

1 **Late presenter thrombolysis for ischemic stroke between 4.5-24 hours after last known**
2 **well: a retrospective cohort study**

3
4 Lester Y. Leung, MD, MSc,¹ Devin Zebelean, MPH,¹ Emiliya Melkumova, MD,¹ Katelyn
5 Skeels, MSN, APRN, FNP-C,¹ Neel Madan, MD,² David E. Thaler, MD, PhD¹

6
7 ¹Division of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases, Department of Neurology, Tufts Medical
8 Center, Boston, MA

9 ²Division of Neuroradiology, Department of Radiology, Tufts Medical Center

10

11 Corresponding author:

12 Lester Y. Leung, MD, MSc

13 Department of Neurology

14 Tufts Medical Center

15 800 Washington Street, Box 314, Boston, MA 02111

16 Phone: 617-636-5848

17 Fax: 617-636-8199

18 Email: lleung@tuftsmedicalcenter.org

19

20 Running title: Late presenter thrombolysis for ischemic stroke

21 Abstract word count: 265

22 Manuscript word count: 3041

23 Figures: 1

24 Tables: 3

25

26 Keywords: stroke, acute stroke, thrombolysis, wakeup, extended window

27 **Background:** Two RCTs demonstrated efficacy and safety of IV alteplase for patients with acute
28 ischemic stroke (AIS) who awoken with symptoms or with last known well (LKW) more than
29 4.5 hours prior to arrival. However, real world experience using CT perfusion (CTP) or DWI-
30 MRI for patient selection in the U.S. is limited. We developed the Tufts Late Presenter
31 Thrombolysis (LPT) protocol to offer alteplase to patients with wakeup stroke, known LKW
32 more than 4.5 hours, or unknown LKW likely more than 4.5 hours and less than 24 hours, using
33 CTP or DWI-MRI to aid patient selection.

34
35 **Methods:** We reviewed ED stroke codes from our Comprehensive Stroke Center between
36 1/1/20-12/31/22 to identify patients treated with alteplase. Data were collected on demographics,
37 comorbidities, LKW-to-treatment time (LTT), imaging modality, imaging findings, NIHSS,
38 vessel occlusions, endovascular therapy (EVT), symptomatic ICH, and 90 days mRS. Outcomes
39 for comparative analyses included process times (door to needle, door to CT) and clinical
40 outcomes (90 day mRS, symptomatic ICH).

41
42 **Results:** Forty-three of 118 patients (36%) presenting with AIS and treated with thrombolysis
43 were treated between 4.5-24 hours after LKW. Patients treated in the 4.5 hour window and the
44 later window had similar demographics, comorbidities, NIHSS, and EVT rates. CTP was used in
45 the majority of LPT cases. The median penumbra was 45.04 mL (11.55-83.21), and the median
46 core infarct was 5.92 mL (1.89-16.7). Symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage occurred in one LPT
47 case (2.3%). Favorable mRS (0-1) was achieved by 36% of LPT patients with documented 90
48 day mRS.

49

50 **Conclusions:** A pragmatic protocol offering thrombolysis to late presenters may be safe and
51 achieve favorable outcomes.

52

53 **Introduction**

54

55 While last known well to treatment time remains the major determinant of functional outcome
56 and safety of treatment with acute revascularization therapies in acute ischemic stroke (AIS), the
57 increasingly widespread use of advanced neuroimaging technologies in the hyperacute setting
58 offers the ability to select patients, based on favorable physiology, for thrombolysis and
59 thrombectomy in later time windows. Two randomized clinical trials, WAKEUP and EXTEND,
60 demonstrated safety and efficacy of IV thrombolysis beyond 4.5 hours after last known well
61 (LKW) using DWI-MRI and CT perfusion (CTP), respectively, to evaluate patients who awoken
62 with stroke symptoms or have known LKW beyond 4.5 hours.(1, 2) A third nonrandomized trial,
63 MR WITNESS, assessed the safety of thrombolysis in patients without a witnessed onset of
64 symptoms likely between 4.5 to 24 hours from LKW using MRI.(3) Nonetheless, the American
65 Heart Association-American Stroke Association guidelines for the early management of AIS
66 only incorporated data from the WAKEUP trial: thus, its provisional recommendations regarding
67 thrombolysis beyond 4.5 hours was based solely on an MRI-informed practice.(4) Accordingly,
68 the safety, efficacy, and logistical considerations of thrombolysis beyond 4.5 hours using CTP in
69 the real world setting is largely unknown. Furthermore, the selection criteria for the WAKEUP
70 and EXTEND trials do not readily overlap, making it challenging to offer thrombolysis in these
71 scenarios while adhering strictly to the RCT selection criteria.

72

73 Acknowledging the different target populations, heterogeneous selection criteria, and different
74 imaging modalities used in recent clinical trials on thrombolysis in later time windows, we
75 sought to create a pragmatic, inclusive protocol for “late presenter thrombolysis” at Tufts

76 Medical Center, favoring CTP as the more readily available technology. We started this protocol
77 in February 2020 as a nonmandatory treatment option that our neurologists could offer to select
78 patients. In this study, we sought to compare characteristics of patients treated with thrombolysis
79 through standard and LPT protocols and assess outcomes for patients treated through the LPT
80 protocol.

81

82 **Methods**

83

84 *Design and sample*

85

86 This is a retrospective cohort study including all patients age ≥ 18 hospitalized at a
87 comprehensive stroke center (Tufts Medical Center) with a principal diagnosis of acute ischemic
88 stroke (AIS) presenting to the emergency department and treated with thrombolysis between
89 1/1/2020-12/31/2022. An evidence informed protocol (Figure 1) extending the time window for
90 thrombolysis up to 24 hours was implemented on 2/1/20 and allowed for use of CTP or DWI-
91 MRI to aid patient selection. Patients were identified from a prospective database of stroke code
92 activations. The LPT cohort were patients who received alteplase between 4.5-24 hours after
93 LKW, and the standard window comparison group were patients who received alteplase within
94 4.5 hours after LKW. All patients who survived the hospitalization received phone calls at
95 approximately 90 days post-stroke to assess a modified Rankin Score (mRS). This study was
96 approved by the IRB at Tufts Medical Center and followed STROBE guidelines.

97

98 *Covariates*

99

100 Data were collected on demographics, comorbidities, admission NIHSS, imaging modalities,
101 imaging findings, LKW-to-thrombolysis time (in hours), endovascular treatment (EVT),
102 symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage (sICH, defined as imaging signs of any intracranial
103 hemorrhage and post-treatment NIHSS increase ≥ 4), and 90 day mRS. CTP imaging was
104 processed using Syngo.via (Siemens) using default settings (core infarct defined as a region of
105 absolute cerebral blood flow [CBF, measured in milliliters of blood per 100 grams of brain]
106 reduction to 30% or less than the maximum CBF; penumbra defined as the region with time-to-
107 maximum [TMax, measured in seconds] greater than 6 seconds). Outcomes for comparative
108 analyses included process times (door to needle, door to CT; measured in minutes) and clinical
109 outcomes (90 day mRS, sICH). Missingness for specific covariates is indicated in the tables,
110 including loss-to-followup for the 90 day mRS assessment.

111

112 *Statistical analyses*

113

114 Descriptive statistics and comparative statistics (t-test, Chi square, Kruskal-Wallis rank sum) are
115 reported according to the structure of the data). R (version 4.2.3, Vienna, Austria) was used for
116 all statistical analyses.

117

118 **Results**

119

120 Among 118 patients presenting to the ED with AIS and treated with alteplase, 43 (36%) were
121 treated with the LPT protocol. Demographics, comorbidities, NIHSS, and EVT rates were

122 similar between both cohorts (Table 1). The median NIHSS was 8 (IQR 3, 14) in both cohorts.
123 The median LKW-to-thrombolysis time was 11 (IQR 8, 15) in the LPT cohort as compared to 2
124 (IQR 1, 3) in the standard window cohort.
125
126 Regarding process outcomes, both median door to CT times and median door to needle times
127 longer for patients in the LPT cohort as compared to the standard window cohort (Table 2).
128
129 Clinical outcomes were comparable between both cohorts (Table 2). Favorable 90 day mRS
130 (defined as 0-1) was achieved by 36.4% of patients in the LPT cohort as compared to 50.9% in
131 the standard window cohort ($p = 0.19$) among those with a documented 90 day assessment.
132 Symptomatic ICH occurred in a single patient in the LPT cohort (2.3%) and in no patients in the
133 standard window cohort ($p = 0.19$).
134
135 Advanced imaging findings are described in Table 3. Among LPT patients, CTP was the
136 advanced neuroimaging modality for 91% of patients. DWI-MRI was used for 1 patient (2.3%),
137 and no advanced imaging was used for 3 patients (7.0%), due to presentation near the 4.5 hour
138 threshold in 2 cases and a very late presentation near the 24 hour mark in 1 case (i.e. CTP was
139 omitted to expedite thrombolysis with a clinical presentation of monocular vision loss due to
140 central retinal artery occlusion). Core infarcts were generally small (median 5.9 mL, IQR 1.9,
141 17), and penumbras were generally intermediate in volume (median 45 mL, IQR 12, 83).
142 Thrombolysis was offered in 4 cases where CTP did not detect a penumbra or a core infarct (i.e.
143 lacunar stroke) but a clinical deficit was present. Vessel occlusions were present on CT

144 angiography in 65% of cases (with 35% due to large vessel occlusion defined as terminal ICA,
145 M1, or basilar artery occlusion).

146

147 **Discussion**

148 To our knowledge, this is the first study describing real world experience with a pragmatic
149 protocol leveraging both CTP and DWI-MRI to select a broad range of patients for thrombolysis
150 when presenting between 4.5 and 24 hours after LKW. This builds upon the findings of the
151 WAKEUP and EXTEND trials as well as prior observational studies using noncontrast CT for
152 patient selection.(1-3, 5, 6) Most of the randomized trials informing this practice used MRI as the
153 primary modality to select patients, but this is impractical for many hospitals that lack rapid and
154 consistent access to this technology.(7) This study illustrates how CTP can be used to inform
155 clinical decision-making despite lingering concerns regarding the possible low sensitivity of CTP
156 for detecting small infarcts and posterior circulation infarcts.

157

158 The central finding of this study is that thrombolysis beyond the conventional time window can
159 be achieved without a high rate of sICH when patients are selected with advanced neuroimaging
160 guidance. Our pragmatic protocol (e.g. not mandating treatment or strict adherence to specific
161 core or penumbra measurements) allowed for treatment with a variety of clinical and imaging
162 characteristics, including large penumbras, lacunar syndromes, and preceding EVT. Considering
163 the high rate of CTP use versus MRI, this study suggests that a protocol based solely on the
164 WAKEUP trial selection criteria that only allows use of DWI-MRI for patient selection may be
165 too restrictive, especially in hospitals where CTP is more readily available than MRI in a timely
166 fashion. This study adds to the data indicating that thrombolysis beyond 4.5 hours after LKW

167 can be accomplished using CTP and is reasonably safe as compared to standard window
168 thrombolysis.

169
170 The process time outcomes in this study illustrate early challenges and opportunities for
171 improvement with the LPT protocol. We anticipated that the door to needle time would be longer
172 for LPT patients as compared to standard window patients due to the need to process and
173 interpret CTP or DWI-MRI findings and incorporate this into treatment decisions. However, the
174 door to CT time was also longer for LPT patients: this time interval ideally should not be
175 different between LPT and standard window patients, so this difference suggests that the
176 Neurology and Emergency Medicine clinicians and Pharmacists might not have proceeded
177 through the stroke code protocols as swiftly for patients potentially eligible for LPT as compared
178 to standard window patients. This may be due to the contemporary novelty of this practice and
179 uncertainty regarding the effectiveness and safety of this practice. The findings from this study
180 hopefully can provide reassurance on the potential for clinical benefit and the relative safety of
181 this practice, and thus encourage stroke teams to proceed through the treatment process as
182 efficiently for LPT patients as with standard window patients given the continued importance of
183 time as a determinant of outcomes in acute stroke.

184
185 Notably, the majority of estimated core infarcts for patients treated with the Tufts Late Presenter
186 Thrombolysis protocol were relatively small and comparable to those reported in EXTEND
187 (median 6 mL in our study vs median 5 mL in EXTEND).² Even the one patient who had a sICH
188 had a small estimated core infarct (2 mL with a 72 mL penumbra). However, our protocol
189 (modeled on the EXTEND protocol) used an upper threshold recommendation of 70 mL for

190 estimated core infarcts on CTP. Two patients had estimated core infarcts above the 70 mL
191 recommended threshold (80 and 83 mL), and five additional patients had estimated core infarcts
192 between 20-70 mL; none of these patients had sICH. Altogether, this study provides only limited
193 data on the safety of thrombolysis for patients with medium to large estimated core infarcts on
194 CTP. Future trials of LPT should intentionally assess efficacy and safety of thrombolysis with
195 larger estimated core infarcts than those seen in EXTEND.

196

197 This study has important strengths and limitations. First, patients were administered
198 thrombolysis in accordance with a local, standard-of-care protocol informed by prior clinical trial
199 and observational data, so the process of evaluating and treating patients was largely
200 homogeneous. Second, to our knowledge, this is the largest report of thrombolysis cases
201 combining potential treatment-eligible patient categories outside the standard time window.
202 Third, the diverse spectrum of demographic and clinical characteristics of both cohorts is
203 comparable to many comprehensive stroke centers with broad catchments areas in the U.S. One
204 important limitation is that the Tufts LPT protocol does not mandate thrombolysis in the later
205 time window which could result in some selection bias. Nonetheless, the characteristics of
206 treated patients in both time windows were similar, so any selection bias is unlikely to influence
207 the results of the comparative analyses. Finally, there was considerable missingness in 90 day
208 mRS for patients treated in both time windows, so the proportion of patients achieving excellent
209 outcomes may be subject to loss-to-follow up bias. However, the proportion of missingness was
210 similar between the two cohorts, again suggesting that this is unlikely to substantially influence
211 the comparative results.

212

213

214 **Conclusion**

215 The Tufts Late Presenter Thrombolysis protocol leveraging both CTP and DWI-MRI is
216 pragmatic, feasible, safe, and associated with favorable outcomes for patients with acute
217 ischemic stroke.

218

219 **Funding:** None.

220

221 **Disclosures:** None.

222

223 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank Amr Jijakli, MPH, MBBS, and Mohammed Al-
224 Dulaimi, MD for their assistance with data collection.

225

226 **References**

227 1. Thomalla G, Simonsen CZ, Boutitie F, Andersen G, Berthezene Y, Cheng B, et al. MRI-
228 Guided Thrombolysis for Stroke with Unknown Time of Onset. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(7):611-
229 22.

230 2. Ma H, Campbell BCV, Parsons MW, Churilov L, Levi CR, Hsu C, et al. Thrombolysis
231 Guided by Perfusion Imaging up to 9 Hours after Onset of Stroke. *N Engl J Med*.
232 2019;380(19):1795-803.

233 3. Schwamm LH, Wu O, Song SS, Latour LL, Ford AL, Hsia AW, et al. Intravenous
234 thrombolysis in unwitnessed stroke onset: MR WITNESS trial results. *Ann Neurol*.
235 2018;83(5):980-93.

- 236 4. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, et al.
237 Guidelines for the Early Management of Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke: 2019 Update to
238 the 2018 Guidelines for the Early Management of Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Guideline for
239 Healthcare Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association.
240 Stroke. 2019;50(12):e344-e418.
- 241 5. Barreto AD, Fanale CV, Alexandrov AV, Gaffney KC, Vahidy FS, Nguyen CB, et al.
242 Prospective, open-label safety study of intravenous recombinant tissue plasminogen activator in
243 wake-up stroke. Ann Neurol. 2016;80(2):211-8.
- 244 6. Roveri L, La Gioia S, Ghidinelli C, Anzalone N, De Filippis C, Comi G. Wake-up stroke
245 within 3 hours of symptom awareness: imaging and clinical features compared to standard
246 recombinant tissue plasminogen activator treated stroke. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis.
247 2013;22(6):703-8.
- 248 7. Thomalla G, Boutitie F, Ma H, Koga M, Ringleb P, Schwamm LH, et al. Intravenous
249 alteplase for stroke with unknown time of onset guided by advanced imaging: systematic review
250 and meta-analysis of individual patient data. Lancet. 2020;396(10262):1574-84.
251

252 **Figure 1. Tufts Late Presenter Thrombolysis Protocol**

253 Thrombolysis for suspected acute ischemic stroke may be offered to patients awakening with
254 stroke symptoms, with LKW > 4.5 hours, and with unknown LKW likely less than 24 hours,
255 with the following selection criteria:

256 **Inclusion Criteria** (recommended)

257 LKW within 24 hours

258 Parenchymal imaging suggesting small core infarct (one of the following):

259 CT Perfusion Head: Infarct core volume ≤ 70 mL (lesion size as estimated by markedly
260 reduced CBV or CBF < 30% of normal)

261 MRI Brain: DWI positive, FLAIR negative

262 Parenchymal imaging suggesting the presence of a penumbra (one of the following):

263 CT Perfusion Head: Penumbra approximately 20% larger than core or ≥ 10 mL larger

264 MRI Brain: DWI positive, FLAIR negative

265 All criteria that apply for IV alteplase use with LKW ≤ 4.5 hours

266 **Exclusion Criteria** (IV alteplase generally not recommended)

267 Unable to undergo CT Perfusion or acute MRI

268 All criteria that apply for IV alteplase use with LKW ≤ 4.5 hours

269 **Other factors that may affect benefit-risk ratio** (if they are present, counsel and clearly
270 document decision making)

271 NIHSS ≥ 25

272 DWI lesion size > 100 mL or $\geq 1/3$ MCA territory

273 All factors that apply for IV alteplase use with LKW ≤ 4.5 hours

274

275

276 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics, outcomes, and imaging findings of patients considered for**
 277 **late presenter thrombolysis.**

Characteristic	Standard window (< 4.5 h) (n=75)	Late presenter thrombolysis (wakeup stroke, 4.5-24 h) (n=43)	p-value
Age, median in years (IQR)	69 (58,80)	72 (61,80)	0.69
Sex, female (%)	37 (49.3%)	18 (41.9%)	0.43
Race, non-white (%)	21 (28.8%)*	16 (38.1%)**	0.30
Comorbidities			
Atrial fibrillation	9 (12.0%)	8 (18.6%)	0.33
Coronary artery disease	12 (16.0%)	10 (23.3%)	0.33
Diabetes mellitus	16 (21.3%)	15 (34.9%)	0.11
Hyperlipidemia	41 (54.7%)	30 (69.8%)	0.11
Hypertension	54 (72.0%)	32 (74.4%)	0.78
Prior stroke	13 (17.3%)	7 (16.3%)	0.88
Tobacco use (ever)	18 (24.0%)	7 (16.3%)	0.32
Admission NIHSS, median (IQR)	8 (3, 14)	8 (3, 14)	0.74
LKW-to-thrombolysis, median in hours (IQR)	2 (1, 3)**	11 (8, 15)	<0.001
Endovascular therapy	23 (30.7%)	8 (18.6%)	0.15

performed (%)			
----------------------	--	--	--

278 *Missing for 2 patients.

279 **Missing for 1 patient.

280 **Table 2. Clinical and process outcomes for patients treated with standard window and late**
 281 **presenter thrombolysis.**

Outcome	Standard window (< 4.5 h (n=75))	Late presenter thrombolysis (wakeup stroke, 4.5-24 h) (n=43)	p-value
Door to CT time, median in minutes (IQR)	22 (17, 29)*	34 (26, 48)	0.013
Door to needle time, median in minutes (IQR)	42 (32, 60)	76 (58, 118)	<0.001
Symptomatic ICH (%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.3%)	0.19
90 day mRS, median (IQR)	1 (0, 4)**	2 (1-3)†	0.33
90 day mRS (% 0-1)	28 (50.9%)**	12 (36.4%)†	0.19

282 *Missing for 1 patient.

283 **Missing for 20 patients or 27% (standard window).

284 †Missing for 10 patients or 23% (LPT).

285 **Table 3. Imaging findings for patients treated with late presenter thrombolysis.**

Advanced imaging performed	n = 43
CTP	39 (90.7%)
DWI-MRI	1 (2.3%)
None	3 (7.0%)
Core infarct measurement, median in mL (IQR; range)	5.92 (IQR 1.89, 16.7; range 0-83.04)
Penumbra measurement, median in mL (IQR; range)	45.04 (IQR 11.55, 83.21; range 0-215.21)
Potential recuperation ratio, median (IQR; range)	79.85% (IQR 60.75%, 94.52%; range 0-100%)
Vessel occlusion on CTA	28 (65.1%)
ACA (A2)	2
Basilar artery	4
MCA (M1)	8
MCA (M2)	5
MCA (M3)	1
PCA (P2)	3
ICA (terminus)	3
Vertebral (V4)	2

286