

Daniel Roy (Université de Montréal)
 Federico Carpani (University of Toronto)
 Nima Kashani (University of Saskatchewan)
 Claudia Candale-Radu (University of Manitoba)
 Nishita Singh (Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba)
 Maria Bres Bullrich (Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University)
 Robert Joseph Sarmiento (University of Alberta)
 Ryan Muir (Calgary Stroke Program and Hotchkiss Brain Institute)
 Carmen Parra-Fariñas (St. Michael's Hospital)
 Stephanie Reiter (University of Toronto)
 Yan Deschaintre (CHUM)
 Ravinder-Jeet Singh (Northern Ontario School of Medicine University)
 Vivek Bodani (University of Toronto)
 Aristeidis Katsanos (McMaster University)
 Ronit Agid (Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network)
 Atif Zafar (Saint Michael's Hospital University of Toronto)
 Vitor Mendes Pereira (St Michaels Hospital, University of Toronto)
 Julian Spears (University of Toronto)
 Thomas Marotta (University of Toronto)
 Pascal Djiadeu (McMaster University)
 Sunjay Sharma (McMaster University)
 Forough Farrokhyar (McMaster University)

Title: Clinical Uncertainty In Large Vessel Occlusion Ischemic Stroke (CULVO): An Intrarater And Interrater Agreement Study

Name and degree	Affiliation	Disclosures
Jose Danilo B. Diestro MD <i>danni.diestro@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Department of Global Health, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	JBD: Honoraria from Medtronic. Travel grant from Microvention;
Robert Fahed MSc MD <i>rfahed@toh.ca</i>	Department of Medicine - Division of Neurology, The Ottawa Hospital - Ottawa Hospital Research Institute and University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Abdelsimar T. Omar II MD <i>budd.omar@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Neurosciences, <i>Philippine</i> General Hospital, University of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Christine Hawkes MD <i>christine.hawkes@medportal.ca</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Eef J. Hendriks MD <i>hendriks.eef@gmail.com</i>	Division of Interventional Neuroradiology, Joint Department of Medical Imaging (JDMI), Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Clare Angeli Enriquez MD <i>clare_angeli@yahoo.com</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Muneer Eesa MD <i>muneereesa@gmail.com</i>	Department of Radiology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Grant Stotts MD <i>gstotts@toh.ca</i>	Department of Medicine - Division of Neurology, The Ottawa Hospital - Ottawa Hospital Research Institute	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.

	and University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	
Hubert Lee MD MSc <i>hube.lee@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurosurgery, Division of Neurointerventional Neuroradiology Trillium Health Partners	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Shashank Nagendra MD <i>shashank.nagendra@ucalgary.ca</i>	Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Alexandre Poppe MD <i>alexandre.yves.poppe.med@ssss.gouv.qc.ca</i>	Department of Neurosciences Faculté de médecine, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Céline Ducroux MD <i>celina.ducroux@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medicine - Division of Neurology, The Ottawa Hospital - Ottawa Hospital Research Institute and University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Timothy Lim MD <i>lim.tru@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Karl Narvacan MD <i>karl.narvacan@mail.utoronto.ca</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Michael Rizzuto MD <i>michael.rizzuto@alumni.ubc.ca</i>	Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, Vancouver General Hospital, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Afra Alfalahi MD <i>a.s.maisem@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Hidehisa Nishi MD PhD <i>venturahighway83@gmail.com</i>	Department of Neurosurgery, Koseikai Takeda hospital, Kyoto, Japan Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Pragyan Sarma MD <i>pragyanimhans@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto,	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.

	Ontario, Canada	
Vladislav Ze'ev Itsekzon-Hayosh MD, MSc <i>Zeevits@gmail.com</i>	Division of Interventional Neuroradiology, Joint Department of Medical Imaging (JDMI), Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Katrina Ignacio MD <i>kathaignacio@gmail.com</i>	Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
William Boisseau MD MSc <i>boisseau.william@gmail.com</i>	Interventional Neuroradiology Department, Rothschild Foundation Hospital, Paris, France	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Eduardo Pimenta Ribeiro Pontes Almeida MD <i>Eduardo.Almeida@uhn.ca</i>	University Health Network - Toronto General Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Anass Benomar MD PhD <i>anass.benomar@umontreal.ca</i>	Department of Radiology, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CHUM), Montreal, Quebec, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Mohammed A. Almekhlafi MSc MD <i>mohammed.almekhlafi1@ucalgary.ca</i>	Departments of Clinical Neurosciences, Radiology, and Community Health Sciences Hotchkiss Brain Institute and O'Brien Institute for Public Health, Cumming School of Medicine at the University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada	MAM: Member of the scientific advisory board of Palmera Medical
Genvieve Milot MD <i>neurochirurgiemilot@hotmail.com</i>	Department of Surgery (Neurosurgery), Centre Hospitalier de Quebec, Université Laval, Québec City, Québec, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Aviraj Satish Deshmukh MBBS <i>avirajdesmukh@gmail.com</i>	Division of Clinical Sciences, Health Sciences North, Northern Ontario School of Medicine University, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Kislay Kishore MBBS MCh <i>kislaykishore13@yahoo.in</i>	Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Donatella Tampieri MD <i>donatella.tampieri@queensu.ca</i>	Department of Radiology, Kingston Health Sciences Centre, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Jeffrey Z. Wang MD <i>Jeff.Wang@unityhealth.to</i>	Department of Medicine, Division of Neurology, Unity Health- St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Abhilekh Srivastava MBBS <i>mrabhilekh@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Hamilton General Hospital, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.

Daniel Roy MD <i>daniel.roy.med@ssss.gouv.qc.ca</i>	Département de Radiologie, Radio-Oncologie et Médecine Nucléaire Université de Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Federico Carpani MD <i>federico.carpani@uhn.ca</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Nima Kashani MD <i>nimamani2@gmail.com</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Royal University Hospital, University of Saskatchewan	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Claudia Candale-Radu MD <i>ccradu7@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Internal Medicine, Health Sciences Center, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Nishita Singh MD <i>nishitaneurology@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Internal Medicine, Health Sciences Center, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Maria Bres Bullrich MD <i>Maria.BresBullrich@lhsc.on.ca</i>	Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Robert Sarmiento MD <i>sarmientorj@yahoo.com</i>	Vancouver General Hospital-University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Ryan Muir MD <i>ryan.muir@mail.utoronto.ca</i>	Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Carmen Parra-Farinas MD PhD <i>carmenparrafarinas@gmail.com</i>	Divisions of Neuroradiology & Neurointervention, Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Stephanie D. Reiter MD <i>stephanie.d.reiter@gmail.com</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Yan Deschaintre MD <i>yan.deschaintre.med@ssss.gouv.qc.ca</i>	Department of Neurosciences Faculté de médecine, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Quebec, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Ravinder-Jeet Singh MD <i>drsidhu19@gmail.com</i>	Division of Clinical Sciences, Health Sciences North, Northern Ontario School of Medicine University, Sudbury, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Vivel Bodani MD <i>vivek.bodani@utoronto.ca</i>	Division of Interventional Neuroradiology, Joint Department of Medical Imaging, Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, University of Toronto,	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.

	Toronto, Ontario, Canada	
Aristeidis Katsanos MD PhD <i>aristeidis.katsanos@medportal.ca</i>	Division of Neurology, Department of Medicine, Hamilton General Hospital, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Ronit Agid MD <i>Ronit.Agid@uhn.ca</i>	Division of Interventional Neuroradiology, Joint Department of Medical Imaging, Toronto Western Hospital, University Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Atif Zafar MD <i>Atif.Zafar@unityhealth.to</i>	Department of Medicine, Division of Neurology, Unity Health- St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Vitor Mendes Pereira MSc MD <i>vitor.pereira@unityhealth.to</i>	Department of Surgery, Division of Neurosurgery, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Julian Spears SM MD <i>Julian.Spears@unityhealth.to</i>	Department of Surgery, Division of Neurosurgery, St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Thomas R. Marotta MD <i>tom.marotta@unityhealth.to</i>	Department of Medical Imaging, Division of Diagnostic and Therapeutic Neuroradiology, Unity Health- St Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada	TRM: Principal of eVasc Neurovascular
Pascal Djiadeu PhD <i>djiadeup@mcmaster.ca</i>	Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Department of Global Health, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Sunjay Sharma MSc MD <i>sharmasun@hhsc.ca</i>	Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Conflict of Interest: None. Disclosure of Funding: None.
Forough Farrokhyar PhD	Department of Surgery, Department	Conflict of Interest: None.

<i>farrokh@mcmaster.ca</i>	of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, Department of Global Health, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada	Disclosure of Funding: None.
----------------------------	---	------------------------------

All the authors meet the following criteria:

1. *Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND*
2. *Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND*
3. *Final approval of the version to be published; AND*
4. *Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.*

Keywords: Stroke, Perfusion, Thrombectomy, Imaging

Funding: *JBD is a recipient of the Fergus Mills Scholarship of McMaster University for the Clinical Uncertainty in Large Vessel Occlusion (CULVO) study.*

Abstract (298 Words)

Background: Limited research exists regarding the impact of neuroimaging modality on endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) decisions for late window large vessel occlusion (LVO) stroke cases.

Purpose: This study assesses whether perfusion CT imaging: 1) alters the proportion of recommendations for EVT, and 2) enhances the reliability of EVT decision-making compared to non-contrast CT and CT angiography.

Materials and Methods: We conducted an online survey using 30 patients drawn from an institutional database of 3144 acute stroke cranial CT scans. These cases were presented to 29 stroke or neurointerventional physicians from Canada across two sessions. Physicians evaluated each patient both with and without perfusion imaging and gave EVT recommendations. We used non-overlapping 95% confidence intervals and difference in agreement classification as criteria to suggest a difference between the Gwet AC1 statistics (κ_G). Our outcomes were: 1) the proportion of EVT recommendations, and 2) interrater and intrarater agreement, with or without perfusion imaging.

Results: In the first round, 29 raters completed the assessment, with 28 finishing the second round. The percentage of EVT recommendations differed by 1.1% with or without perfusion imaging. However, individual decisions changed in 21.4% of cases, with 11.3% against EVT and 10.1% in favor. Interrater agreement (κ_G) among the 29 raters was similar between non-perfusion CT neuroimaging and perfusion CT neuroimaging ($\kappa_G = 0.487$; 95% CI 0.327, 0.647 and $\kappa_G = 0.552$; 95% CI 0.430, 0.675). The 95% CIs overlapped with moderate agreement in both. Intrarater agreement exhibited overlapping 95% CIs for all 28 raters. κ_G was either substantial or excellent (0.81-1) for 71.4% (20/28) of raters in both groups.

Conclusion: The difference in EVT recommendations is minimal with either neuroimaging protocol. Regarding agreement we found that use of automated CT perfusion images does not significantly impact the reliability of EVT decisions for late window LVO patients.

Keywords: stroke, perfusion, thrombectomy, decision, agreement, reliability

Abbreviations:

CTA: Computed tomography angiography

NCCT: Non-contrast cranial CT

EVT: Endovascular thrombectomy

LVO: large vessel occlusion

ASPECTS: Alberta Stroke Program Early CT Score

Introduction

The efficacy of endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) for large vessel occlusion stroke patients has been demonstrated by randomized controlled trials, indicating that the mechanical removal of the clot leads to better clinical outcomes compared to best medical management.¹⁻⁵ Non-perfusion CT neuroimaging which consists of a non-contrast cranial computed tomography (NCCT) scan and a computed tomography angiogram (CTA) along with clinical findings are deemed sufficient to recommend EVT for large vessel occlusion stroke presenting within 6 hours of presumed stroke onset.

For the late window (6-24 hours) however, both the American Heart Association and Canadian Stroke Best Practices recommend that perfusion CT neuroimaging (NCCT, CTA and perfusion imaging) be utilized to allow for more nuanced patient selection.^{6,7} These recommendations are driven by use of perfusion imaging in late-window EVT trials. Both DAWN and DEFUSE 3, used perfusion imaging to derive quantitative values for core infarct and excluded those that were considered to have a large core. By including a strict core size in their inclusion criteria, these studies hoped to minimize futile recanalization. New randomized trials that also include late-window large vessel occlusion stroke patients have demonstrated that even with a large core, those who underwent EVT still derived a significant benefit.⁸⁻¹⁰ Hence, it appears that the objection to employing EVT for large core infarcts on the grounds of futility is unfounded. Further evidence for non-perfusion CT has recently come in from the MR CLEAN

LATE trial that did not employ perfusion imaging prior to randomizing patients in the late window.¹¹ Lastly, CLEAR and SOLSTICE consortiums found no difference in clinical outcomes between with or without perfusion neuroimaging.^{12,13}

We performed an experimental survey among stroke neurologists and neurointerventionalists, encompassing a wide range of large vessel occlusion stroke cases. The study aimed to examine: 1) the difference in proportion of EVT recommendations with and without perfusion imaging and, 2) whether the use of perfusion CT neuroimaging improves the reliability among physicians in repeated surveys (intra-rater) and among different physicians and experience (interrater), compared to non-perfusion CT neuroimaging. Reliability and agreement are used interchangeably across the text. We use these terms to refer to the propensity of the raters to make the same decision about a case after removal of chance agreement.¹⁴

We hypothesize that the reliability of EVT decisions will be similar based on either neuroimaging modality.

Methodology

The study was prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS).¹⁵

Case Selection

All included studies were taken from an institutional database of patients undergoing in-house neuroimaging for symptoms of acute ischemic stroke. A team of clinical and research

physicians (_____) reviewed our database to identify reported large vessel occlusions in patients being scanned for symptoms of stroke from January 2018 to August 2022. _____ a dual trained stroke neurologist and neurointerventionalist reviewed all the flagged studies to determine eligibility using the following criteria: 1) ≥ 18 years old, 2) stroke onset or last known well time between 6-24 hours prior to start of imaging (late-window stroke), 3) use of automated perfusion CT (RAPID, iSchemaView, Menlo Park, CA), 4) confirmed large vessel occlusion on CTA involving: first segment of the middle cerebral artery (M1), terminal portion of the internal carotid artery or tandem occlusion, 5) penumbra size of at least 15cc of perfusion CT, 6) mismatch ratio of at least 1.8, 7) National Institutes of Health Stroke Score (NIHSS) of 6 or more. For quality control, neuroimaging with unsatisfactory elements (artifacts, improper timing of contrast, or poor perfusion study quality) were excluded.

To minimize the paradoxes of Kappa statistics,^{16,17} we included the full range of infarct core sizes: 10 cases with small core (0-49 cc), 10 cases with medium core (50-100cc), 10 cases with large core (>100 cc). We selected cases with the intention of assessing the reliability (reproducibility) of clinician judgments within an experimental environment that encompasses a comprehensive range of core infarct sizes and clinical characteristics.¹⁸

Rater Selection

We invited stroke neurologists and neurointerventionalists in Canada who work in EVT capable stroke centers with access to perfusion imaging. Clinical fellows with at least a year of fellowship were allowed to participate. Invitations were sent to the physicians through the Canadian Stroke Consortium and the Canadian Interventional Neuro Group mailing lists. The

raters were classified as: stroke neurologists, neurointerventionalists (neuroradiologists and neurosurgeons) and dual-trained neurologists who are both stroke neurologists and neurointerventionalists.

Survey

Selected cases were collected using Microsoft Excel v16.72 and placed into the survey format on REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture).^{19,20} Personalized links were emailed to the participants. The following case details were provided: age, location of occlusion, the NIHSS, time of onset, time of scan, non-perfusion CT neuroimaging (NCCT and CTA). The NCCT scans were shown in stroke window settings (window width of 35HU and window level of 35HU).^{21–23} The same 30 cases were shown again with the same information but with perfusion CT neuroimaging. Overall, the participants encountered 60 cases comprised of the same 30 patients shown twice with and without perfusion imaging. The raters were not informed that these 60 cases were the same 30 patients shown twice. To test intra-rater agreement, a second round of survey was done at least 3 weeks from the first. The survey was pilot tested and revised based on feedback from 7 trainee physicians who did not meet the study's official rater criteria.

For each case, the raters were asked to grade ASPECTS, the single-phase collateral score (collateral score 0: absence of vessels distal to the occlusion, 1: $\leq 50\%$ but $>0\%$ collateral supply, 2: $\geq 50\%$ but $<100\%$ collateral supply or 3: 100% collateral supply) and finally whether they would recommend EVT based on the available clinical and radiologic data.^{24,25}

Sample Size

We estimated, using kappaSize package in R version 4.2.0 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), assuming an anticipated kappa value of 0.6 (substantial), that at least 30 cases were necessary for the lower limit of a 95% one-sided confidence interval to remain above 0.45 between at least 6 raters, considering an anticipated prevalence of EVT recommendation of 0.5.²⁶ A rule of thumb for agreement studies with binary outcomes is to have at least 10 raters reviewing at least 30-50 patients.¹⁸ While more patients will enable us to provide an even wider spectrum of patients, we also want to avoid rater fatigue. For this study, we selected 60 cases with three questions each. We needed at least 6 raters based on the sample size computation but aimed for at least 10 to follow the current convention.

Agreement Statistics

The inter-rater and intra-rater agreement of the recommendation of EVT were assessed using Gwet's AC1 (κ_G) reliability coefficient. AC1 stands for agreement coefficient, first order chance correction and is used for binary data.²⁷ We derived the κ_G for binary (EVT recommendations) data, with 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals. The agreement categories were defined as poor ($\kappa_G < 0$), slight ($\kappa_G = 0-0.20$), fair ($\kappa_G = 0.21-0.40$), moderate ($\kappa_G = 0.41-0.60$), substantial ($\kappa_G = 0.61-0.80$) and excellent ($\kappa_G > 0.80$) according to the Landis and Koch criteria.²⁸ Non-overlapping confidence intervals and level of agreement were considered for potential difference between KG values.²⁹ The following prespecified subgroup analyses of interrater reliability were conducted: rater specialty, rater experience, infarct core size and time

since stroke onset. For intrarater reliability, we looked at rater specialties. We used the R statistical computing language (R Core Team, 2022) in the RStudio framework to compute for the K_G values using the irrCAC package.³⁰ The κ_G statistic has been shown to be relatively resistant to the Kappa paradox. κ_G has a less severe correction for chance agreement compared to Cohen's Kappa because it does not assume all observed ratings may yield an agreement by chance and it places greater emphasis on hard-to-score subjects.^{27,31}

We had initially planned to perform interrater agreement analysis on the first round of the survey only. However, two new randomized controlled trials (ANGEL-ASPECT and SELECT 2) on EVT for large vessel occlusion stroke patients with large core infarcts were published during the study period.^{9,10} We felt that these new trials might influence how raters make their decisions; thus, we also estimated the interrater reliability on the second round.

Ethics

The study was approved by the research ethics board of _____.

Consent from patients was waived. Survey participants' consent was obtained before the survey, and reaffirmed after, to ensure their continued agreement despite the study's inherent deceptive methodology.

Results

Patients

A total of 3,144 cranial CT scans done for symptoms of stroke were reviewed. Of these, 912 were found to have intracranial vascular occlusion. After applying the inclusion criteria, 120

cranial CT scan of large vessel occlusion stroke patients were found eligible (eFigure 1). The final 30 were selected to balance out clinical characteristics and radiologic features.

eTable 1 summarizes the characteristics of the 30 large vessel occlusion stroke patients whose CT scans were selected for final inclusion in the study. The median age was 77.0 years (min, max: 39.0, 92.0), 46.7% were females, most of the occlusions (60%) were on the middle cerebral artery and 40% of the patients underwent treatment with EVT. The mean NIHSS was 17 (standard deviation: 7), the median officially reported ASPECTS was 5 (min, max: 0, 10) and the median core infarct size was 82cc (min, max: 0, 270).

Raters

Invitations were sent to the members of the two Canadian societies of physicians directly involved in EVT decision-making for large vessel occlusion stroke patients, the Canadian Interventional Neuro Group (31 members) and the Canadian Stroke Consortium (186 members). Thirty-four respondents began responding to the initial survey that opened on November 29, 2022 but 5 did not complete it, leaving 29 respondents available for analysis. Of the 29 that finished the first round of surveys, 11 (37.9%) were stroke neurologists, 11 (37.9%) were neurointerventionalists and 7 were dual trained. Ten (34.5%) were senior raters with 10 or more years of experience. All except one rater finished the second round which opened on January 19, 2023. (See eTable 2)

EVT Decisions

Involving 60 CT scans of large vessel occlusion stroke cases and 29 raters, a total of 1,740 decisions were rendered regarding the recommendation for or against thrombectomy. The characteristics associated with the decisions regarding treatment made by the raters are summarized in Table 1. Substantial discrepancies in median values and frequencies of recommendations favoring or against EVT are observed in the following: Alberta Stroke Program Early CT Score (ASPECTS) (3 versus 7), core size (125 cc versus 50cc), collateral scores, and National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) scores (20 versus 14). The percentage of decisions made against (50.7%) or for (49.5%) EVT based on perfusion CT scan was comparable.

The mosaic plot in Figure 1 shows the distribution of EVT decisions for 870 cases (30 cases shown to 29 raters twice—non-perfusion CT neuroimaging and perfusion CT neuroimaging). The overall recommendation for EVT was 59.0% (513/870) without perfusion images and 57.8% (503/870) with perfusion images a difference of only 1.1%. The observed agreement for no EVT (30.9%, 269/870) and for EVT (47.7%, 415/870) was 78.6% (684/870). Among 870 cases studied, 11.3% (98 cases) recommended EVT based on non-perfusion CT but not on perfusion CT scans, while 10.1% (88 cases) advised against EVT on non-perfusion CT but recommended it on perfusion CT for the same patients. Despite the small difference 1.1% in total EVT recommendations, decisions changed in 21.4% of cases.

Inter-rater Agreement

The interrater (κ_G) agreement is similar with non-perfusion CT neuroimaging compared to perfusion CT neuroimaging ($\kappa_G = 0.487$; 95% CI 0.327,0.647 and $\kappa_G = 0.552$; 95% CI 0.430,0.675). (See Figure 2) The confidence intervals overlap and both κ_G signify moderate

agreement.²⁸ Similarly the interrater agreement was also not significantly different between the neuroimaging protocols when calculated according to physician subspecialty and experience. Both the subgroups for dual trained physicians and small core infarcts achieved substantial agreement across both neuroimaging protocols. The level of agreement increased (moderate to substantial) from non-perfusion CT neuroimaging to perfusion CT neuroimaging in the subgroups of stroke onset of 6-12 hours CT ($\kappa_G = 0.502$; 95% CI 0.237,0.767 and $\kappa_G = 0.621$; 95% CI 0.427,0.815) and large core infarcts ($\kappa_G = 0.451$; 95% CI 0.367,0.76 and $\kappa_G = 0.665$; 95% CI 0.411,0.919). (See Table 2)

As we elaborated on earlier, we performed an unplanned inter-rater analysis of the second survey round. (See Figure 2) There was no significant increase or decrease in agreement between the first and second round in both neuroimaging protocols as confidence intervals overlapped and stayed in the moderate agreement classification. Even for the subgroup of large core infarcts, the agreement level stayed at moderate in the second round ($\kappa_G = 0.443$; 95% CI 0.081,0.805 and $\kappa_G = 0.550$; 95% CI 0.253,0.847).

Intrarater Reliability

Twenty-eight (out of 29) raters finished both surveys. Table 3 summarizes the intra-rater agreement of these 28 raters according to the type of neuroimaging reviewed for their decisions. Confidence intervals of all intra-rater agreements overlap between both neuroimaging protocols for each of the 28 raters signifying no significant difference as per our predefined criteria. Seventeen of the 28 raters (60.7%) had a change in the classification of intrarater agreement from

non-perfusion CT neuroimaging to perfusion CT neuroimaging. With the addition of automated CT perfusion images, 11/17 had improved by at least one category while 6/17 had worsened by at least one category. eFigure 2 demonstrates the distribution of K_G for intra-rater reliability of the 28 raters. It illustrates that while the K_G values remain in the same category (substantial), the median value for perfusion CT is higher than non-perfusion CT.

Discussion

Our study pursues two interconnected yet distinct objectives. Concerning decisions related to EVT, we observed a change in approximately 21.4% of decisions when perfusion imaging was incorporated. In terms of reliability, our findings revealed no statistically significant disparities in both intra- and interrater reliability, whether perfusion imaging was included or not. The propensity of raters to arrive at consistent decisions for cases remained comparable across both groups.

EVT Decisions

Even though the raters were looking at the same patient clinical data, NCCTs and CTAs, their decisions for EVT changed in one out of every 5 patients (21.4%, 186/870) with perfusion imaging and these changes occurred in both directions, 10.1% (88/870) for EVT and 11.3% (98/870) against EVT. Taken together these changes in decisions with perfusion CT neuroimaging only led to 1.1% (10/870) fewer recommendations for EVT. Tabulating EVT recommendations, we saw that decisions for EVT were more common for patients with better

collaterals, higher ASPECTS, smaller infarcted cores. These are all intuitive as these factors all portend a better prognosis to large vessel occlusion stroke patients undergoing EVT.^{25,32}

There are several possible reasons for these changes in decisions based on the neuroimaging presented. For those that go from recommending EVT to recommending against it (non-perfusion CT neuroimaging to perfusion CT neuroimaging), this may be from seeing the core infarct quantified. While early ischemic changes may not be apparent on non-contrast computed tomography (NCCT), they may appear larger on automated perfusion images. This could be attributed to genuine ischemia or the manifestation of the ghost core phenomenon, wherein the core infarct appears larger on perfusion imaging than its actual size.³³ (See Patient 7 in eFigure 3) For those that go from recommending against EVT to recommending it (non-perfusion CT neuroimaging to perfusion CT neuroimaging), the decision is likely based on seeing a large value for the penumbra on automated perfusion images or a smaller core to the ASPECTS they calculated. Despite the possibility that the frank hypodensity observed on non-contrast computed tomography (NCCT) is the only region affected by the arterial occlusion, automated perfusion images can reveal viable regions surrounding the core infarct that could potentially be salvaged. (See Patient 17 in eFigure 3)

Interrater Reliability

Interrater agreement (K_G) on the decision to recommend EVT for late window large vessel occlusion stroke patients was comparable whether raters viewed non-perfusion CT neuroimaging or perfusion CT neuroimaging. Both were classified as moderate agreement and

overlapping confidence intervals. The same results, overlapping confidence intervals at the same level of agreement, were found in both the first and second rounds of the survey. These findings support our hypothesis that the addition of perfusion imaging does not alter the reliability of decisions made by physicians of different specialties on a wide spectrum of large vessel occlusion stroke patients. In contrast, a similar study showed overlapping confidence intervals with the addition of automated perfusion imaging but had an increase in agreement from moderate ($K = 0.506$) to substantial ($K=0.704$) with the addition of automated perfusion imaging.³⁴ This is likely accounted for by the differences in study design as the aforementioned study utilized only two raters and gave an “indecisive” option for EVT decisions.

Intrarater Reliability

The intrarater agreement statistics (κ_G) on the decision to recommend EVT for late window large vessel occlusion stroke patients for each rater had overlapping confidence intervals between non-perfusion CT neuroimaging or perfusion CT neuroimaging. The extremes of intrarater agreement are striking: non-perfusion CT (min, max: 0.359, 0.817) and perfusion CT (min, max: 0.416, 0.896). We posit that this difference may be due to some reviewers already being familiar with the newly published randomized trials and some not.^{10,11} In essence, the reviewers with lower intrarater agreement may have “disagreed” with themselves on account of the new evidence. While those with higher K_G may not have reviewed the evidence or do not yet subscribe to it.

Limitations

Our study has notable limitations, including the absence of a universally accepted method for comparing agreement statistics (KG) beyond magnitude documentation. To gauge similarity in KG values, we relied on overlapping confidence intervals and comparable levels of agreement.²⁹ Additionally, the study's applicability is restricted to Canadian-based raters, and it does not encompass other stroke imaging modalities. We also omitted detailed clinical information and did not conduct an analysis of clinical outcomes in relation to the chosen imaging modality. Finally, examining causality between baseline patient and rater variables, including the choice of neuroimaging modality, and the decision to recommend EVT is not within the study's scope.

Conclusion

In this study, we found that the addition of CTP presented to the raters altered 21.4% of the decisions on EVT but the net difference in EVT recommendations was only 1.1% (10/870) between the two neuroimaging protocols. Secondly, the study suggests that addition of perfusion imaging to NCCT and CTA does not significantly affect the interrater and intrarater reliability of the decisions made by physicians on EVT for late window large vessel occlusion stroke patients. Stated differently, the propensity of raters arriving at consistent decisions for the same cases, whether in comparison to other raters (interrater) or their own assessments (intrarater), remains similar regardless of the presence or absence of perfusion imaging in the review process.

Stated differently, the propensity of raters arriving at consistent decisions for the same cases, whether in comparison to other raters (interrater) or their own assessments (intrarater), remains similar regardless of the presence or absence of perfusion imaging in the review process.

References

1. Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafe A, et al. Stent-Retriever Thrombectomy after Intravenous t-PA vs. t-PA Alone in Stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(24):2285-2295. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1415061
2. Goyal M, Demchuk AM, Menon BK, et al. Randomized Assessment of Rapid Endovascular Treatment of Ischemic Stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(11):1019-1030. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1414905
3. Jovin TG, Chamorro A, Cobo E, et al. Thrombectomy within 8 Hours after Symptom Onset in Ischemic Stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(24):2296-2306. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1503780
4. Berkhemer OA, Fransen PSS, Beumer D, et al. A Randomized Trial of Intraarterial Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(1):11-20. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1411587
5. Campbell BCV, Mitchell PJ, Kleinig TJ, et al. Endovascular Therapy for Ischemic Stroke with Perfusion-Imaging Selection. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372(11):1009-1018. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1414792
6. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, 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. *Stroke*. 2019;50(12). doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000211
7. Heran M, Lindsay P, Gubitz G, et al. Canadian Stroke Best Practice Recommendations: Acute Stroke Management, 7 th Edition Practice Guidelines Update, 2022. *Canadian Journal of Neurological Sciences / Journal Canadien des Sciences Neurologiques*. Published online December 19, 2022:1-31. doi:10.1017/cjn.2022.344
8. Yoshimura S, Sakai N, Yamagami H, et al. Endovascular Therapy for Acute Stroke with a Large Ischemic Region. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2022;386(14):1303-1313. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2118191
9. Sarraj A, Hassan AE, Abraham MG, et al. Trial of Endovascular Thrombectomy for Large Ischemic Strokes. *New England Journal of Medicine*. Published online February 10, 2023. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2214403
10. Huo X, Ma G, Tong X, et al. Trial of Endovascular Therapy for Acute Ischemic Stroke with Large Infarct. *New England Journal of Medicine*. Published online February 10, 2023. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2213379

11. Olthuis SGH, Pirson FA V, Pinckaers FME, et al. Endovascular treatment versus no endovascular treatment after 6–24 h in patients with ischaemic stroke and collateral flow on CT angiography (MR CLEAN-LATE) in the Netherlands: a multicentre, open-label, blinded-endpoint, randomised, controlled, phase 3 t. *The Lancet*. 2023;401(10385):1371-1380. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00575-5
12. Almekhlafi MA, Thornton J, Casetta I, et al. Stroke imaging prior to thrombectomy in the late window: results from a pooled multicentre analysis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2022;93(5):468-474. doi:10.1136/jnnp-2021-327959
13. Nguyen TN, Abdalkader M, Nagel S, et al. Noncontrast Computed Tomography vs Computed Tomography Perfusion or Magnetic Resonance Imaging Selection in Late Presentation of Stroke With Large-Vessel Occlusion. *JAMA Neurol*. Published online November 8, 2021. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2021.4082
14. Benomar A, Zarour E, Létourneau-Guillon L, Raymond J. Measuring Interrater Reliability. *Radiology*. 2023;309(3). doi:10.1148/radiol.230492
15. Kottner J, Audigé L, Brorson S, et al. Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS) were proposed. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(1):96-106. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.03.002
16. Feinstein AR, Cicchetti D V. High agreement but low kappa: I. The problems of two paradoxes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1990;43(6):543-549. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(90)90158-I
17. Cicchetti D V, Feinstein AR. High agreement but low kappa: II. Resolving the paradoxes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1990;43(6):551-558. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(90)90159-m
18. Fahed R, Darsaut TE, Farzin B, Chagnon M, Raymond J. Measuring clinical uncertainty and equipoise by applying the agreement study methodology to patient management decisions. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2020;20(1):214. doi:10.1186/s12874-020-01095-8
19. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009;42(2):377-381. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010
20. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform*. 2019;95:103208. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208
21. University of Calgary. ASPECTScore in Acute Stroke. Published 2023. Accessed October 1, 2022. <http://www.aspectsinstroke.com/casepacs/imaging-findings-of-stroke/256-importance-of-windowing-and-levelling>
22. Turner PJ, Holdsworth G. CT stroke window settings: an unfortunate misleading misnomer? *Br J Radiol*. 2011;84(1008):1061-1066. doi:10.1259/bjr/99730184
23. Potter CA, Vagal AS, Goyal M, Nunez DB, Leslie-Mazwi TM, Lev MH. CT for Treatment Selection in Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Code Stroke Primer. *RadioGraphics*. 2019;39(6):1717-1738. doi:10.1148/rg.2019190142
24. Pexman JH, Barber PA, Hill MD, et al. Use of the Alberta Stroke Program Early CT Score (ASPECTS) for assessing CT scans in patients with acute stroke. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2001;22(8):1534-1542.

25. Tan IYL, Demchuk AM, Hopyan J, et al. CT Angiography Clot Burden Score and Collateral Score: Correlation with Clinical and Radiologic Outcomes in Acute Middle Cerebral Artery Infarct. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*. 2009;30(3):525-531. doi:10.3174/ajnr.A1408
26. Donner A, Rotondi MA. Sample size requirements for interval estimation of the kappa statistic for interobserver agreement studies with a binary outcome and multiple raters. *Int J Biostat*. 2010;6(1):Article 31. doi:10.2202/1557-4679.1275
27. Gwet KL. *Handbook of Inter-Rater Reliability*. Fourth. Advanced Analytics, LLC; 2014.
28. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*. 1977;33(1):159-174.
29. Bacchus E, Kate MP, Benomar A, Farzin B, Raymond J, Darsaut TE. Inter-rater reliability of the simplified Modified Rankin Scale as an outcome measure for treated cerebral aneurysm patients. *Neurochirurgie*. Published online June 2022. doi:10.1016/j.neuchi.2022.04.003
30. Gwet KL. irrCAC: Computing Chance-Corrected Agreement Coefficients (CAC). Published online 2019.
31. Gwet KL. Computing inter-rater reliability and its variance in the presence of high agreement. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*. 2008;61(1):29-48. doi:10.1348/000711006X126600
32. Campbell BC V, Majoie CBLM, Albers GW, et al. Penumbra imaging and functional outcome in patients with anterior circulation ischaemic stroke treated with endovascular thrombectomy versus medical therapy: a meta-analysis of individual patient-level data. *Lancet Neurol*. 2019;18(1):46-55. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30314-4
33. García-Tornel Á, Campos D, Rubiera M, et al. Ischemic Core Overestimation on Computed Tomography Perfusion. *Stroke*. 2021;52(5):1751-1760. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.031800
34. Khumtong R, Krings T, Pereira VM, Pikula A, Schaafsma JD. Comparison of multimodal CT scan protocols used for decision-making on mechanical thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke. *Neuroradiology*. 2020;62(3):399-406. doi:10.1007/s00234-019-02351-5

Table 1. Endovascular thrombectomy decisions

Characteristic	Decision: No EVT (N=724)	Decision: EVT (N=1016)	Overall (N=1740)
NIHSS: Median [Min, Max]	20.0 [6.00, 27.0]	14.0 [6.00, 27.0]	17.5 [6.00, 27.0]
Laterality of occlusion: Left	222 (30.7%)	474 (46.7%)	696 (40.0%)
Time from stroke onset to presentation (Hours): Median [Min, Max]	13.1 [6.95, 21.5]	13.1 [6.95, 21.5]	13.1 [6.95, 21.5]
Sex: Female	337 (46.5%)	475 (46.8%)	812 (46.7%)
Age (Years): Median [Min, Max]	79.0 [39.0, 92.0]	75.0 [39.0, 92.0]	77.0 [39.0, 92.0]
Specialty of Rater			
Stroke Neurology	315 (43.5%)	375 (36.9%)	690 (39.7%)
Neurointervention	261 (36.0%)	399 (39.3%)	660 (37.9%)
Dual trained	148 (20.4%)	242 (23.8%)	390 (22.4%)
Experience of Rater (Years): Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [2.00, 33.0]	4.00 [2.00, 33.0]	4.00 [2.00, 33.0]
Imaging presented at each decision			
Perfusion CT neuroimaging	367 (50.7%)	503 (49.5%)	870 (50.0%)
Non-perfusion CT neuroimaging	357 (49.3%)	513 (50.5%)	870 (50.0%)
ASPECTS given by the rater: Median [Min, Max]	3.00 [0, 10.0]	7.00 [1.00, 10.0]	5.00 [0, 10.0]
Infarct core size Median [Min, Max]	125 [0, 270]	50.0 [0, 270]	81.0 [0, 270]
Collateral grading given by the rater			
0: Absence of vessels on CTA distal to occlusion	146 (20.2%)	38 (3.7%)	184 (10.6%)
1: Collateral supply filling 0-50% of MCA territory	405 (55.9%)	266 (26.2%)	671 (38.6%)
2: Collateral supply filling 51-99% of MCA territory	150 (20.7%)	437 (43.0%)	587 (33.7%)
3: Collateral supply filling 100% of MCA territory	23 (3.2%)	275 (27.1%)	298 (17.1%)

NIHSS National institutes of health stroke score; SD Standard deviation; CT Computed tomography ASPECTS Alberta stroke program early CT score

Table 2 Interrater Agreement for Endovascular Thrombectomy

Subgroups	All Cases		Imaging			
			Non-perfusion CT		Perfusion CT	
	n=60		n=30		n=30	
	OA (%)	Gwet AC1 (κ_G)	OA (%)	Gwet AC1 (κ_G) (95% CI)	OA (%)	Gwet AC1 (κ_G) (95% CI)
All raters (n=29)	75.3	0.519 (0.422,0.617)	73.5	0.487 (0.327,0.647)	77.1	0.552 (0.430,0.675)
Physician/rater specialty						
Stroke Neurology (n=12)	72.7	0.457 (0.346,0.569)	73.1	0.465 (0.300,0.630)	72.2	0.450 (0.291,0.609)
Neurointervention (n=11)	75.8	0.535 (0.427,0.644)	72.6	0.487 (0.306,0.668)	78.9	0.588 (0.455,0.722)
Dual trained (n=6)	81.7	0.657 (0.525,0.788)	78.9	0.604 (0.395,0.812)	84.4	0.710 (0.538,0.881)
Physician/ rater experience						
Junior (n=19)	75.4	0.519 (0.415,0.623)	74.6	0.505 (0.337,0.673)	76.2	0.534 (0.401,0.667)
Senior (n=10)	74.8	0.518 (0.412,0.624)	71.5	0.456 (0.292,0.620)	78.1	0.581 (0.441,0.721)
Core infarct size						
Small/ Medium (0-100ccc) (n=20)	76.6	0.626 (0.497,0.755)	76.0	0.603 (0.385,0.821)	77.2	0.648 (0.487,0.81)
Large (>100cc) (n=10)	72.7	0.563 (0.12,0.783)	68.6	0.451 (0.367,0.76)	76.7	0.665 (0.411,0.919)
Time since stroke onset						
Late: 6-12 hours (n=14)	77.3	0.560 (0.406,0.714)	73.7	0.502 (0.237,0.767)	80.6	0.621 (0.427,0.815)
Very late: 12-24 hours (n=16)	73.6	0.483 (0.353,0.615)	73.2	0.475 (0.255,0.695)	73.9	0.493 (0.323,0.662)

The cells have been shaded to reflect the degree of agreement (Gwet's AC1): moderate (0.41–0.60) white and substantial (0.61–0.80) gray. OA: observed agreement; CI: confidence interval

Table 3 Intra-rater agreement for Endovascular Thrombectomy

	Overall		Non-perfusion CT		Perfusion CT	
Rater ID	OA (%)	Gwet's AC1 (95% CI)	OA (%)	AC1 (95% CI)	OA (%)	AC1 (95% CI)
1	80.0	0.602 (0.393,0.810)	73.3	0.469 (0.133,0.805)	86.7	0.735 (0.477,0.992)
2	86.7	0.741 (0.566,0.915)	86.7	0.738 (0.482,0.994)	86.7	0.744 (0.49,0.997)
3	83.3	0.694 (0.506,0.882)	86.7	0.760 (0.516,1.00)	80.0	0.627 (0.327,0.926)
4	83.3	0.679 (0.488,0.871)	83.3	0.694 (0.42,0.968)	83.3	0.670 (0.388,0.952)
5	90.0	0.800 (0.644,0.956)	90.0	0.800 (0.572,1)	90.0	0.802 (0.575,1)
6	81.7	0.673 (0.480,0.867)	86.7	0.792 (0.572,1)	76.7	0.546 (0.225,0.867)
7	86.7	0.804 (0.66,0.948)	86.7	0.804 (0.594,1)	86.7	0.804 (0.594,1)
8	78.3	0.599 (0.387,0.811)	83.3	0.706 (0.438,0.974)	73.3	0.487 (0.149,0.825)
9	91.7	0.858 (0.73,0.986)	90.0	0.816 (0.601,1)	93.3	0.896 (0.742,1)
10	76.7	0.580 (0.363,0.797)	73.3	0.562 (0.239,0.885)	80.0	0.615 (0.314,0.917)
11	80.0	0.671 (0.479,0.864)	73.3	0.540 (0.21,0.87)	86.7	0.792 (0.572,1)
12	86.7	0.738 (0.562,0.914)	83.3	0.676 (0.395,0.956)	90.0	0.801 (0.575,1)
13	76.7	0.627 (0.422,0.831)	80.0	0.689 (0.418,0.959)	73.3	0.562 (0.239,0.885)
14	86.7	0.744 (0.57,0.917)	80.0	0.627 (0.327,0.926)	93.3	0.869 (0.682,1)
15	80.0	0.602 (0.393,0.81)	90.0	0.800 (0.572,1)	70.0	0.416 (0.065,0.768)
16	81.7	0.680 (0.489,0.871)	83.3	0.733 (0.482,0.985)	80.0	0.627 (0.327,0.926)
17	81.7	0.650 (0.451,0.849)	70.0	0.416 (0.065,0.768)	93.3	0.876 (0.696,1)
18	80.0	0.604 (0.396,0.812)	83.3	0.670 (0.388,0.952)	76.7	0.538 (0.217,0.859)
19	85.0	0.701 (0.515,0.887)	83.3	0.670 (0.388,0.952)	86.7	0.733 (0.475,0.992)
20	80.0	0.655 (0.457,0.853)	73.3	0.540 (0.210,0.870)	86.7	0.770 (0.533,1)
21	92.0	0.849 (0.714,0.983)	90.0	0.817 (0.601,1)	93.3	0.880 (0.705,1)
22	70.0	0.416 (0.175,0.657)	66.7	0.359 (-0.006,0.724)	73.3	0.491 (0.139,0.813)
23	78.3	0.568 (0.353,0.782)	80.0	.602 (0.298,0.905)	76.7	0.546 (0.225,0.867)
24	80.0	0.621 (0.414,0.827)	70.0	0.450 (0.097,0.802)	90.0	0.805 (0.581,1)
25	71.6	0.485 (0.249,0.721)	66.7	0.378 (0.01,0.745)	76.7	0.589 (0.275,0.902)

26	86.7	0.736 (0.56,0.912)	86.7	0.751 (0.502,1)	86.7	0.735 (0.477,0.992)
27	88.3	0.768 (0.602,0.935)	83.3	0.667 (0.384,0.95)	93.3	0.872 (0.688,1)
28	88.3	0.768 (0.599,0.934)	83.3	0.667 (0.384,0.95)	93.3	0.867 (0.678,1)

The cells have been shaded to reflect the degree of agreement (Gwet's AC1): Fair (0.21–0.40) green moderate (0.41–0.60) white, substantial (0.61–0.80) gray and excellent (>0.80) black OA: observed agreement

Figure 1. How does neuroimaging affect endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) decisions? A mosaic plot with a contingency table overlay is utilized to display the distribution of 870 cases (30 patients x 29 raters) and the corresponding decisions for or against endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) between two imaging protocols. All percentages are based on the denominator of 870. All box sizes are proportional to the magnitude of decisions. For instance, the lower left box represents the 10.1% (88/270) of all decisions. In this box, EVT was not recommended on non-perfusion imaging but recommended on perfusion imaging. Conversely the upper right quadrant of the plot signifies cases where EVT was recommended based on non-perfusion neuroimaging but not on perfusion neuroimaging (11.3%, 98/270). Conversely, the lower left quadrant represents cases that were not recommended for EVT based on non-perfusion CT neuroimaging but were deemed appropriate for EVT following perfusion CT neuroimaging.

Figure 2 Interrater Agreement for Endovascular Thrombectomy Between Two Surveys. Clustered bar graphs with error bars show Gwet's AC1 (κ_G) statistic with 95% confidence interval for inter-rater agreement between neuroimaging modalities and two survey rounds.

There is extensive confidence intervals overlap between neuroimaging modalities and time from stroke onset indicating no differences. The level of agreement is marked as moderate (lower black line) or substantial (higher gray line) above the threshold lines.

Recommendations for EVT on non-perfusion CT

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300180>; this version posted December 20, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Recommendations for EVT on perfusion CT

No EVT

EVT

No EVT

269 (30.9%)

EVT

88 (10.1%)

98 (11.3%)

415 (47.7%)

