





1 **Association of Endovascular Thrombectomy Volume and Outcomes in Acute Ischemic**
2 **Stroke: A National Inpatient Sample Study**

3
4 Lane Fry, M.D.¹; Aaron Brake, M.D.²; Cody Heskett, BS³; Frank A. De Stefano, D.O.⁴; Ari
5 Williams, M.D.⁴; Nashaat Majo, BS³; Catherine Lei, BS³; Abdul-Rahman Alkiswani, BS³; Kevin
6 Le, BS³; Adam G. Rouse, Ph.D, M.D.⁴; Jeremy Peterson, M.D.⁴; Koji Ebersole M.D.⁴

7
8 ¹Department of Radiology, University of Kansas, Kansas City, Kansas

9 ²Department of Neurology, University of Iowa Hospital and Clinics, Iowa City, Iowa

10 ³University of Kansas School of Medicine, Kansas City, Kansas

11 ⁴Department of Neurological Surgery, University of Kansas, Kansas City, Kansas

12

13 **Corresponding Author:**

14

15 Lane Fry

16 University of Kansas Medical Center

17 Department of Radiology

18 3901 Rainbow Blvd, MS 4032

19 Kansas City, Kansas, 66160

20 Phone: 816-294-4328

21 Email: rfry@kumc.edu

22

23 **Running Title:** *EVT Volume in National Inpatient Sample*

24

25 **Keywords:** Endovascular Thrombectomy, Acute Ischemic Stroke, National Inpatient Sample,
26 Volume-Outcome Relationship

27

28

29 **Abstract:** 300

30 **Word count:** 5187

31 **Figures/Tables:** 2 Figures, 4 Tables

32 **References:** 23

33

34 **Disclosures:** None

35 **Funding:** None

36

37 **Abstract**

38 **Background:** Previous studies have reported a positive relationship between higher hospital
39 endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) volume and shorter procedures, higher revascularization
40 rates, and improved functional outcomes. We investigated the association between hospital EVT
41 volume and clinical outcomes using the National Inpatient Sample (NIS) database from 2016-
42 2020.

43
44 **Methods:** A cross-sectional analysis of the NIS examining the relationship of hospital EVT
45 volume and outcomes was performed. All relevant clinical and demographic information was
46 collected. The outcomes were favorable functional outcome (home without assistance), inpatient
47 mortality, and intracerebral hemorrhage (ICH). Centers were classified as high-volume if they
48 were in the top quintile of annual EVT volume. We performed univariate, multivariate, nearest
49 neighbor matched analysis, and an exploratory annual case volume cutoff analysis.

50
51 **Results:** There were 114,640 patients who underwent EVT included in the sample. Of these,
52 24,415 (21.3%) were in the high-volume group. High-volume centers had higher rates of
53 favorable functional outcome in univariate (OR 1.20, $p < 0.001$), multivariate (aOR 1.19, $p =$
54 0.003), and matched analysis (OR 1.14, $p = 0.028$). Prior to matching, lower rates of inpatient
55 mortality (OR 0.83, $p < 0.001$). However, in univariate and matched analysis there were no
56 differences between high and low-volume centers. There were no differences in ICH across all
57 analyses. Functional benefit was first noted at ≥ 50 EVTs, but centers performing ≥ 175 EVTs
58 had substantially higher functional benefit (aOR 1.42, $p = 0.002$).

59
60 **Conclusions:** Our analysis demonstrates increased hospital case volume is associated with a
61 modest improvement in favorable functional outcomes in patients undergoing EVT for AIS.
62 Attempts to identify procedural cut off values reveal likely improved functional outcomes
63 beginning at 50 EVT per year, while this benefit seems to increase with increasing case volumes.
64 These higher levels of case volumes do not lead to higher rates of inpatient mortality or ICH.

65
66

67 **Introduction:**

68 Endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) has emerged as the standard of care for patients presenting
69 with acute ischemic stroke due to large vessel occlusion (LVO), demonstrating significant
70 benefits in terms of revascularization, neurological recovery, and functional outcomes.^{1,2} The
71 successful implementation of EVT relies on well-coordinated stroke systems of care,
72 incorporating streamlined processes for patient selection, timely intervention, and optimal post-
73 procedural management. Previous studies have reported a positive relationship between higher
74 hospital EVT volume and shorter procedure times, higher revascularization rates, and improved
75 functional outcomes.³⁻⁸ As EVT becomes increasingly integrated into routine clinical practice,
76 understanding the impact of hospital case volume on patient outcomes is essential for optimizing
77 stroke care.

78
79 Two prior administrative studies have examined the volume-outcome relationship for EVT in
80 acute ischemic stroke.^{3,4} Each of these studies demonstrated benefit for patients at high-volume
81 thrombectomy centers in terms of favorable functional outcome and inpatient mortality.
82 However, the patient population in both studies were limited to only patients on Medicare and
83 only encompassed data from 1-2 years.

84
85 In this study, we sought to investigate the association between hospital EVT volume and clinical
86 outcomes using the National Inpatient Sample (NIS) database from 2016-2020. The NIS is a
87 comprehensive and nationally representative dataset of inpatient hospital stays in the United
88 States, including all payers. Our objective was to provide robust, population-level evidence to
89 inform ongoing discussions regarding the optimization of EVT delivery and stroke care
90 networks. We hypothesized that higher volume centers would have higher rates of favorable
91 functional outcome when compared to lower volume centers.

92
93 **Methods:**

94 *Study Design*

95 This is a cross-sectional retrospective analysis of United States hospital inpatient admissions
96 examining the relationship of hospital EVT volume and outcomes. This study was conducted in
97 accordance with STROBE guidelines.

98
99 *Data Source*

100 The NIS is the largest national inpatient database in the United States, containing 7 million
101 unweighted hospital admissions annually. It is developed and maintained by the Healthcare Cost
102 and Utilization Project (HCUP) and consists of de-identified inpatient hospitalization data
103 derived from billing and discharge information from the participating hospitals. Utilization of
104 provided discharge weights reported by participating institutions allows for estimates of
105 nationally representative statistics.

106
107 *Patient Selection*

108 Weighted discharge NIS data from 2016-2020 was surveyed for patients admitted with primary
109 *International Classification of Disease, Tenth Version*, (ICD-10) admission diagnosis of AIS
110 (cerebral infarction - ICD-10-CM I63.xx). Endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) (ICD-10-PR
111 03CGxx, 03CHxx, 03CJxx, 03CKxx, 03CLxx, 03CPxx, 03CQxx, 037Gxx, 03Qxx) and
112 intravenous tPA (IV-tPA) (ICD-10-CM Z92.82, ICD-10-PR 3E03316, 3E03317, 3E04316,

113 3E04317) procedural codes were then interrogated to determine treatment exposure. Patients
114 were included if they were admitted for AIS and received EVT. An overview of patient selection
115 is seen in **Supplemental Figure 1**.

116

117 *Demographic and Clinical Characteristics*

118 Baseline demographic data extracted from the NIS database was collected including age, sex,
119 race, primary payer status, hospital location, and teaching status. Comorbidity burden was
120 assessed by utilizing the Charlson comorbidity index.^{9,10} We identified markers of stroke severity
121 based on previous NIS studies analyzing EVT outcomes.^{11,12} Markers of stroke severity included
122 ICD-10 diagnoses related to level of consciousness (stupor and coma), infarct size (cerebral
123 edema and herniation), neurological deficits (neglect, dysphagia, and aphasia), and reliance upon
124 respiratory or nutritional support (mechanical ventilation, nasogastric tube, and parenteral
125 nutrition). Additionally, the proportion of total AIS admissions undergoing EVT were collected.

126

127 *Outcome Measures*

128 The primary clinical end point of this study was favorable functional outcome, defined as a
129 routine discharge to home without assistance. This discharge disposition has been demonstrated
130 to have a strong correlation with mRS ≤ 2 at 90 days.¹²⁻¹⁴ Secondary outcomes were the rates of
131 ICH and inpatient mortality between the treatment groups. Additionally, we investigated all
132 discharge destinations (Short-Term Rehab Hospital, Skilled Nursing/Intermediate Care Facility,
133 Home Health Care) available in the NIS for each group. The length of stay (LOS) and the total
134 charges from the admission were also analyzed.

135

136 *Determination of EVT Volume Status and Hospital Characteristics*

137 Utilizing the NIS HOSP_NIS variable we counted the number of EVT procedures performed at
138 each unique hospital for each year included in the analysis. High-volume centers were defined as
139 those being in the top 20th percentile of EVT volume. This volume determination has been used
140 prior in other national database analysis.^{15,16}

141

142 To further explore potential volume cut-off values where outcomes were significantly improved,
143 we used similar methodology as Stein et al.⁴ We compared favorable functional outcomes and
144 inpatient mortality measures between increasing intervals of EVT procedures performed at a
145 hospital. We started at a volume of 25 EVTs and increased by 25 EVTs until we reached a
146 threshold of 300 EVTs performed. Once we discovered statistical differences between the high
147 and low-volume groups, we utilized increments of 5 EVTs to determine a more precise cutoff
148 point.

149

150 *Propensity Score Matching*

151 Patients were matched 1:1 between high and low-volume centers utilizing nearest neighbor
152 matching using logit distance. Patients were matched based on demographic (age, sex, minority
153 status, and location/teaching status of the hospital), comorbidity burden (Charlson Comorbidity
154 Index, Hypertension, Intracranial Atherosclerotic Disease (ICAD), Atrial Fibrillation, and
155 Diabetes), stroke severity (as described above), and IV-tPA status.

156

157 *Statistical Analysis*

158 Statistical analyses were performed accounting for the sampling design of the NIS, with
159 appropriate strata, weights, and clusters according to HCUP guidelines. Statistical analyses were
160 conducted with RStudio (Posit Software, Boston, MA, USA). Propensity matching was
161 performed with the “MatchIt” package.¹⁷ All complex survey samples, including regression
162 analysis and statistical tests, were performed with the “Survey” package.¹⁸ Survey weighted t-
163 tests and chi-squared analysis were performed to compare means and association of categorical
164 variables, respectively. Univariate and multivariate models were used to compare the high-
165 volume group to the low-volume group with all outcome measures and discharge dispositions.
166 Variables with a significance level < 0.1 were included in multivariate analysis. This was done
167 with an unmatched cohort and then again with the matched cohort model. We assessed the trends
168 of the number of EVT_s performed nationwide and the number of centers offering EVT during
169 the study period utilizing a Pearson’s correlation coefficient. We assumed the number of centers
170 was distributed as a Poisson random variable, and thus performed a square root transformation to
171 approximate a normal distribution before calculating the correlation. An alpha threshold of 0.05
172 was selected to define significance, with all p-values being 2-sided.

173

174 **Results:**

175 Centers grouped in the top quintile of EVT volume performed ≥ 115 EVT_s in a given year.
176 Centers performing < 115 EVT_s in a given year were analyzed as the low-volume cohort. After
177 aggregating the number of centers in individual years, there were 158 high-volume centers and
178 2,580 low-volume centers during the study period. The total number of centers performing EVT
179 increased over time ($r = 0.960$, $p = 0.009$). The numbers of high-volume ($r = 0.961$, $p = 0.009$)
180 and low-volume centers ($r = 0.952$, $p = 0.013$) both increased during the study period. The
181 number of EVT_s performed increased at both high ($r = 0.963$, $p = 0.008$) and low-volume centers
182 ($r = 0.988$, $p = 0.002$). The trend of centers and number of EVT_s performed is seen in **Figure 1**.

183

184 Before propensity score matching, there were 114,640 patients who underwent EVT included in
185 the sample. Of these, 24,415 (21.3%) were in the high-volume group. An overview of patient
186 groups is seen in **Supplemental Figure 1**. The mean (\pm SD) number of EVT_s performed at high-
187 volume centers was 166 (± 49), while there was an average of 55 (± 28) EVT_s performed at low-
188 volume centers. There were higher rates of IV-tPA at low-volume centers (36.73% vs. 32.77%, p
189 < 0.001). High-volume centers had lower rates of atrial fibrillation (41.80% vs. 44.95%, p
190 < 0.001) and younger patients (68.66 vs. 69.34, $p = 0.022$). These findings are summarized in
191 **Table 1**.

192

193 After nearest neighbor matching, there were 24,415 patients in each group. There were no
194 statistical differences in age, sex, comorbid conditions, utilization of tPA, or markers of stroke
195 severity in the matched groups. The nearest neighbor matching adequately matched
196 comorbidities, markers of stroke severity, and utilization of IV-tPA. High-volume centers
197 performed EVT in a higher proportion of stroke patients than low-volume centers (19% vs 12%,
198 $p < 0.001$). The results after matching are summarized in **Table 2**.

199

200 Prior to matching, the high-volume centers had higher rates of favorable functional outcome, as
201 defined by discharge to home without assistance (22.18% vs. 19.19%; OR 1.20, 95% CI [1.08-
202 1.33]; $p < 0.001$) and lower rates of inpatient mortality (10.49% vs. 12.44%; OR 0.83, 95% CI
203 [0.74-0.92]; $p < 0.001$), but there was no difference in rates of ICH (18.53% vs. 17.77%; OR

204 1.05, 95% CI [0.95-1.17]; $p = 0.340$). After matching, univariate analysis revealed high-volume
205 centers outperformed low-volume centers in terms of favorable functional outcome (22.18% vs.
206 19.97%; OR 1.14, 95% CI [1.01-1.29]; $p = 0.028$). There was no difference in inpatient mortality
207 (10.49% vs. 10.73%; OR 0.97, 95% CI [0.85 - 1.12]; $p = 0.709$) or rates of ICH (18.53% vs.
208 17.55%; OR 1.07, 95% CI [0.95-1.21]; $p = 0.287$) after matching. Multivariate analysis of
209 unmatched data demonstrated a persistent benefit for favorable functional outcome for the high-
210 volume group (aOR 1.19 95% CI [1.06 - 1.34], $p = 0.003$) with no differences in inpatient
211 mortality and ICH. Examining discharge dispositions, there were no differences in all other
212 discharge destinations (Rehab, Skilled Nursing Facility, or Home with assistance) in univariate
213 or multivariate models. There were no differences in LOS before and after matching. However,
214 the mean total charges for patients at high-volume centers was significantly less in both the
215 unmatched (\$180,336.91 vs. \$208,360, $p < 0.001$) and matched (\$180,336.91 vs. \$198,974.41, p
216 = 0.013) cohorts. All outcome models are summarized in **Table 3**.

217
218 In our exploratory volume cut-off analysis, a difference in the combined metric of favorable
219 functional outcome and inpatient mortality manifested between 25 and 50 EVT's. A mortality
220 benefit alone manifested at 45 EVT's while higher odds of favorable functional outcome alone
221 manifested at 50 EVT's performed annually. The volume cut-off analysis is seen in **Figure 2**.

222
223 There was a notable increase in the odds of favorable functional outcome in patients treated at
224 centers performing ≥ 175 EVT's per year, identifying a group we labeled "super high-volume
225 centers." This finding prompted an additional multivariate sub-analysis comparing three groups,
226 low volume vs. high-volume vs. super high-volume centers. Compared to low-volume centers,
227 super-high-volume centers had higher odds of favorable functional outcomes (aOR 1.42, 95% CI
228 [1.13 - 1.78], $p = 0.002$) while high-volume centers did not differ from the low-volume centers
229 (aOR 1.09, 95% CI [0.97 - 1.22], $p = 0.158$). Neither the super-high (aOR 0.91, 95% CI [0.75 -
230 1.11], $p = 0.341$) nor the high-volume (aOR 0.92, 95% CI [0.79 - 1.07], $p = 0.291$) centers
231 outperformed low-volume centers in terms of mortality. There was also no difference in rates of
232 ICH between super-high (aOR 1.14, 95% CI [0.93-1.38], $p = 0.209$) nor high-volume (aOR 0.99,
233 95% CI [0.88-1.11], $p=0.801$) centers compared to low-volume centers. These findings are
234 summarized in **Table 4**.

235 236 **Discussion:**

237 An association between case volume and improved patient outcomes is well documented in the
238 literature for percutaneous coronary intervention for acute coronary syndromes.¹⁹ A similar
239 finding has been demonstrated among centers performing mechanical thrombectomy for acute
240 stroke.^{3,4} For example, Stein et al., using Medicare/Medicaid data, estimated the annual hospital
241 volume for outcome benefit and mortality benefit were 26.2 and 44.8, respectively.⁴ In another
242 analysis of CMS data, Waqas et al. demonstrated that hospital EVT volume was associated with
243 lower mortality and higher discharge to home rates, identifying the two central quartiles of
244 mortality and discharge to home rates to be 24 and 23 respectively.³ Accordingly,
245 neuroendovascular certification and training standards reflect the intuitive understanding that a
246 relationship between case volume and outcomes likely exists. For example, as of 2021, The Joint
247 Commission recommends 15 thrombectomies per year or 30 over 2 years to meet criteria for
248 Thrombectomy-capable Stroke Center (TSC) or a Comprehensive Stroke Center (CSC)
249 certification. The Society of Neurological Surgeons (SNS) and its Committee for Advanced

250 Subspecialty Training (CAST) has defined a minimum number of cases performed for
251 competency in neuroendovascular surgery including at least 30 acute ischemic stroke
252 interventions.²⁰

253
254 Consistent with prior studies and certification standards, our analysis of the NIS database also
255 finds that higher hospital thrombectomy case volume is positively associated with higher rates of
256 favorable functional outcome. Unlike prior studies, our analysis includes all patients who
257 received EVT from 2016-2020, as reported in the database, regardless of payor source, yielding a
258 larger sample size than previous studies and one that more closely reflects real-world
259 populations. In our analysis, favorable functional outcome was defined as routine discharge to
260 home without assistance, which strongly correlates to an mRS ≤ 2 .¹²⁻¹⁴ Thus the present study
261 analyzes patients achieving the very best outcomes after intervention. The positive association
262 between case volume and favorable functional outcome was persistent across all analyses. The
263 benefit first manifests at ≥ 50 EVTs and demonstrates increasing benefit with higher annual case
264 volume. In a sub-analysis however, this effect appears driven by the outcomes achieved by
265 super-high-volume centers, those performing ≥ 175 EVTs in a year. Centers performing ≥ 175
266 EVTs annually outperformed lower volume centers in achieving very favorable outcomes by 6-
267 7%. Further, the super-high volume high-volume centers referred a higher proportion of patients
268 to mechanical thrombectomy, exposing more candidates to the benefit. The functional benefit is
269 persistent after successful matching of patient groups and utilizing multivariate logistic
270 regression. While a broader definition of “benefit” would undoubtedly yield a lower case volume
271 requirement, perhaps even substantially so, our analysis suggests that the likelihood of achieving
272 a very favorable outcome after mechanical thrombectomy is best at the very highest-volume
273 centers.

274
275 Consistent with prior studies, our analysis finds that mechanical thrombectomy is safe. In
276 unmatched, univariate analysis, higher volume centers had lower rates of inpatient mortality, but
277 this difference was not observed after matching nor in adjusted analyses. In matched univariate
278 analysis, super-high-volume centers demonstrated a mortality benefit compared to low-volume
279 centers, but the difference was not observed in matched multivariate analysis. Meanwhile, there
280 was no identifiable association between rates of ICH and thrombectomy volume status in any
281 analysis. In other words, our analysis demonstrates that low volume centers achieved the same
282 safety outcomes as even the super-high-volume centers. Viewed another way, our study finds
283 that the super-high-volume centers matched the safety outcomes of lower-volume centers,
284 despite a higher proportion of stroke patients being referred from thrombectomy, and more
285 patients treated outside the tPA window.

286
287 Lastly, our analysis identified an apparent cost savings for patients treated at higher volume
288 centers. Existing data reporting EVT procedure volume and incurred cost per patient does not
289 exist to this point. Previous publications have only examined patient outcomes as a function of
290 hospital volume.³⁻⁵ Our matched analysis demonstrates a nearly \$18,000 savings per patient, on
291 average, when treated at a high-volume center. Similar findings have been seen in other
292 procedural disciplines with high-volume centers more likely to have lower costs and improved
293 outcomes.^{21,22}

294
295 **Limitations:**

296 This study is primarily limited by the inherent nature of sampling from a large national database
297 and retrospective study design. The NIS collects a sample of discharged patient data from each
298 hospital partaking in the HCUP consortium. As a sample driven database, the NIS is not able to
299 give exact numbers of cases per institution. This means that our value estimation for cutoff data
300 is based on hospital sample data and is likely under-estimating the true number of cases
301 performed by each hospital. This has significant implications in terms of numeric derivatives
302 (such as cutoff values for outcomes). However, as a sample database we are still able to reliably
303 group hospitals into quintiles based on relative case volume. The NIS is an administrative
304 database, reliant on coding via the ICD-10 system. Patients that may not represent our intended
305 sample population may inadvertently be included due to coding errors. While it is less likely that
306 coding mistakes may occur for inpatient mortality and disposition status, our sample is not
307 immune from potential errors. Additionally, the HOSP_NIS variable does not carry over from
308 year-to-year, so we are unable to assess if low-volume centers are increasing their volumes over
309 time. Further, differing stroke triage systems exist and may alter the outcomes for stroke patients,
310 but our study is not equipped to examine the effects of these systems as it relates to patient
311 outcomes.²³

312
313 **Conclusion:**

314 Our analysis demonstrates increased hospital case volume is associated with a modest
315 improvement in favorable functional outcomes in patients undergoing EVT for AIS. Attempts to
316 identify procedural cut off values reveal likely improved functional outcomes beginning at 50
317 EVT per year, while this benefit seems to increase with increasing case volumes. These higher
318 levels of case volumes do not lead to higher rates of inpatient mortality or ICH. Higher volume
319 centers were also associated with decreased costs per patient. These findings further validate the
320 relationship between procedural volume and outcomes and should assist in construction of
321 policies of optimal stroke-care management and credentialing of potential comprehensive stroke
322 centers.

323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336

337 **References**

- 338 1. Badhiwala JH, Nassiri F, Alhazzani W, et al. Endovascular Thrombectomy for Acute
339 Ischemic Stroke: A Meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2015;314(17):1832. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.13767
- 340 2. Zhongxing Y, Zhiqiang L, Jiangjie W, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Endovascular Treatment
341 for Acute Large-Vessel Ischemic Stroke Beyond 6 h After Symptom Onset: A Meta-
342 Analysis. *Front Neurol*. 2021;12:654816. doi:10.3389/fneur.2021.654816
- 343 3. Waqas M, Tutino VM, Cappuzzo JM, et al. Stroke thrombectomy volume, rather than stroke
344 center accreditation status of hospitals, is associated with mortality and discharge
345 disposition. *J NeuroIntervent Surg*. 2023;15(3):209-213. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2021-
346 018079
- 347 4. Stein LK, Mocco J, Fifi J, Jette N, Tuhim S, Dhamoon MS. Correlations Between Physician
348 and Hospital Stroke Thrombectomy Volumes and Outcomes: A Nationwide Analysis.
349 *Stroke*. 2021;52(9):2858-2865. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.033312
- 350 5. Shim DH, Kim Y, Roh J, et al. Hospital Volume Threshold Associated with Higher Survival
351 after Endovascular Recanalization Therapy for Acute Ischemic Stroke. *J Stroke*.
352 2020;22(1):141-149. doi:10.5853/jos.2019.00955
- 353 6. Kim BM, Baek JH, Heo JH, Kim DJ, Nam HS, Kim YD. Effect of Cumulative Case Volume
354 on Procedural and Clinical Outcomes in Endovascular Thrombectomy. *Stroke*.
355 2019;50(5):1178-1183. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.119.024986
- 356 7. Gupta R, Horev A, Nguyen T, et al. Higher volume endovascular stroke centers have faster
357 times to treatment, higher reperfusion rates and higher rates of good clinical outcomes. *J*
358 *NeuroIntervent Surg*. 2013;5(4):294-297. doi:10.1136/neurintsurg-2011-010245
- 359 8. Rinaldo L, Brinjikji W, Rabinstein AA. Transfer to High-Volume Centers Associated With
360 Reduced Mortality After Endovascular Treatment of Acute Stroke. *Stroke*. 2017;48(5):1316-
361 1321. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.016360
- 362 9. Prommik P, Tootsi K, Saluse T, Strauss E, Kolk H, Märtson A. Simple Excel and ICD-10
363 based dataset calculator for the Charlson and Elixhauser comorbidity indices. *BMC Med Res*
364 *Methodol*. 2022;22(1):4. doi:10.1186/s12874-021-01492-7
- 365 10. Sundararajan V, Henderson T, Perry C, Muggivan A, Quan H, Ghali WA. New ICD-10
366 version of the Charlson comorbidity index predicted in-hospital mortality. *Journal of*
367 *Clinical Epidemiology*. 2004;57(12):1288-1294. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.03.012
- 368 11. Patel PD, Salwi S, Liles C, et al. Creation and Validation of a Stroke Scale to Increase Utility
369 of National Inpatient Sample Administrative Data for Clinical Stroke Research. *J Stroke*
370 *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2021;30(4):105658. doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.105658
- 371 12. Dicipinigaitis AJ, Dick-Godfrey R, Gellerson O, et al. Real-World Outcomes of
372 Endovascular Thrombectomy for Basilar Artery Occlusion: Results of the BAronIS Study.
373 *Ann Neurol*. Published online March 10, 2023. doi:10.1002/ana.26640
- 374 13. ElHabr AK, Katz JM, Wang J, et al. Predicting 90-day modified Rankin Scale score with
375 discharge information in acute ischaemic stroke patients following treatment. *BMJ Neurol*
376 *Open*. 2021;3(1):e000177. doi:10.1136/bmjno-2021-000177
- 377 14. Qureshi AI, Chaudhry SA, Sapkota BL, Rodriguez GJ, Suri MFK. Discharge destination as a
378 surrogate for Modified Rankin Scale defined outcomes at 3- and 12-months poststroke
379 among stroke survivors. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012;93(8):1408-1413.e1.
380 doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2012.02.032
- 381 15. Koester SW, Cole TS, Kimata AR, et al. Assessing the volume-outcome relationship of
382 carotid artery stenting in nationwide administrative data: a challenge of patient population

- 383 bias. *J Neurointerv Surg*. 2023;15(e2):e305-e311. doi:10.1136/jnis-2022-019695
- 384 16. Leifer D, Fonarow GC, Hellkamp A, et al. Association Between Hospital Volumes and
385 Clinical Outcomes for Patients With Nontraumatic Subarachnoid Hemorrhage. *JAHA*.
386 2021;10(15):e018373. doi:10.1161/JAHA.120.018373
- 387 17. Ho D, Imai K, King G, Stuart EA. MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing for Parametric
388 Causal Inference. *J Stat Soft*. 2011;42(8):1-28. doi:10.18637/jss.v042.i08
- 389 18. Lumley T. Analysis of Complex Survey Samples. *J Stat Soft*. 2004;9(8):1-19.
390 doi:10.18637/jss.v009.i08
- 391 19. Saito Y, Inohara T, Kohsaka S, et al. Volume-Outcome Relations of Percutaneous Coronary
392 Intervention in Patients Presenting With Acute Myocardial Infarction (from the J-PCI
393 Registry). *Am J Cardiol*. 2023;192:182-189. doi:10.1016/j.amjcard.2023.01.027
- 394 20. Day AL, Siddiqui AH, Meyers PM, et al. Training Standards in Neuroendovascular Surgery:
395 Program Accreditation and Practitioner Certification. *Stroke*. 2017;48(8):2318-2325.
396 doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.016560
- 397 21. Li LT, Chuck C, Bokshan SL, et al. High-Volume and Privately Owned Ambulatory
398 Surgical Centers Reduce Costs in Achilles Tendon Repair. *Orthop J Sports Med*.
399 2020;8(4):2325967120912398. doi:10.1177/2325967120912398
- 400 22. Campos S, Diniz P, Ferreira FC, Voiosu T, Arvanitakis M, Deviere J. Assessing the impact
401 of center volume on the cost-effectiveness of centralizing ERCP. *Gastrointest Endosc*.
402 Published online December 5, 2023:S0016-5107(23)03135-8. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2023.11.058
- 403 23. Raychev R, Sun JL, Schwamm L, et al. Performance of Thrombectomy-Capable,
404 Comprehensive, and Primary Stroke Centers in Reperfusion Therapies for Acute Ischemic
405 Stroke: Report from the Get With The Guidelines Stroke Registry: Stroke Outcomes Per
406 Hospital Certification Status. *medRxiv*. Published online July 6, 2023:2023.07.05.23292270.
407 doi:10.1101/2023.07.05.23292270
- 408

409 **Table 1.** Demographic, clinical, and outcome measures of unmatched cohort.
410

| | Overall n = 114,640 | Low Volume Center Patients n = 90,225 | High Volume Center Patients n = 24,415 | p-value |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---------|
| Demographics | | | | |
| Age (± SD, Range) | 69.19 ± 14.44 (18.00-90.00) | 69.34 ± 14.34 (18.00-90.00) | 68.66 ± 14.79 (18.00-90.00) | 0.022 |
| Sex (% Female) | 58,135 (50.71%) | 45,770 (50.73%) | 12,365 (50.65%) | 0.911 |
| Location and Teaching Status | | | | |
| Rural | 320 (0.28%) | 320 (0.35%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0.097 |
| Urban, Non-Teaching | 8,930 (7.79%) | 7,600 (8.42%) | 1,330 (5.45%) | |
| Urban, Teaching | 105,390 (91.93%) | 82,305 (91.22%) | 23,085 (94.55%) | |
| Minority Status | | | | |
| White | 78,930 (68.85%) | 61,445 (68.10%) | 17,485 (71.62%) | 0.035 |
| Non-White | 35,710 (31.15%) | 28,780 (31.90%) | 6,930 (28.38%) | |
| Payer Status | | | | |
| Medicaid | 11,310 (9.88%) | 8,940 (9.92%) | 2,370 (9.73%) | <0.001 |
| Medicare | 71,145 (62.14%) | 56,050 (62.19%) | 15,095 (61.94%) | |
| No Charge | 310 (0.27%) | 270 (0.30%) | 40 (0.16%) | |
| Other | 2,410 (2.10%) | 1,930 (2.14%) | 480 (1.97%) | |
| Private Insurance | 24,940 (21.78%) | 19,810 (21.98%) | 5,130 (21.05%) | |
| Self-Pay | 4,380 (3.83%) | 3,125 (3.47%) | 1,255 (5.15%) | |
| Comorbidities | | | | |
| Diabetes | 33,465 (29.19%) | 26,315 (29.17%) | 7,150 (29.29%) | 0.884 |
| ICAD | 19,835 (17.30%) | 15,445 (17.12%) | 4,390 (17.98%) | 0.258 |
| Hypertension | 60,375 (52.66%) | 47,650 (52.81%) | 12,725 (52.12%) | 0.469 |
| Atrial Fibrillation | 50,765 (44.28%) | 40,560 (44.95%) | 10,205 (41.80%) | <0.001 |
| Charlson Comorbidity Score | 4.26 ± 1.95 (1.00-16.00) | 4.26 ± 1.96 (1.00-16.00) | 4.26 ± 1.92 (1.00-14.00) | 0.942 |
| Stroke Presentation | | | | |
| Intravenous tPA | 41,140 (35.89%) | 33,140 (36.73%) | 8,000 (32.77%) | <0.001 |
| Average Proportion of Strokes taken to EVT | 13% ± 6% (1% - 50%) | 11% ± 5% (1% - 50%) | 19% ± 7% (6% - 49%) | <0.001 |
| Markers of Stroke Severity | | | | |
| Cerebral Edema | 24,280 (21.18%) | 19,095 (21.16%) | 5,185 (21.24%) | 0.947 |
| Herniation | 9,235 (8.06%) | 7,000 (7.76%) | 2,235 (9.15%) | 0.026 |
| Dysphagia | 37,870 (33.03%) | 28,525 (31.62%) | 9,345 (38.28%) | <0.001 |
| Aphasia | 57,520 (50.17%) | 44,970 (49.84%) | 12,550 (51.40%) | 0.135 |
| Neglect | 12,685 (11.07%) | 9,475 (10.50%) | 3,210 (13.15%) | 0.003 |
| Coma | 1,915 (1.67%) | 1,640 (1.82%) | 275 (1.13%) | 0.005 |
| Stupor | 270 (0.24%) | 225 (0.25%) | 45 (0.18%) | 0.395 |
| Nasogastric Feeding Tube | 550 (0.48%) | 470 (0.52%) | 80 (0.33%) | 0.153 |
| Parenteral Nutrition | 175 (0.15%) | 150 (0.17%) | 25 (0.10%) | 0.299 |
| Mechanical Ventilation | 28,925 (25.23%) | 23,650 (26.21%) | 5,275 (21.61%) | <0.001 |
| Length of Stay (± SD, Range) | 8.53 ± 10.15 (0.00-289.00) | 8.54 ± 10.29 (0.00-289.00) | 8.53 ± 9.59 (0.00-155.00) | 0.974 |
| Total Charges (± SD) | 202,400.99 ± 172,509.20 | 208,360.04 ± 179,263.16 | 180,336.91 ± 142,649.79 | <0.001 |

Outcomes

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|--------|
| Favorable Functional Outcome | 22,725 (19.82%) | 17,310 (19.19%) | 5,415 (22.18%) | <0.001 |
| Inpatient Mortality | 13,780 (12.02%) | 11,220 (12.44%) | 2,560 (10.49%) | <0.001 |
| Intracerebral Hemorrhage | 20,560 (17.93%) | 16,035 (17.77%) | 4,525 (18.53%) | 0.34 |

411
412 **Abbreviations:** EVT, Endovascular Thrombectomy; ICAD, Intracranial Atherosclerotic Disease;
413 SD, Standard Deviation.

414 **Table 2.** Demographic, clinical, and outcome measures after nearest neighbor matching.

| | Overall n = 48,830 | Low Volume Center Patients n = 24,415 | High Volume Center Patients n = 24,415 | p- value |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|-------------|
| Demographics | | | | |
| Age (± SD, Range) | 68.84 ± 14.68 (18.00-90.00) | 69.02 ± 14.57 (18.00-90.00) | 68.66 ± 14.79 (18.00-90.00) | 0.295 |
| Sex (% Female) | 25,085 (51.37%) | 12,720 (52.10%) | 12,365 (50.65%) | 0.129 |
| Location and Teaching Status | | | | |
| Rural | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | > 0.999 |
| Urban, Non-Teaching | 2,635 (5.40%) | 1,305 (5.35%) | 1,330 (5.45%) | |
| Urban, Teaching | 46,195 (94.60%) | 23,110 (94.65%) | 23,085 (94.55%) | |
| Minority Status | | | | |
| White | 35,245 (72.18%) | 17,760 (72.74%) | 17,485 (71.62%) | 0.505 |
| Non-White | 13,585 (27.82%) | 6,655 (27.26%) | 6,930 (28.38%) | |
| Comorbidities | | | | |
| Diabetes | 14,165 (29.01%) | 7,015 (28.73%) | 7,150 (29.29%) | 0.58 |
| ICAD | 8,495 (17.40%) | 4,105 (16.81%) | 4,390 (17.98%) | 0.191 |
| Hypertension | 25,380 (51.98%) | 12,655 (51.83%) | 12,725 (52.12%) | 0.8 |
| Atrial Fibrillation | 20,760 (42.51%) | 10,555 (43.23%) | 10,205 (41.80%) | 0.182 |
| Charlson Comorbidity Score (± SD, Range) | 4.26 ± 1.95 (1.00-15.00) | 4.25 ± 1.98 (1.00-15.00) | 4.26 ± 1.92 (1.00-14.00) | 0.864 |
| Stroke Presentation | | | | |
| Intravenous tPA | 16,190 (33.16%) | 8,190 (33.54%) | 8,000 (32.77%) | 0.52 |
| Average Proportion of Strokes taken to EVT | 15% ± 7% (1% - 49%) | 12% ± 5% (1% - 33%) | 19% ± 7% (6% - 49%) | <0.001 |
| Markers of Stroke Severity | | | | |
| Cerebral Edema | 10,075 (20.63%) | 4,890 (20.03%) | 5,185 (21.24%) | 0.312 |
| Herniation | 4,410 (9.03%) | 2,175 (8.91%) | 2,235 (9.15%) | 0.741 |
| Dysphagia | 18,420 (37.72%) | 9,075 (37.17%) | 9,345 (38.28%) | 0.467 |
| Aphasia | 25,085 (51.37%) | 12,535 (51.34%) | 12,550 (51.40%) | 0.959 |
| Neglect | 6,560 (13.43%) | 3,350 (13.72%) | 3,210 (13.15%) | 0.593 |
| Coma | 540 (1.11%) | 265 (1.09%) | 275 (1.13%) | 0.858 |
| Stupor | 75 (0.15%) | 30 (0.12%) | 45 (0.18%) | 0.43 |
| Nasogastric Feeding Tube | 145 (0.30%) | 65 (0.27%) | 80 (0.33%) | 0.617 |
| Parenteral Nutrition | 50 (0.10%) | 25 (0.10%) | 25 (0.10%) | >0.999 |
| Mechanical Ventilation | 10,220 (20.93%) | 4,945 (20.25%) | 5,275 (21.61%) | 0.265 |
| Length of Stay (± SD, Range) | 8.36 ± 9.11 (0.00-155.00) | 8.20 ± 8.61 (0.00-147.00) | 8.53 ± 9.59 (0.00-155.00) | 0.153 |
| Total Charges (± SD) | 189,654.70 ± 153,334.78 | 198,974.41 ± 162,806.47 | 180,336.91 ± 142,649.79 | 0.013 |
| Outcomes | | | | |
| Favorable Functional Outcome | 10,290 (21.07%) | 4,875 (19.97%) | 5,415 (22.18%) | 0.028 |
| Inpatient Mortality | 5,180 (10.61%) | 2,620 (10.73%) | 2,560 (10.49%) | 0.709 |
| Intracerebral Hemorrhage | 8,810 (18.04%) | 4,285 (17.55%) | 4,525 (18.53%) | 0.287 |

415 **Abbreviations:** EVT, Endovascular Thrombectomy; ICAD, Intracranial Atherosclerotic Disease;
 416 SD, Standard Deviation.

417

418 **Table 3. Univariate, Multivariate, and Matched Logistic Regression Models of Outcome**
 419 **Measures and Discharge Dispositions comparing High Volume Centers to Low Volume Centers.**

| | Low Volume Center Patients | High Volume Center Patients | Odds Ratios (95% Confidence Interval) | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
| | | | Unmatched Univariate | p-value | Matched Univariate | p-value | Unmatched Multivariate* | p-value |
| Favorable Functional Outcome (High vs. Low Volume) | 17,310 (19.19%) | 5,415 (22.18%) | 1.20 (1.06 - 1.33) | < 0.001 | 1.14 (1.01 - 1.29) | 0.028 | 1.19 (1.06 - 1.34) | 0.003 |
| Inpatient Mortality (High vs. Low Volume) | 11,220 (12.44%) | 2,560 (10.49%) | 0.83 (0.74 - 0.92) | < 0.001 | 0.97 (0.85 - 1.12) | 0.709 | 0.92 (0.81 - 1.04) | 0.184 |
| Intracerebral Hemorrhage (High vs. Low Volume) | 16,035 (17.77%) | 4,525 (18.53%) | 1.05 (0.95 - 1.17) | 0.34 | 1.07 (0.95 - 1.21) | 0.287 | 1.04 (0.93 - 1.15) | 0.574 |
| Short-term Rehab Hospital | 3,020 (3.35%) | 660 (2.70%) | 0.80 (0.46 - 1.40) | 0.439 | 0.93 (0.52 - 1.65) | 0.798 | 0.87 (0.50 - 1.52) | 0.629 |
| Skilled Nursing Facility | 49,630 (55.01%) | 13,180 (53.98%) | 0.96 (0.88 - 1.04) | 0.328 | 0.92 (0.83 - 1.01) | 0.08 | 0.92 (0.84 - 1.00) | 0.053 |
| Home Health | 9,045 (10.02%) | 2,600 (10.65%) | 1.07 (0.95 - 1.21) | 0.268 | 1.04 (0.90 - 1.20) | 0.59 | 1.08 (0.96 - 1.22) | 0.205 |

*Adjusted for Age, Atrial Fibrillation, Intravenous tPA, Location and Teaching Status, Minority Status, Herniation, Dysphagia, Neglect, Coma, Mechanical Ventilation, and Proportion of Strokes treated with EVT at a specific Hospital

420

421

422 **Table 4.** Univariate and Multivariate Logistic Regression Models comparing Super-High Volume
 423 vs. High Volume vs. Low Volume Centers.

424

| | Low Volume Center Patients n = 90,225 | High Volume Center Patients n = 16,635 | Super-High Volume Center Patients n = 7,780 | Odds Ratios (95% Confidence Interval) | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| | | | | Univariate High Volume | p- val | Univariate Super- High Volume | p- va lu e | Multivariate* High- Volume | p- va lu e | Multivariate* Super- High Volume | p- va lu e |
| Good Functional Outcome*** | 17,310 (19.19%) | 3,370 (20.26%) | 2,045 (26.29%) | 1.07 (0.97 - 1.18) | 0.1 73 | 1.50 (1.23 - 1.84) | 0.00 1 | 1.08 (1.97 - 1.22) | 0.15 8 | 1.42 (1.13 - 1.78) | 0.00 2 |
| Inpatient Mortality | 11,220 (12.44%) | 1,805 (10.85%) | 755 (9.70%) | 0.86 (0.76 - 0.97) | 0.0 16 | 0.76 (0.62 - 0.93) | 0.00 7 | 0.92 (0.79 - 1.07) | 0.29 1 | 0.91 (0.75 - 1.11) | 0.34 1 |
| Intracerebral Hemorrhage | 16,035 (17.77%) | 3,010 (18.09%) | 1,515 (19.47%) | 1.02 (0.91 - 1.15) | 0.7 08 | 1.12 (0.92 - 1.36) | 0.26 4 | 0.99 (0.88 - 1.11) | 0.80 1 | 1.14 (0.93 - 1.38) | 0.20 9 |

*Adjusted for Age, Atrial Fibrillation, Intravenous tPA, Location and Teaching Status, Minority Status, Herniation, Dysphagia, Neglect, Coma, Mechanical Ventilation, and Proportion of Strokes treated with EVT at a specific Hospital

** All Odds Ratios in comparison to Low-Volume Centers

*** As defined by routine discharge to home without assistance

425

426

427 **Figure Legends**

428

429 **Figure 1.** Line plots demonstrating the increase in total number of endovascular thrombectomies
430 (EVT) performed and total centers performing EVT in the United States from 2016 to 2020.

431

432 **Figure 2.** Line plots demonstrating between dichotomized volume thresholds and outcomes in
433 multivariate models for hospital case volume. Models adjusted age, atrial fibrillation, intravenous
434 tPA, location and teaching status, minority status, herniation, dysphagia, neglect, coma,
435 mechanical ventilation, and proportion of strokes treated with endovascular thrombectomy at a
436 specific hospital.

437 * Denotes a statistically difference in adjusted odds ratios

438

439

440

441