not be compared,
298 since an arm and leg drift was scored as normal. This may in part explain the high sensitivity
299 of motor function items, although correlation was still strongest for these items. Furthermore,

300 we used the prehospital assessment of agnosia for comparison with neglect, whilst this does
301 not encompass all modalities of the NIHSS definition of neglect. However, even in the
302 additional analysis in the LPSS cohort with the addition of tactile extinction to agnosia, the
303 sensitivity of neglect remained lowest. These results should be interpreted with caution
304 since a high proportion of patients who had neglect on the NIHSS missed prehospital
305 assessment of agnosia and tactile extinction. This again suggests that assessment of neglect is
306 challenging, which is in line with previous literature.¹⁰ Possibly, since completing all items
307 was not required in the LPSS, paramedics could have refrained from documenting prehospital
308 assessment in certain cases, e.g. if patients could not be instructed because of a decreased
309 consciousness or if patients were fixed for transport. We cannot exclude that this may have
310 influenced the estimations of correlation, sensitivity and specificity. Furthermore, symptoms
311 might have altered between the assessments due to spontaneous improvement or worsening,
312 which may explain some of the disparities.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ However, we found no clear or clinically
313 relevant trend in correlation after stratification for onset-to-ambulance-arrival time, the time
314 interval between both assessments was relatively short (median 29 minutes) and patients with
315 a final diagnosis of TIA were excluded. We therefore expect this effect to be limited. Also,
316 even despite this possible disturbance, the overall correlation between both assessments was
317 still strong. Furthermore, we would expect that a possible difference over time would apply to
318 all prehospital items equally and therefore not explain differences between the individual
319 items. Lastly, in the Netherlands, ambulance paramedics are well-trained registered nurses
320 who received additional education in ambulance care. This may have improved their
321 neurological examination and prehospital stroke assessment may be more challenging in
322 regions where paramedics are less extensively trained.

323

324 **CONCLUSIONS**

325 The overall prehospital assessment of stroke code patients by paramedics correlates strongly
326 with in-hospital assessment by physicians, indicating that paramedics can adequately assess
327 stroke-related neurological deficits in a prehospital setting. Prehospital assessment of neglect,
328 abnormal speech and gaze deviation differed most from in-hospital assessment. Focused
329 training on these three items may help to improve prehospital stroke triage.

330

331 **The LPSS and PRESTO collaborators:**

332 Leo A M Aerden, Kees C L Alblas, Jeannette Bakker, Eduard van Belle, Timo Bevelander,
333 Jan Bosch, Bianca Buijck, Jasper D Daems, Luuk Dekker, Diederik W J Dippel, Tamara
334 Dofferhoff-Vermeulen, Pieter Jan van Doormaal, Kirsten R I S Dorresteijn, Dion Duijndam,
335 Martijne H C Duvekot, Roeland P J van Eijkelenburg, Adriaan C G M van Es, Jan-Hein
336 Hensen, Amber Hoek, Henk Kerkhoff, Loet M H Kloos, Gaia T Koster, Nyika D Kruyt, Jan
337 Willem Kuiper, Karlijn F de Laat, Arnoud M de Leeuw, Hester F Lingsma, Aad van der
338 Lugt, Geert Lycklama À Nijeholt, Lisette Maasland, Bruno J M van Moll, Walid Moudrous,
339 Laus J M M Mulder, Truc My Nguyen, Anja Noordam-Reijm, Erick Oskam, Aarnout
340 Plaisier, Bob Roozenbeek, Anouk D Rozeman, Els L L M de Schryver, Esmee Venema,
341 Marieke J H Wermer, Ruben M van de Wijdeven, Ido R van den Wijngaard, Annemarie D
342 Wijnhoud, Merel L Willeboer, Mirjam Woudenberg, Mandy M A van der Zon, Erik W van
343 Zwet, Egon D Zwets, Stas A Zylicz

344

345 **Sources of Funding and Funding Statement**

346 The LPSS was funded by the Dutch Brain Foundation (grant HA20 15.01.02), the Dutch
347 Innovation Funds (grant 3.240), and Health-Holland (grant LSHM16041). The PRESTO
348 study was funded by the BeterKeten collaboration and Theia Foundation (Zilveren Kruis).

349 The funders had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or
350 writing of the report, or the decision to submit for publication.

351

352 **Disclosures**

353 MJHW reported receiving Clinical Established Investigator grant 2016T086 from the Dutch
354 Heart Foundation and VIDI grant 9171337 from the Netherlands Organization for Health
355 Research and Development (ZonMw) during the conduct of the original LPSS study. DWJD
356 reports funding from the Dutch Heart Foundation, Brain Foundation Netherlands, The
357 Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development, Health Holland Top Sector
358 Life Sciences & Health, and unrestricted grants from Penumbra Inc., Stryker, Medtronic,
359 Thrombolytic Science, LLC and Cerenovus for research, all paid to institution outside the
360 submitted work. BR reported funding from the Dutch Heart Foundation and the Netherlands
361 Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw) during the conduct of this
362 study, paid to the institution. NDK reported receiving grant HA20 15.01.02 from the Dutch
363 Brain Foundation, grant 3.240 from the Dutch Innovation Funds, and grant LSHM16041
364 from Health~Holland during the conduct of the study. No other disclosures or conflicts of
365 interests were reported.

366

367 **Data availability statement**

368 In compliance with Dutch law, patient data cannot be made available, since participants were
369 not informed during the opt-out procedure about the public sharing of their individual
370 participant data in de-identified form. The syntax and output files of the statistical analyses
371 can be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

372

373 **References**

- 374 1. Association AH. Mission: Lifeline Stroke. Severity-based stroke triage algorithm for
375 EMS. American Heart Association. 2020. Accessed October 31 2022.
- 376 2. Nguyen TTM, van den Wijngaard IR, Bosch J, van Belle E, van Zwet EW, Dofferhoff-
377 Vermeulen T, Duijndam D, Koster GT, de Schryver E, Kloos LMH, et al. Comparison of
378 Prehospital Scales for Predicting Large Anterior Vessel Occlusion in the Ambulance
379 Setting. *JAMA Neurol.* 2020;78:157-164. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.4418
- 380 3. Duvekot MHC, Venema E, Rozeman AD, Moudrous W, Vermeij FH, Biekart M,
381 Lingsma HF, Maasland L, Wijnhoud AD, Mulder L, et al. Comparison of eight
382 prehospital stroke scales to detect intracranial large-vessel occlusion in suspected
383 stroke (PRESTO): a prospective observational study. *The Lancet Neurology.*
384 2021;20:213-221. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(20)30439-7
- 385 4. Brott T, Adams Jr HP, Olinger CP, Marler JR, Barsan WG, Biller J, Spilker J, Holleran R,
386 Eberle R, Hertzberg V. Measurements of acute cerebral infarction: a clinical
387 examination scale. *Stroke.* 1989;20:864-870. doi: 10.1161/01.str.20.7.864
- 388 5. Hackett CT, Rahangdale R, Protetch J, Saleemi MA, Rana SS, Wright DG, Fishman R,
389 Noah P, Tayal AH. Rapid Arterial Occlusion Evaluation Scale Agreement between
390 Emergency Medical Services Technicians and Neurologists. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.*
391 2020;29. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2020.104745
- 392 6. Kim JT, Chung PW, Starkman S, Sanossian N, Stratton SJ, Eckstein M, Pratt FD, Conwit
393 R, Liebeskind DS, Sharma L, et al. Field Validation of the Los Angeles Motor Scale as a
394 Tool for Paramedic Assessment of Stroke Severity. *Stroke.* 2017;48:298-306. doi:
395 10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.015247
- 396 7. Guillory BC, Gupta AA, Cubeddu LX, Boge LA. Can Prehospital Personnel Accurately
397 Triage Patients for Large Vessel Occlusion Strokes? *J Emerg Med.* 2020;58:917-921.
398 doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2020.01.015
- 399 8. Bhatt NR, Frankel MR, Nogueira RG, Fleming C, Bianchi NA, Morgan O, Chester K,
400 English SW, Janocko N, Navalkele D, et al. Reliability of Field Assessment Stroke
401 Triage for Emergency Destination Scale Use by Paramedics: Mobile Stroke Unit First-
402 Year Experience. *Stroke.* 2021;52:2530-2536. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.033775
- 403 9. Nor AM, McAllister C, Louw SJ, Dyker AG, Davis M, Jenkinson D, Ford GA. Agreement
404 between ambulance paramedic- and physician-recorded neurological signs with Face
405 Arm Speech Test (FAST) in acute stroke patients. *Stroke.* 2004;35:1355-1359. doi:
406 10.1161/01.STR.0000128529.63156.c5
- 407 10. Demeestere J, Garcia-Esperon C, Lin L, Bivard A, Ang T, Smoll NR, Garnett A,
408 Loudfoot A, Miteff F, Spratt N, et al. Validation of the National Institutes of Health
409 Stroke Scale-8 to Detect Large Vessel Occlusion in Ischemic Stroke. *Journal of stroke
410 and cerebrovascular diseases : the official journal of National Stroke Association.*
411 2017;26:1419-1426. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2017.03.020
- 412 11. Whelley-Wilson CM, Newman GC. A stroke scale for emergency triage. *Journal of
413 stroke and cerebrovascular diseases : the official journal of National Stroke
414 Association.* 2004;13:247-253. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2004.04.005
- 415 12. Kothari RU, Pancioli A, Liu T, Brott T, Broderick J. Cincinnati Prehospital Stroke Scale:
416 reproducibility and validity. *Annals of emergency medicine.* 1999;33:373-378. doi:
417 10.1016/s0196-0644(99)70299-4
- 418 13. Venema E, Duvekot MHC, Lingsma HF, Rozeman AD, Moudrous W, Vermeij FH,
419 Biekart M, van der Lugt A, Kerkhoff H, Dippel DWJ, et al. Prehospital triage of

420 patients with suspected stroke symptoms (PRESTO): protocol of a prospective
421 observational study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028810
422 14. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
423 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)
424 statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet (London, England)*.
425 2007;370:1453-1457. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(07)61602-x
426 15. Williams LS, Yilmaz EY, Lopez-Yunez AM. Retrospective assessment of initial stroke
427 severity with the NIH Stroke Scale. *Stroke*. 2000;31:858-862. doi:
428 10.1161/01.str.31.4.858
429 16. Shkirkova K, Schuberg S, Balouzian E, Starkman S, Eckstein M, Stratton S, Pratt FD,
430 Hamilton S, Sharma L, Liebeskind DS, et al. Paramedic Global Impression of Change
431 During Prehospital Evaluation and Transport for Acute Stroke. *Stroke*. 2020;51:784-
432 791. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.119.026392
433 17. Saver JL, Altman H. Relationship between neurologic deficit severity and final
434 functional outcome shifts and strengthens during first hours after onset. *Stroke*.
435 2012;43:1537-1541. doi: 10.1161/strokeaha.111.636928
436 18. Balucani C, Levine SR, Sanossian N, Starkman S, Liebeskind D, Gornbein JA, Shkirkova
437 K, Stratton S, Eckstein M, Hamilton S, et al. Neurologic Improvement in Acute
438 Cerebral Ischemia: Frequency, Magnitude, Predictors, and Clinical Outcomes.
439 *Neurology*. 2023;100:e1038-e1047. doi: 10.1212/wnl.0000000000201656
440 19. Swinscow TDV. *Statistics at Square One*. BMJ Publishing Group; 2009.
441 20. Perez de la Ossa N, Carrera D, Gorchs M, Querol M, Millan M, Gomis M, Dorado L,
442 Lopez-Cancio E, Hernandez-Perez M, Chicharro V, et al. Design and validation of a
443 prehospital stroke scale to predict large arterial occlusion: the rapid arterial
444 occlusion evaluation scale. *Stroke*. 2014;45:87-91. doi:
445 10.1161/STROKEAHA.113.003071
446 21. Beume LA, Hieber M, Kaller CP, Nitschke K, Bardutzky J, Urbach H, Weiller C, Rijntjes
447 M. Large Vessel Occlusion in Acute Stroke. *Stroke*. 2018;49:2323-2329. doi:
448 10.1161/strokeaha.118.022253
449 22. Patrick L, Smith W, Keenan KJ. Large Vessel Occlusion Stroke Detection in the
450 Prehospital Environment. *Curr Emerg Hosp Med Rep*. 2021;9:64-72. doi:
451 10.1007/s40138-021-00234-9
452

453

454 **TABLES & FIGURES**

455

456 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of analyzed patients.

Characteristic	n=2850
Age, median (IQR)	73 (61-82)
Female sex, n/N (%)	1401/2850 (49)
Premorbid mRS 0-2, n/N (%)	2208/2641 (84)
History of:	
atrial fibrillation, n/N (%)	421/2829 (15)
hypertension, n/N (%)	1720/2835 (61)
hypercholesterolemia, n/N (%)	1470/2828 (52)
diabetes mellitus, n/N (%)	579/2830 (21)
ischemic stroke or TIA*, n/N (%)	811/2832 (29)
myocardial infarction, n/N (%)	316/2825 (11)
intracranial hemorrhage, n/N (%)	86/2841 (3)
Use of antiplatelet medication, n/N (%)	1002/2822 (36)
Use of oral anticoagulation, n/N (%)	457/2809 (16)
Primarily presented at a PSC, n/N (%)	1196/2850 (42)
Primarily presented at a TSC, n/N (%)	1654/2850 (58)
Onset-to-ambulance-arrival time, in minutes, median (IQR)	91 (30-277)
Ambulance-arrival-to-door time, in minutes, median (IQR)	29 (23-36)
Total prehospital assessment score (range 0-15), median (IQR)	2 (1-5)
Total in-hospital NIHSS score (range 0-42), median (IQR)	3 (1-7)

457

458 * In PRESTO only information on a history of ischemic stroke was collected.

459 *IQR = interquartile range; mRS = modified Rankin Scale; NIHSS = National Institutes of*

460 *Health Stroke Scale; PSC = primary stroke center; TIA = transient ischemic attack; TSC =*

461 *thrombectomy-capable stroke center*

462

463 **Table 2.** Correlation between the total prehospital assessment score (range 0-15) and in-
464 hospital NIHSS score (range 0-42), and stratified by final diagnosis.

	N*	Spearman's r_s (95% CI)	Median total prehospital assessment score (IQR)	Median total in-hospital NIHSS score (IQR)
Total cohort	2058	0.70 (0.68-0.72)	2 (1-5)	3 (1-7)
aLVO ischemic stroke	211	0.76 (0.69-0.81)	8 (4-10)	12 (6-17)
non-aLVO ischemic stroke	959	0.61 (0.56-0.64)	2 (1-5)	3 (2-5)
intracranial hemorrhage	153	0.83 (0.77-0.87)	6 (3-10)	10 (4-18)
stroke mimic	735	0.55 (0.49-0.59)	1 (0-3)	1 (0-3)

465

466 * Analyses were performed in patients of whom both complete prehospital assessment and
467 in-hospital NIHSS scores were available.

468 *aLVO = anterior large vessel occlusion; CI = confidence interval; IQR = interquartile*
469 *range; NIHSS = National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale*

470

471 **Table 3.** Comparison of prehospital and in-hospital assessments of individual items.

	N	Spearman's r_s * (95% CI)	Sensitivity* (95% CI)	Specificity* (95% CI)
Questions	2735	0.61 (0.59-0.64)	78 (75-81)	87 (85-88)
Commands	2736	0.55 (0.52-0.57)	74 (70-78)	85 (84-87)
Abnormal speech	2729	0.50 (0.47-0.53)	85 (83-87)	65 (62-67)
Gaze deviation	2713	0.51 (0.48-0.54)	66 (61-70)	89 (88-90)
Facial palsy	2759	0.58 (0.55-0.60)	76 (73-79)	79 (77-81)
Arm motor function	2443	0.68 (0.66-0.70)	95 (93-97)	71 (69-73)
Leg motor function	2225	0.64 (0.61-0.66)	93 (91-96)	70 (68-72)
Neglect (compared to agnosia) †	1725	0.31 (0.27-0.35)	52 (45-59)	84 (82-85)
Neglect (compared to agnosia and tactile extinction) ‡	1249	0.26 (0.21-0.31)	64 (54-74)	79 (77-82)

472

473 * For correlation, the combined score of LPSS and PRESTO was compared with the NIHSS.


474 For sensitivity and specificity, items were dichotomized as either normal or abnormal and the
475 in-hospital NIHSS was used as reference. Values are shown in percentages (%).

476 † In PRESTO, agnosia was only scored in patients with left sided hemiparesis.

477 ‡ Only shown for the LPSS cohort, because tactile extinction was not examined in PRESTO.

478 *CI = confidence interval*

479 **Figure 1.** Flowchart of analyzed patients.



480

481

482 *LPSS = Leiden Prehospital Stroke Study; PRESTO = PREhospital triage of patients with*

483 *suspected STrOke study; TIA = transient ischemic attack*