

1 **Recommendations for implementing the INTERACT3 care bundle for intracerebral**  
2 **hemorrhage in Latin America: a Delphi Study**

3 Ma. Ignacia Allende MD,<sup>1</sup> Paula Muñoz-Venturelli MD PhD,<sup>1,2,3</sup> Francisca Gonzalez MPH,<sup>1,4</sup>  
4 Francisca Bascur NP,<sup>1</sup> Craig S. Anderson MD PhD,<sup>1,3,5</sup> Menglu Ouyang MD PhD,<sup>3</sup> Báltica  
5 Cabieses PhD,<sup>6</sup> Alexandra Obach PhD,<sup>6</sup> Vanessa Cano-Nigenda MD MSc,<sup>7</sup> Antonio Arauz  
6 MD PhD,<sup>7</sup> on behalf of the LATAM INTERACT3 Consensus Statement Panel\*.

7 <sup>1</sup>Centro de Estudios Clínicos, Instituto de Ciencias e Innovación en Medicina, Facultad de  
8 Medicina Clínica Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile.

9 <sup>2</sup>Servicio de Neurología, Departamento de Neurología y Psiquiatría, Clínica Alemana de  
10 Santiago, Facultad de Medicina Clínica Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile.

11 <sup>3</sup>The George Institute for Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South  
12 Wales, Sydney, Australia.

13 <sup>4</sup>Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud Blanquerna, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain.

14 <sup>5</sup>Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Fudan University,  
15 Shanghai, China

16 <sup>6</sup>Centro de Salud Global Intercultural, Instituto de Ciencias e Innovación en Medicina,  
17 Facultad de Medicina Clínica Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo, Chile.

18 <sup>7</sup>Instituto Nacional de Neurología y Neurocirugía Manuel Velasco Suarez, Mexico City,  
19 Mexico.

20 \*names of the LATAM INTERACT3 Consensus Statement Panel are listed in the  
21 supplementary material.

22 **Corresponding author:**

23 Dr. Paula Muñoz Venturelli

24 E: [paumunoz@udd.cl](mailto:paumunoz@udd.cl)

25 Centro de Estudios Clínicos, Instituto de Ciencias e Innovación en Medicina, Facultad de  
26 Medicina Clínica Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo, Avenida Plaza 680, Piso 4, Las  
27 Condes, Santiago, Chile

28 **Word Count: 5185**

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29 **Abstract (225 words)**

30 **Background and aims:** The third Intensive Care Bundle with Blood Pressure Reduction in  
31 Acute Cerebral Hemorrhage Trial (INTERACT3) showed that the implementation of a care  
32 bundle improves outcomes after acute intracerebral hemorrhage (ICH). We aimed to establish  
33 consensus-based recommendations for the broader integration of the care bundle across Latin  
34 American countries (LAC).

35 **Methods:** A 3-phase Delphi study allowed a panel of 32 healthcare workers from 14 LAC to  
36 sequentially rank various statements that commenced with 43 statements relevant to 7  
37 domains (training, resources and infrastructure, education of patients, blood pressure,  
38 temperature, glycemic control, and reversal of anticoagulation). The pre-defined consensus  
39 threshold was 75%.

40 **Results:** A total of 55 statements reached consensus by the third round, which included 12  
41 new statements that emerged through rounds. The highest-ranked statements in each domain  
42 emphasized critical aspects with successful implementation requiring a minimum level of  
43 resources to be made available. Key priorities included the continuous training of all  
44 healthcare workers involved in the management of ICH, establishing protocols aligned with  
45 available resources, and a collaborative inter-disciplinary approach to care being supported by  
46 institutional networks. Statements related to anticoagulation reversal were given the highest  
47 priority, which highlighted interest in the topic but limited availability of treatment in the  
48 region.

49 **Conclusions:** Consensus statements are provided to facilitate integration of the INTERACT3  
50 care bundle to reduce disparities in ICH outcomes in LAC.

51 **Key words:** Implementation science, intracerebral hemorrhage, care bundle, stroke, Latin  
52 America.

53 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms:**

54 INTERACT3: The third INTensive Care Bundle with Blood Pressure Reduction in Acute

55 Cerebral Hemorrhage Trial.

56 LAC: Latin American Countries.

57

## 58 **Introduction**

59 Intracerebral hemorrhage (ICH) is not as common as ischemic stroke but makes a  
60 disproportionately higher contribution to the loss of productive life from stroke due to its high  
61 rates of death and disability, worldwide.<sup>1,2</sup> The third INTensive Care Bundle with Blood  
62 Pressure Reduction in Acute Cerebral Hemorrhage Trial (INTERACT3) was an international,  
63 multicenter, stepped-wedge, cluster-randomized, controlled clinical trial that showed for the  
64 first time, that active care through a care bundle including time- and target -based protocols  
65 involving early intensive blood pressure (BP) lowering (achieving systolic BP <140 mmHg),  
66 glycemic control (achieving 6.1-7.8 mmol/L and 7.8-10.0 mmol/L without and with diabetes  
67 mellitus, respectively), treatment of pyrexia (achieving temperature level <37.5 °C), and  
68 reversal of anticoagulation (achieving an international normalized ratio [INR] <1.5), within 1  
69 hour of the initiation of treatment and to be maintained for 7 days, led to significantly better  
70 functional recovery, lower mortality, and improved quality of life at 6-months.<sup>3</sup> However,  
71 challenges exist in the broader implementation of this care bundle in ICH.

72 Latin American countries (LAC) had the fourth largest burden of stroke in 2019, with ICH  
73 being a major contributor due to the high prevalence of hypertension, obesity, and various  
74 barriers to integrate evidence-based care.<sup>1,4</sup> LAC poses unique challenges in implementing  
75 new treatment strategies, as the healthcare systems are deeply fragmented, often with little  
76 coordination between discipline groups.<sup>5</sup> Inequitable access to healthcare that is coupled with  
77 substantial budget constraints, impedes the capacity to address healthcare demands arising  
78 from social and demographic shifts. Structural disparities between social groups, limited  
79 availability of universal healthcare coverage, and diversity in culture and health literacy in the  
80 region present considerable challenges to addressing the burden of stroke as well as other  
81 common conditions.<sup>5,6</sup>

82 A better understanding of facilitators and barriers can facilitate the integration of new  
83 interventions and improve knowledge-to-practice gaps. The INTERACT3 study captured  
84 some barriers to implementing the care bundle through an embedded process evaluation. We  
85 wished to consolidate such information by generating structured strategies specific to LAC.  
86 Herein, we report our efforts to establish recommendations to the implementation of the  
87 INTERACT3 care bundle in hospitals across LAC.

## 88 **Methods**

### 89 *Study design*

90 We performed a 3-phase online Delphi process with the aim of obtaining expert  
91 recommendations for implementing the INTERACT3 care bundle in LAC. The goal of the  
92 Delphi methodology is to achieve expert consensus by employing semi-structured  
93 questionnaires with open-ended questions and controlled assessment and feedback to pre-  
94 defined statements. Mixed methods-quantitative and qualitative-analysis are undertaken until  
95 an accord is established and summarized.<sup>7,8</sup> The method is widely used to establish  
96 recommendations for patient care and public health, such as during the COVID-19  
97 pandemic.<sup>9-11</sup> Our study conformed to the Recommendations for the Conducting and  
98 Reporting of Delphi Studies (CREDES) (Table S1).<sup>12</sup>

### 99 *Generation of the Delphi survey*

100 Two of us (MIA and FGM) conducted a comprehensive review of the INTERACT3 process  
101 evaluation that was limited to LAC (results are unpublished) to formulate 43 statements to  
102 include in the first round. These statements were thoughtfully categorized into seven  
103 domains: (i) training and education (6 statements); (ii) human resources and infrastructure (5  
104 statements); (iii) early intensive BP control (7 statements); (iv) strict glucose control (12  
105 statements); (v) body temperature control (6 statements); (vi) rapid reversal of anticoagulation

106 (3 statements); and (vii) education for patients and family members (4 statements). Two  
107 survey versions were designed in English and Spanish to accommodate linguistic diversity.  
108 Extensive discussions were undertaken of the domains and individual statements over two  
109 meetings. The rounds underwent careful examination for clarity, coherence, and linguistic  
110 refinement in neutral Spanish (VCN) and English (MO and CA) to produce the final  
111 questionnaire.

### 112 *Selection of panelist*

113 We used an iterative sampling approach to identify panelists (Figure 1). Potential participants  
114 were identified from known specialist contacts of the research group and through snowball  
115 recruitment. Invitations to participate were extended through an online recruitment letter that  
116 outlined the study objectives. Panelists were offered compensation for their time (USD\$100)  
117 upon completion of the study.

118 To assess the expertise of invited participants, a survey collected demographic and hospital  
119 characteristic data in the initial recruitment letter. Eligibility for participation included the  
120 following criteria: being a healthcare professional with a minimum of 5 years of experience in  
121 a respective field; having at least one year of experience in a public health facility; and being  
122 currently involved in the care of ICH patients, including the hyperacute care phase of stroke.  
123 People working in a facility without computerized tomography or an emergency area were  
124 excluded.

125 We defined the required sample size as 32 participants to align with similar studies where 30-  
126 40 was considered adequate to define common themes.<sup>13-15</sup> Participants were selected to a  
127 maximum of 4 panelists from each of 16 LAC for representation.

### 128 *Data collection*

129 We pre-specified 3 rounds to ensure consensus and mitigate drop-out, based on previous  
130 research indicating results diminish or stabilize at this stage.<sup>16</sup> A REDCap® platform was  
131 used to generate and distribute surveys.<sup>17,18</sup>

132 Each round lasted 14 days, and an average of 3 reminders was needed to prompt survey  
133 completion. Between rounds, the research group allotted 3 weeks to analyze responses and  
134 create the subsequent round; this allowed a separation of 5 weeks between rounds. In the first  
135 round (R1), panelists were asked to rate each of the statements according to their level of  
136 agreement on a descending 4-point Likert scale (strongly agree [SA], agree [A], disagree [D],  
137 and strongly disagree [SD]). Following each statement and dimension, panelists could  
138 provide comments and suggest edits for the current statements or propose additional ones.

139 The pre-defined consensus threshold was set at 75% agreement (SA or A) for retention of a  
140 statement, as defined elsewhere.<sup>9,15,19</sup> Statements below this threshold were modified  
141 according to feedback from panelists, and some statements were modified if they failed to  
142 reach 75% of SA from panelist feedback.

143 In the second round (R2), statements with modifications and any new ones suggested by  
144 panelists, were included in the survey. Statements that achieved consensus agreement were  
145 removed and only include in the final ranking section in round 3 (R3). Panelists were  
146 provided with percentage agreement in R1 and relevant unidentified citations. As in R1, they  
147 were provided with open comment boxes at the end of each statement and dimension.

148 R3 followed a similar dynamic process, but this time the panelists had to rank the importance  
149 of all retained statements on a 9-point Likert scale, from 1 ‘most important’ to 9 ‘least  
150 important’. Ultimately, they could indicate which statement they considered should be  
151 removed from the final report; this applied to all statements that received a 75% agreement for  
152 exclusion. The goal was to ensure that the final report only included statements with a  
153 substantial level of importance. Anonymity was maintained throughout the Delphi rounds.

154 *Data analysis*

155 Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Statements results were  
156 summarized using percentage of agreement, and consensus was achieved if  $\geq 75\%$  of  
157 combined ‘SA’ and ‘A’ responses were obtained. For the ranking section, median and  
158 percentage of statements rated  $\geq 3$  were reported. STATA version 18 was used in all  
159 statistical analyzes.

160 Qualitative data were analyzed (MIA and FGM) using a simple content analysis from the  
161 comments gathered in each round. Group consensus was used to decide on the requirement to  
162 modify existing statements or consider new statements that emerged in each round. Verbatim  
163 quotes from participants are presented to support the findings.

164 *Ethical approval*

165 The study was approved by the Scientific Ethics Committee of Clínica Alemana-Universidad  
166 del Desarrollo (number 2023-68). All panelists provide an online informed consent before  
167 participation in the study.

168 **Results**

169 The panelist group comprised 32 participants (mean age  $37.1 \pm 5.8$  years) from 14 LAC  
170 (Figure 2) who were predominantly neurologists (87.5%) with a mean of  $9.7 \pm 3.7$  years of  
171 experience. Table 1 provides details of their other characteristics. They responded to all 3  
172 rounds (Figure 1). In R1, of the 43 statements, 3 failed to reach the pre-defined agreement of  
173 75%, 29 were modified based on weak agreement, and 8 new statements emerged from the  
174 panelists. Thus, the 11 statements that achieved consensus were not modified nor passed on  
175 to R2.

176 In R2, of the 40 statements that achieved consensus, 8 were modified due to lack of SA  
177 consensus and 4 new statements were created. The 32 statements that achieved consensus



178 were not modified and did not pass to R3. Thus, the final round involved the rating of 12  
179 statements and by the end, all statements achieved consensus. The panelists also had the  
180 opportunity to rank all 55 statements considered throughout the rounds within each domain.  
181 As there were no statements with 75% consensus agreement for exclusion from the final  
182 report, the following section presents all the statements in the final round, with quotes to  
183 emphasize relevance.

#### 184 *Training and education*

185 Statements concerning national initiatives were the highest ranked and achieved substantial  
186 consensus. For example, the need to create a ‘stroke code’ protocol for the early treatment of  
187 ICH patients (SA 93.8%; ranking 1.34±1.45) (Table S2). Moreover, education to the general  
188 public was to emphasize the importance of symptom recognition and need to promptly call  
189 emergency services (SA 84.4%; ranking 1.46±1.31).

190 *“One of the main limitations in providing and applying the bundle of care is that symptoms*  
191 *are not recognized in time, and as a result, individuals do not seek medical attention.”*

192 Emphasis was made to provide training to all healthcare workers involved in the management  
193 of ICH patients (SA 93.8%; ranking 1.34±1.45), without prioritizing certain groups over  
194 others.

195 *“Although the background of the neurology team is usually better, I believe that training*  
196 *should be given to all staff and not prioritizing non-neurologist staff”*

197 The high rotational nature of staffing in emergency rooms was highlighted as a barrier to  
198 effective implementation. Thus, efforts should be made towards continuous education of  
199 staff.

#### 200 *Human resources and infrastructure*

201 The key concern was the provision of training to healthcare workers (SA 90.6%; ranking  
202  $1.09 \pm 0.29$ ) (Table S3), and the necessity for cohesion between different discipline units.

203 *“All personnel who treat patients with intracerebral hemorrhage should be on the same  
204 page.”*

205 Assurance over the allocation of minimum resources in countries (SA 81.3%; ranking  
206  $1.43 \pm 0.84$ ) was also deemed a high priority. Importance was also given to statements that  
207 highlighted the need for a collaborative approach through the creation of communication  
208 pathways between units to ensure prompt notification of imaging results (SA 68.8%; ranking  
209  $1.71 \pm 1.05$ ); and continuity of treatment for patients transferred to other units (SA 68.8%;  
210 ranking  $1.75 \pm 1.27$ ).

211 *“In-hospital delays due to miscommunication are higher than we generally assume.”*

212 *Early intensive BP control*

213 Adherence to the strict monitoring protocol used in INTERACT3 was given the highest  
214 priority (Table S4). Despite a good overall correlation between rating and ranking being  
215 achieved, this statement had the highest combined disagreement in the domain (Combined  
216 Disagreement [CD] 15.7%, ranking  $1.28 \pm 0.58$ ). Although the panelists agreed on the  
217 minimum set of BP measurement used in the INTERACT3 protocol, monitoring requirements  
218 should be based on individual requirements.

219 *“Monitoring may need to be invasive and continuous or stricter in the first 72 hours in  
220 patients and even more so if they are being managed with intravenous treatment.”*

221 *“It should be understood that this statement speaks of as a minimum so it is clear that it  
222 leaves the possibility of individualizing monitoring according to the situation and severity of  
223 each patient.”*

224 Ensuring that there is a minimum level of resources being readily available, such as  
225 intravenous antihypertensive drugs, was ranked highly (SA 81.3%; ranking  $1.31\pm 0.64$ ). Some  
226 panelists said this was the main barrier to implementation. Given challenges in the allocation  
227 of healthcare resources, initiatives to provide treatment protocols aligned with local resources  
228 was encouraged (SA 87.5%; ranking  $1.37\pm 0.55$ ). Emphasis was also placed on providing  
229 evidence-based protocols that are periodically updated.

### 230 *Strict glucose control*

231 Recommendations in this domain were driven by concerns over the requirement for insulin  
232 pumps in the INTERACT3 protocol (Table S5). Thus, the highest ranked recommendation  
233 was the necessity to include practical training sessions on glycemic management, despite  
234 having a relative low agreement (SA 59.4%; ranking  $1.5\pm 0.80$ ). Moreover, panelists  
235 expressed concern over the widespread unavailability of insulin pumps in LAC; these are  
236 generally reserved for patients with extremely poor glucose control. Panelists agreed that  
237 specific protocols (SA 87.5%, ranking  $1.68\pm 0.89$ ) and communication channels with  
238 endocrinologists and pharmacists (SA 40.6%, ranking  $1.75\pm 0.76$ ) should be established for  
239 complex patients.

240 *“In complicated scenarios, there should be guidelines to help in the optimal monitoring and*  
241 *control of glycemia”.*

242 Another highly ranked recommendation was the need for assurance over the strict  
243 measurement of blood glucose level (BGL) (SA 71.9%; ranking  $1.59\pm 0.87$ ). Compared to the  
244 BP monitoring domain, there was less agreement over the glycemic protocol used in  
245 INTERACT3 (SA 31.3%; ranking  $3\pm 2.01$ ). This primarily stemmed from its use in the stable  
246 non-diabetic patient, where consideration was recommended towards using a more relaxed  
247 monitoring of BGL as resources are limited.

248 *“If the patient is not diabetic or does not have elevated blood sugar at the onset, I do not*  
249 *think it is advisable to spend resources”.*

250 *Body temperature control*

251 Emphasis was on training of healthcare workers (SA 75%; ranking 1.53±1.13) (Table S6).

252 Monitoring of patients was also considered necessary (SA 59.4%; ranking 1.75±0.84).

253 *“Focus on proper monitoring, and temperature control. This is a point that is often*  
254 *overlooked.”*

255 *Rapid reversal of anticoagulation*

256 Key aspects were the availability and affordability of modern treatments in this increasing  
257 important topic (Table S7). The utmost priority was assurance over the availability of  
258 anticoagulation reversal agents (SA 81.3%; ranking 1.21±0.49).

259 *“Establish protocols where there is no need to have the approval of different sectors to allow*  
260 *for the administration of reversing agents.”*

261 Another aspect was the need for strategies to ensure 24-hour availability of INR measurement  
262 as part of a collaborative approach, supported by networks between healthcare facilities (SA  
263 81.3%; ranking 1.21±0.49). The need to provide training was also highlighted (SA 87.5%;  
264 ranking 1.31±0.50).

265 *“There is fear with patients who experience bleeding on anticoagulants. Doctors suspend*  
266 *treatment, and there is a fear of restarting due to recurrence. Workshops on this topic are*  
267 *important because not everyone is familiar with it.”*

268 *Education for patients and family members.*

269 Use of plain language to educate patients and their families (and/or caregivers) was  
270 considered a priority (SA 90.6%; ranking 1.37±0.75) (Table S7). Given that need for frequent

271 monitoring of the care bundle, panelists emphasized the need to educate relatives on the  
272 benefits of this approach for ICH patients (SA 78.1%; ranking  $1.62 \pm 0.75$ ), whilst also  
273 avoiding projecting unrealistic expectations.

274 *“It should be clear, without providing false expectations, but without discouraging, as this can  
275 limit the opportunity for improvement.”*

#### 276 *Overall priorities*

277 The statement that received the highest ranking across all domains was the provision of  
278 training for all healthcare workers, which emphasized the necessity for teamwork during  
279 implementation of the care bundle (SA 90.6%; ranking  $1.09 \pm 0.29$ ). Anticoagulation reversal  
280 emerged as the domain with the highest-prioritized statements, followed by BP control (Table  
281 S4 and S5). Within these domains, the statements that received the highest rankings were  
282 those related to resource allocation and education.

#### 283 **Discussion**

284 Our study provides fresh perspectives on areas that need to be addressed to ensure successful  
285 integration of the INTERACT3 care bundle across hospitals in LAC. High-priority domains  
286 were BP control, anticoagulation reversal, and resourcing, with a focus on education and  
287 training. Blood glucose and temperature control domains had lower rankings and received  
288 less consensus overall. Use of the Delphi technique allowed us to identify recommendations  
289 from a comprehensive perspective of different clinician stakeholders in LAC.

290 A common perspective was the need to ensure that a minimum level of resources would be  
291 made available to achieve effective integration of the care bundle. Concerns were raised over  
292 the shortage of antihypertensive drugs and reversal anticoagulation agents, which panelists  
293 deemed as a critical barrier in being able to achieve effective implementation of key

294 components of the care bundle. This is consistent with previous studies in which contextual  
295 factors, such as financial resource constraints, are among the most frequently mentioned  
296 barriers.<sup>20</sup> Other recommendations related to resources, including the availability of  
297 glucometers, thermometers, and BP monitors, did not receive as high a level of ranking,  
298 possibly because they reflected a lower priority of need. Recognizing the substantial  
299 challenges in the allocation of healthcare resources in LAC, the panelists acknowledged the  
300 importance of developing simple and efficient protocols. However, prioritizing the supply of  
301 core items, such as the items ranked higher, was deemed a crucial point in resource-  
302 constrained settings in LAC.

303 In common with other country-level recommendations, the generation of a ‘stroke code’  
304 emerged as another critical aspect. While there has been a global focus on prompt  
305 implementation of reperfusion therapy for acute ischemic stroke over recent decades, no such  
306 urgency has been uniformly applied to patients with ICH, in part due to the lack of any proven  
307 treatments and also due to the natural history of a poor outcome. Indeed, while 90% of the  
308 panelists reported having a “stroke code” protocol in their workplaces, only two-thirds had an  
309 integrated ICH management pathway. The panelists emphasized a pressing need to address  
310 this gap given that robust evidence is now emerging that time makes a difference to prognosis  
311 in ICH. The non-aggressive approach of clinicians to ICH is further reflected in the common  
312 use of low threshold to withdraw active care in these patients.<sup>21</sup> Training on the benefits of  
313 the INTERACT3 care bundle was considered a means of addressing premature use of do-not-  
314 resuscitate orders and clinician-misjudgment over prognostication.<sup>22</sup> Hence, inclusion of an  
315 ICH pathway and the training of all healthcare workers on the INTERACT3 care bundle were  
316 considered pivotal first steps in reshaping the perspectives of healthcare professionals on ICH  
317 management.

318 It is important to recognize that since ICH is the most severe form of stroke, many patients are  
319 unable to actively participate in the decision-making process.<sup>23</sup> In such overwhelming  
320 scenarios, misinterpretation of prognosis by surrogates decision-makers, most often being  
321 immediate family members, can lead to misunderstandings, emotional distress and conflict, in  
322 response to early decisions to forego treatment.<sup>23,24</sup> In order to provide goal-concordant care,  
323 the panelists emphasized the vital role that counselling of relatives on prognosis has on  
324 ensuring a clear message is received through the use of simple language without instilling  
325 false hope.

326 Our findings further highlight the need for a collaborative approach in stroke care by the  
327 creation of communication channels between professionals and the creation of networks  
328 between healthcare institutions. The dimensions for a collaborative approach were for strict  
329 glucose control and anticoagulation reversal, reflecting the limited availability of treatments  
330 and limited knowledge of approaches in those areas. The panelists were reluctant to promote  
331 the use of insulin pumps, which is consistent with barriers found in the use of the fever,  
332 hyperglycemia, and swallowing dysfunction protocols used in the Quality in Acute Stroke  
333 Care (QASC) study.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, the process evaluation undertaken among Chinese  
334 participants in INTERACT3 found that blood glucose control was the most complex  
335 intervention to implement, and that collaboration and consultations with endocrinology were  
336 key facilitators aligns with our findings.<sup>26</sup> During the Delphi rounds, use of subcutaneous  
337 insulin was often mentioned but it did not reach a high ranking, further emphasizing the need  
338 for training and protocols in the region.

339 Given the relative low use of warfarin anticoagulation in Latin America,<sup>27</sup> and thus a lack of  
340 exposure to anticoagulation reversal, adequate supply of medications alone would unlikely  
341 lead to effective implementation of the care bundle. Continuous training on drug  
342 reconstitution, organizational support, and ensuring 24-hour availability on INR measures

343 through collaborative networks, was contemplated as being important for successful  
344 integration. Other studies have emphasized these being key steps in reducing door-to-needle  
345 time for anticoagulation reversal,<sup>28</sup> and are arguably even more relevant in the era of reversal  
346 agents for direct oral anticoagulants.

347 Our study has several strengths. The Delphi method was used to evaluate recommendations  
348 for implementation of the INTERACT3 care bundle to enhance ICH management. The  
349 panelists from 14 LAC led to a comprehensive perspective being gained that accounted for  
350 variations in healthcare systems and cultural contexts in the region. They provided a  
351 complete response rate throughout rounds that enhances reliability of the results. However,  
352 some limitations are worth mentioning. First, despite our efforts to construct a  
353 multidisciplinary panel, it mainly comprised specialist clinicians without any lived-experience  
354 patient, family or community engagement. Although the panelists were experienced and  
355 worked in a public system, provided them with a holistic view, they may not necessarily  
356 reflect the views of junior staff who work at the front line and are involved in the day-to-day  
357 management of patients with ICH. Finally, as this study focused on LAC, the views may not  
358 be representative of other countries or healthcare systems.

359 In summary, the INTERACT3 bundle of care has the potential to reduce the burden of ICH in  
360 LAC, by alleviating alleviate strain on diverse and complex health systems and improving the  
361 health and wellbeing of those affected. Using the Delphi technique, our study provides a  
362 priority list of key aspects for effective integration of the INTERACT3 care bundle in the  
363 region. Key stakeholders can use these findings to devise context-specific strategies towards  
364 effective implementation.

365

366



367 **Acknowledgments:** The authors thank the LATAM INTERACT3 consensus panel.

368 **Sources of Funding:** This study was funded by The George Institute of Global Health.

369 **Disclosures:** CSA reports research grants from the National Health and Medical Research  
370 Council (NHMRC) of Australia, the Medical Research Council (MRC) and Medical Research  
371 Foundation (MRF) of the UK, and Takeda and Penumbra. PMV receives research grants from  
372 ANID Fondecyt Regular 1221837, Pfizer and Boehringer Ingelheim. BC gets research grants  
373 from Fondecyt Regular 1201461. AO receives research grants from Merck. VCN report  
374 research grant from AstraZeneca and is a speaker for Boehringer and Sanofi. The other  
375 authors declare no conflict of interest.

376

377

## 378 **References**

- 379 1. Feigin VL, Stark BA, Johnson CO, Roth GA, Bisignano C, Abady GG, et al. Global,  
380 regional, and national burden of stroke and its risk factors, 1990–2019: a systematic  
381 analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Neurol* 2021;20:795–820
- 382 2. Magid-Bernstein J, Girard R, Polster S, Srinath A, Romanos S, Awad IA, Sansing LH.  
383 Cerebral hemorrhage: pathophysiology, treatment, and future directions. *Circ Re.*  
384 2022;130:1204-1229
- 385 3. Ma L, Hu X, Song L, Chen X, Ouyang M, Billot L, et al. The third Intensive Care  
386 Bundle with Blood Pressure Reduction in Acute Cerebral Haemorrhage Trial  
387 (INTERACT3): an international, stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial.  
388 *Lancet* 2023;402:27–40
- 389 4. Pacheco-Barrios K, Giannoni-Luza S, Navarro-Flores A, Rebello-Sanchez I, Parente J,  
390 Balbuena A, et al. Burden of stroke and population-attributable fractions of risk factors  
391 in Latin America and the Caribbean. *JAHA* 2022;11:e027044
- 392 5. Atun R, De Andrade LOM, Almeida G, Cotlear D, Dmytraczenko T, Frenz P, et al.  
393 Health-system reform and universal health coverage in Latin America. *Lancet*  
394 2015;385:1230–1247
- 395 6. Ruano AL, Rodríguez D, Rossi PG, Maceira D. Understanding inequities in health and  
396 health systems in Latin America and the Caribbean: a thematic series. *Int J Equity*  
397 *Health* 2021;20:94, s12939-021-01426–1
- 398 7. Okoli C, Pawlowski SD. The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design  
399 considerations and applications. *Information Management* 2004;42:15–29
- 400 8. Keeney S, Hasson F, McKenna H. Consulting the oracle: ten lessons from using the  
401 Delphi technique in nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2006;53:205–212.

- 402 9. Lazarus JV, Romero D, Kopka CJ, Karim SA, Abu-Raddad LJ, Almeida G, et al. A  
403 multinational Delphi consensus to end the COVID-19 public health threat. *Nature*  
404 2022;611:332–345
- 405 10. Rahaghi FF, Balasubramanian VP, Bourge RC, Burger CD, Chakinala MM, Eggert MS,  
406 et al. Delphi consensus recommendation for optimization of pulmonary hypertension  
407 therapy focusing on switching from a phosphodiesterase 5 inhibitor to riociguat. *Pulm*  
408 *Circ* 2022;12:e12055
- 409 11. Van Pottelberghe S, Heine F, Van Dooren S, Hes F, Kupper N. Barriers and facilitators  
410 for the implementation of patient-centered care in cardiogenetics: a Delphi study among  
411 ERN GUARD-heart members. *Eur J Hum Genet* 2023;31:1371–1380.
- 412 12. Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J, Radbruch L, Brearley SG. Guidance on Conducting and  
413 REporting DELphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: recommendations based on a  
414 methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 2017;31:684–706
- 415 13. Stein J, Rodstein BM, Levine SR, Cheung K, Sicklick A, Silver B, et al. Which road to  
416 recovery? Factors influencing postacute stroke discharge destinations: a Delphi study.  
417 *Stroke* 2022;53:947–955
- 418 14. Regan M, Smolar M, Burton R, Clarke Z, Sharpe C, Henn C, Marsden J. Policies and  
419 interventions to reduce harmful gambling: an international Delphi consensus and  
420 implementation rating study. *Lancet Public Health* 2022;7:e705–e717
- 421 15. Mason B, Boyd K, Doubal F, Barber M, Brady M, Cowey E, et al. Core Outcome  
422 measures for palliative and end-of-life research after severe stroke: mixed-method  
423 Delphi study. *Stroke* 2021;52:3507–3513
- 424 16. López-Gómez E. El método Delphi en la investigación actual en educación: una  
425 revisión teórica y metodológica. *Educación XXI*. 2017;21(1):17-40

- 426 17. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic  
427 data capture (REDCap): a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for  
428 providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatic.*  
429 2009;42:377–381
- 430 18. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, et al. The REDCap  
431 consortium: Building an international community of software platform partners. *J*  
432 *Biomed Informatics* 2019;95:103208
- 433 19. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, Pencharz PB, Ling SC, Moore AM, Wales PW.  
434 Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for  
435 reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014;67:401–409
- 436 20. Baatiema L, Otim ME, Mnatzaganian G, de-Graft Aikins A, Coombes J, Somerset S.  
437 Health professionals’ views on the barriers and enablers to evidence-based practice for  
438 acute stroke care: a systematic review. *Implementation Sci* 2017;12:74
- 439 21. Parry-Jones AR, Paley L, Bray BD, Hoffman AM, James M, Cloud GC, et al. Care-  
440 limiting decisions in acute stroke and association with survival: analyses of UK national  
441 quality register data. *Int J Strok.* 2016;11:321–331
- 442 22. Bailey S. The Concept of Futility in Health Care Decision Making. *Nurs Ethics*  
443 2004;11:77–83
- 444 23. Gao L, Zhao CW, Hwang DY. End-of-Life Care Decision-Making in Stroke. *Front*  
445 *Neurol* 2021;12:702833
- 446 24. Hemphill JC, White DB. Clinical Nihilism in Neuroemergencies. *Emerg Med Clin N Am*  
447 2009;27:27–37
- 448 25. Dale S, Levi C, Ward J, Grimshaw JM, Jammali-Blasi A, D’Este C, et al. Barriers and  
449 enablers to implementing clinical treatment protocols for fever, hyperglycaemia, and

- 450 swallowing dysfunction in the quality in acute stroke care (QASC) project: a mixed  
451 methods study. *Worldviews Ev Based Nurs* 2015;12:41–50
- 452 26. Ouyang M, Anderson CS, Song L, Jan S, Sun L, Cheng G, et al. Implementing a goal-  
453 directed care bundle after acute intracerebral haemorrhage: process evaluation for the  
454 Third INTensive Care Bundle with Blood Pressure Reduction in Acute Cerebral  
455 Haemorrhage Trial Study in China. *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2022;51:373–383
- 456 27. Koziel M, Teutsch C, Bayer V, Lu S, Gurusamy VK, et al. Changes in anticoagulant  
457 prescription patterns over time for patients with atrial fibrillation around the world. *J*  
458 *Arrhythmia* 2021;37:990–1006
- 459 28. Parry-Jones AR, Järhult SJ, Kreitzer N, Morotti A, Toni D, Seiffge D, et al. Acute care  
460 bundles should be used for patients with intracerebral haemorrhage: an expert consensus  
461 statement. *Eur Stroke J* 2023;(0)

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

**Table 1. Baseline panelist characteristics**

	Participants (n = 32)
<i>Sociodemographic</i>	
Male	21 (65.62)
Age, yr	37.1 ±5.8
Income of country(*)	
Low-middle income	2 (6.25)
High-middle income	24 (75)
High income	6 (18.75)
Profession	
Medical Doctor	31 (96.88)
General practitioner	1 (3.13)
Specialist	
Neurology	28 (87.50)
Internal Medicine	1 (3.13)
Urgenciology	1 (3.13)
Physiotherapist	1 (3.13)
Experience	
Years in profession, mean ±SD	9.71 ±3.70
Years in ICH patient care, mean ±SD	7.62 ±2.76
Years in Public Health System, mean ±SD	8.12 ±4.05
INTERACT3 investigator	6 (18.75)
<i>Panelist hospital</i>	
Location	
Urban	30 (93.75)
Semi-urban	2 (6.25)
Rural	0 (0)
Health Sector	
Private	6 (18.75)
Public	25 (78.13)
Other	1 (2.70)
Computerized tomography available	32 (100)
Service Units	
Emergency department	32 (100)
Neurosurgery	27 (84.38)
Intensive Care Unit	32 (100)
Stroke Unit	16 (50)
Laboratory facilities	31 (96.88)
Stroke Protocol	26 (81.25)
Inclusion of ICH treatment	17 (65.38)

Data are n (%) or mean±SD

(\*)Income of countries based on the World Bank classification system: high-income includes Chile and Brazil; high-middle-income includes Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Paraguay, and Peru; low-middle-income include Bolivia.

Abbreviations: ICH= intracerebral hemorrhage. INTERACT3=The third INTensive Care Bundle with Blood Pressure Reduction in Acute Cerebral Hemorrhage Trial.

473 **Figures**

474 Figure 1. Flowchart of sampling and Delphi rounds.

475 Figure 2. Distribution of panelists in Latin America.


476

477 **Supplemental Material**

478 List of LATAM INTERACT3 Consensus Panel

479 Tables S1-S7

480



**Figure 1. Flowchart of sampling and Delphi rounds**

Iterative sampling approach resulted in 32 panelists in all rounds. Rr = Response rate. \*R3 analysis not shown since all 12 statements achieved consensus.





**Figure 2. Distribution of panelists in Latin America**