

23

24 Abstract

25 Background: When weighing potential risks versus benefits of reperfusion therapy, the functions likely to
26 recover if blood flow can be restored should be considered. Because deep and motor areas of the brain
27 often infarct relatively early in acute stroke, we hypothesized that reperfusion therapies are more likely to
28 improve language function and neglect (cortical functions) more than motor function.

29 Methods: In this retrospective review of a prospectively collected database, patients with acute stroke due
30 to large vessel occlusion), we evaluated percent improvement (mean change in score/maximum score) for
31 different items of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale with and without endovascular
32 thrombectomy, and/or intravenous thrombolysis.

33 Results: In total, 290 patients (mean age 61.8; SD 14.0; 47.9% female) met the inclusion criteria. For all
34 outcome measures (percent change in language, total language, motor, and neglect) there were significant
35 effects of treatment group ($p < 0.0001$ for all), with the greatest change in the EVT +tPA group, then EVT
36 only group, followed by tPA only, followed by no intervention. Differences between EVT + tPA and
37 EVT only were not significant ($p = .30$ to 0.79 across outcomes). For patients with aphasia and/or right
38 sided weakness before treatment, the percent change in language was significantly greater than the
39 percent change in weakness (29.8% vs. 12.7%; $t(93) = 5.3$; $p < 0.0001$). Greater percent improvement in
40 language was observed in all treatment groups ($p = 0.0003$ to 0.03 across treatment groups).

41 Conclusions: In patients with acute ischemic stroke due to LVO, improvements in all neurological
42 functions occur with tPA, and even more with EVT (with and without IV tPA). However, gains in
43 language are even greater than gains in motor function with both interventions. Few patients had neglect
44 before treatment, but of those who did, the majority improved, and most (92.8%) improved with EVT.

45

46 Introduction

47 Endovascular thrombectomy (EVT) and intravenous thrombolysis (tPA) are effective treatments for acute
48 ischemic stroke secondary to large vessel occlusion (LVO). However, they also carry some risks. When
49 clinicians, patients, and their caregivers weigh the potential risks versus benefits of reperfusion therapy,
50 they should consider what functions are likely to recover if blood flow can be restored. Because deep and
51 motor areas of the brain, including caudate, putamen, insular ribbon, middle frontal gyrus, frontal lobe
52 subcortical white matter, precentral gyrus, and frontal lobe paracentral lobule are particularly vulnerable
53 to hypoperfusion and infarct relatively early in acute stroke,¹ we hypothesized that reperfusion therapies
54 are more likely to improve language function and neglect (cortical functions), more than motor function.
55 That is, successful restoration of blood flow might be more likely to salvage areas that are not already
56 ischemic, including areas critical for language²⁻⁴ and spatial attention,⁵⁻⁷ such as left inferior frontal gyrus,
57 temporal cortex, and inferior parietal cortex. The goal of our study is to evaluate the percent improvement
58 (mean change in score/maximum score) for different items of the National Institutes of Health Score
59 Scale (NIHSS) with and without EVT, and/or tPA in series of patients who had LVO, pretreatment CT
60 angiogram (CTA) to confirm LVO, and NIHSS for evaluation of acute ischemic stroke (a convenience
61 sample from three hospitals).

62 Methods

63 Participants

64 In this IRB approved retrospective study of our prospective collected database, patients with AIS caused
65 by an LVO (defined as distal internal artery, M1, or proximal M2 middle cerebral artery segments) on
66 CTA from 2017-2022 from three centers within our larger hospital enterprise. This study was approved
67 through the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine institutional review board (JHU-IRB00269637)
68 and follows the STROBE checklist guidelines as an observational study.

69 Statistical Analysis

70 We first evaluated percent change (change in score/maximum score) in language, total language
71 (language item + orientation questions and commands), motor (strength in arms and legs and face) across
72 treatment groups (tPA only, EVT only, EVT plus tPA, and no reperfusion therapy) using ANOVA. For
73 all further analyses, we combined EVT only and EVT plus tPA, because there were only small differences
74 between these two groups in percent change in the items of interest. We then used paired t-tests to
75 evaluate differences in percent change in total motor function versus the language item (and total
76 language score) for participants who were aphasic (1 or more points on the language item) and/or had
77 right sided weakness of the arm, leg, or face (1 or more points). We also used paired t-tests to evaluate
78 differences in percent change in total motor function versus neglect/extinction for participants who were
79 had neglect/extinction (1 or more points on this item) and/or had weakness of the left arm, leg, or face (1
80 or more points). Finally, we carried out Fisher's exact tests to evaluate the association between
81 improvement (dichotomous value as 0 and >0 points change and each treatment. P value of ≤ 0.05 was
82 considered significant.

83 Data Availability

84 Anonymized data not published within this article will be made available by request from any qualified
85 investigator.

86 Results

87 A total of 290 patients with LVO were included in the analyses. Mean age was 61.8 (SD 14.0; range 18-
88 97); 139 (47.9%) were female. MRI confirmed infarct was in the left hemisphere in 150 (51.7%) and
89 right hemisphere in 140 (48.3%).

90 Of the 290 patients, 37 (12.8%) received tPA only; 21 (7.2%) underwent EVT and tPA; 18 (6.2%), and
91 214 (73.8%) received neither treatment. The mean NIHSS score was 4.7 (SD 4.4) in the tPA group, 11.8
92 (SD 7.1) in the EVT plus tPA group, 10.8 (SD 7.0) in the EVT only group, and 2.7 (SD 4.4) in the group
93 who received neither intervention.

94 For the entire population, there were significant differences between treatment groups for all outcome
95 measures (Table 1). For all outcome measures (percent change in language, total language, motor, and
96 neglect) there were significant effects of treatment group ($p < 0.0001$ for all), with the greatest change in
97 the EVT+tPA only group, then EVT only group, followed by tPA only, followed by no intervention. For
98 remaining analyses, we combine EVT only and EVT + tPA, since the differences were small and non-
99 significant (by t-test) for all outcomes. Likewise, hereafter, we also report results for language item alone,
100 rather than total language, as there was generally less change in orientation and simple commands, but no
101 significant difference between the percent improved in the two outcomes with tPA ($p = 0.80$) or EVT
102 ($p = 0.70$).

103 For patients with aphasia and/or right sided weakness, the percent change in language was greater than
104 the percent change in weakness (29.8 vs. 12.4; $t = 5.3$; $df = 93$; $p < 0.0001$; see Table 2 for 95% confidence
105 intervals). The greater improvement in language than motor function was observed for all treatment
106 groups (Table 2). For those who received tPA the mean difference was 35.4% (SD 35.4) versus 6.6%
107 (SD 14.3) ($t = 3.1$; $df = 15$; $p = 0.008$). For those who received EVT (with or without tPA), the difference for
108 percent change in language vs weakness was 46.4% (SD 37.3) versus 28.1% (SD 19.0) ($t = 2.3$; $df = 22$;
109 $p = 0.03$). For patients who received neither EVT nor IV tPA (the largest group), the difference was 21.2%
110 (SD 29.7) versus 7.5% (SD 15.7) ($t = 3.9$; $df = 54$; $p = 0.0003$). Relatively few patients had neglect at baseline,
111 and there was no significant difference in percentage improvement in neglect versus weakness, in those
112 with neglect or weakness pretreatment, with either intervention. However, among the few with neglect
113 and weakness pretreatment, there was greater percent improvement in neglect compared to motor function
114 (66.7 ± 28.9 versus -1.7 ± 3.0 ; $t = 4.3$; $df = 2$; $p = 0.0498$).

115 Only 26 patients had neglect/extinction pre-treatment; 6/8 (75%) who received tPA showed some
116 improvement in neglect, 13/14 (92.9%) who received EVT showed some improvement with treatment,
117 and 7/10 (70%) showed some improvement with neither intervention (ns by Fisher's exact).

118 The association between change in each outcome measure (as a dichotomous value) and treatment group
119 was significant by Fisher's exact both language and strength. Figure 1 shows the percentage of patients
120 who showed any improvement on language, weakness, or neglect for those who had deficits at baseline.
121 Interestingly, of those with aphasia or right sided weakness at baseline, 62.5% improved in language with
122 tPA, 78.3% improved in language with EVT, and fewer than half (42.9%) improved with neither
123 intervention. For all functions, improvements were greatest with EVT, then tPA, then no treatment. The
124 difference between treatment groups was significant by Fishers Exact for language ($p=0.01$) and motor
125 function ($p<0.0001$). A greater percentage of patients showed some improvement in strength than
126 language with EVT and without intervention, while a greater percentage of patients showed some
127 improvement in language than strength with tPA (Figure 1). However, there were no significant
128 differences in percentage of patients who made any improvement in language or any improvement in
129 strength, of those who were aphasia and/or weak pre-treatment, for any of the intervention groups (by
130 Fisher's exact).

131 Discussion

132 Consistent with our hypothesis, the cortical function of language improved more (measured as percent
133 change in score) than strength in all treatment groups. Unsurprisingly, EVT had an enormous effect on
134 language, motor, and spatial attention functions; and thrombolysis had a significant, but smaller effect.
135 However, among those with no intervention aimed to restore blood flow, a higher percentage of patients
136 with deficits at baseline improved in strength than in language (or spatial attention). Therefore, it is unlikely
137 that results can be accounted for by more a more sensitive assessment item for language than for motor
138 strength. Rather, results may reflect that reperfusion achieved with EVT or tPA (or both), affects cortical
139 functions such as language more than strength. While reperfusion of the motor strip would also improve
140 motor function (as reflected in strong effects of treatment on motor function), early infarct of subcortical
141 tissues may limit the percent improvement in strength.

142 Our results are important for weighing the risks and benefits of interventions and for counseling regarding
143 prognosis. Patients and families should be advised that deficits such as aphasia might improve more than
144 hemiplegia with intervention, although patients are likely to show at least some improvement in strength
145 with or without treatment (albeit more with treatment).

146 This information may also have implications for selecting outcome measures for interventions to restore
147 blood flow in acute stroke. Currently, the most common outcome measure is the modified Rankin Scale
148 (mRS). However, the mRS is not especially sensitive to deficits that may improve most, such as aphasia.
149 It is more sensitive to motor functions that impede walking.

150 There are important limitations to this study. We used items on the NIHSS as the only assessment of
151 language, spatial attention, and strength. While the scoring is reliable, they are very limited measures of
152 all of these functions. It is possible that fine motor control or other motor function might improve more
153 than proximal strength measured by holding up each arm for 10 sec and each leg for 5 sec.

154 Neglect/extinction was uncommon as measured with the NIHSS, and so we could not compare percent
155 improvement in this domain to other domains. A previous study showed that change in a more objective
156 measurement of neglect (with simple line cancellation) actually correlated better with change in volume
157 hypoperfusion than did change in the total NIHSS score in patients with right hemisphere stroke.⁸ This
158 study was also an observational study, retrospectively analyzing data from a prospectively collected
159 sample of patients. Intervention was not randomized, but was generally determined by following
160 American Heart Association guidelines for treatment of acute ischemic stroke.

161 Nevertheless, results provide novel and important information about the likelihood and estimated degree
162 of improvement in gross measures of aphasia, neglect, and weakness in acute ischemic stroke, which may
163 be useful in clinical decision-making. In patients with both aphasia and weakness pretreatment,
164 language is likely to improve to a greater degree than weakness with tPA or EVT.

165

166

167 Acknowledgements: The authors are grateful to the patients who participated in the study.

168 Funding

169 This study was partially supported by NIH through NIDCD R01 DC05375 (AEH).

170 Disclosures

171 AEH receives remuneration from the American Heart Association as Editor-in-Chief of Stroke and from
172 Elsevier as Associate Editor of PracticeUpdate Neurology. She receives grant funding from National
173 Institute of Deafness and Communication Disorders and from the National Institute of Neurological
174 Diseases and Stroke.

175 References

- 176 1. Payabvash S, Souza LCS, Wang Y, et al. Regional ischemic vulnerability of the brain to
177 hypoperfusion: the need for location specific computed tomography perfusion thresholds in acute
178 stroke patients. *Stroke*. 2011;42(5):1255-1260. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.600940
- 179 2. Saur D, Kreher BW, Schnell S, et al. Ventral and dorsal pathways for language. *Proc Natl Acad
180 Sci U S A*. 2008;105(46):18035-18040. doi:10.1073/pnas.0805234105
- 181 3. Hickok G, Poeppel D. The cortical organization of speech processing. *Nat Rev Neurosci*.
182 2007;8(5):393-402. doi:10.1038/nrn2113
- 183 4. Sebastian R, Long C, Purcell JJ, et al. Imaging network level language recovery after left PCA
184 stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci*. 2016;34(4):473-489. doi:10.3233/RNN-150621
- 185 5. Khurshid S, Trupe LA, Newhart M, et al. Reperfusion of specific cortical areas is associated with
186 improvement in distinct forms of hemispatial neglect. *Cortex*. 2012;48(5):530-539.
187 doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2011.01.003

- 188 6. Corbetta M, Shulman GL. Spatial neglect and attention networks. *Annu Rev Neurosci*.
189 2011;34:569-599. doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-061010-113731
- 190 7. Karnath HO, Rennig J, Johannsen L, Rorden C. The anatomy underlying acute versus chronic
191 spatial neglect: a longitudinal study. *Brain*. 2011;134(Pt 3):903-912. doi:10.1093/brain/awq355
- 192 8. Hillis AE, Wityk RJ, Barker PB, Ulatowski JA, Jacobs MA. Change in perfusion in acute
193 nondominant hemisphere stroke may be better estimated by tests of hemispatial neglect than by
194 the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale. *Stroke*. 2003;34(10):2392-2396.
195 doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000089681.84041.69
- 196
- 197
- 198

199 **Table 1: Percent Change in Each Function and Total Change in NIHSS Score for All Patients**

	Mean (SD) Change				
	Language Item	Total Language	Neglect	Motor	NIHSS Score
tPA Only (N=37)	14.4% (30.0%)	7.8% (17.9%)	9.5% (23.1%)	5.8% (15.3%)	2.84 (0.70)
EVT+tPA (N=21)	31.7% (37.2%)	27.0% (33.1%)	16.7% (28.9%)	27.1% (20.1%)	9.86 (1.39)
EVT Only (N=18)	22.2% (36.2%)	20.4% (28.1%)	19.4% (34.9%)	20.8% (16.6%)	9.00 (1.54)
No Intervention (N=214)	4.7% (18.6%)	4.1% (15.6%)	1.9% (10.7%)	2.5% (9.1%)	1.40 (0.25)
Total (N=290)	9.0% (24.6%)	7.3% (19.7%)	5.0% (17.7%)	5.9% (13.8%)	2.67
ANOVA:					
<i>F</i>	15.65	12.91	11.80	38.76	40.54
<i>p-value</i>	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001

200

201

202 **Table 2: Percent Change in each Function Among those with Pre-Treatment Deficits**

	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence Interval
Combined Groups (N=94)			
Percent Change in Language	29.8	34.0	22.8 - 36.8
Percent Change in Motor	12.4	18.5	8.6 - 16.1
tPA Only (N=16)			
Percent Change in Language	35.4	35.4	16.5 - 54.3
Percent Change in Motor	6.6	14.3	-1.1 - 14.2
EVT (with or without tPA) (N=23)			
Percent Change in Language	46.4	37.3	30.3 - 62.5
Percent Change in Motor	28.1	19.0	20 - 36.3
No Intervention (N=55)			
Percent Change in Language	21.2	29.7	13.2 - 29.2
Percent Change in Motor	7.5	15.7	3.2 - 11.7

203

204

205 Figure Caption

206 Figure 1. Percentage of Patients Who Improved in Each Function with Each Treatment (of those with Pre-
207 Treatment Deficits)

