

1 Prevalence and Determinants of Prehospital Impression of Stroke in Ischemic Stroke Patients

2

3 Mauro Caffarelli MD ^{1,2}, Andrew J. Wood MPH ², Remle P Crowe, PhD ³, Edilberto Amorim

4 MD,² Hooman Kamel MD,⁴ Anthony S. Kim MD MAS ², Elan L. Guterman MD MAS ^{2,5}.

5 ¹ Department of Pediatrics, University of California, San Francisco. San Francisco, CA

6 ² Department of Neurology, UCSF Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California,

7 San Francisco. San Francisco, CA

8 ³ ESO, Inc., Austin, Tx

9 ⁴ Department of Neurology, Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY

10 ⁵ UCSF Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies, University of California, San Francisco.

11 San Francisco, CA

12

13 Corresponding Author: Mauro Caffarelli, MD

14 Mauro.caffarelli@ucsf.edu

15 550 16th Street, 4th Floor, Box 0110, San Francisco, CA 94143

16

17 Word Count: 1993 body; 3782 document

18

19 ABBREVIATIONS

CI	Confidence Interval
EHR	Electronic Health Record
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
ED	Emergency Department
GCS	Glasgow Coma Scale
HDE	Health Data Exchange
RR	Relative Risk
SVI	Social Vulnerability Index

20

21

22 ABSTRACT: 265 words

23 BACKGROUND: Emergency Medical Services (EMS) clinicians are front-line in evaluating
24 patients with stroke in the community. Their ability to correctly identify stroke influences
25 downstream management decisions. We sought to use a large national database of prehospital
26 clinical data to determine risk factors associated with missed EMS stroke identification.

27 METHODS: Retrospective study examining EMS evaluation of adults with Emergency
28 Department (ED) stroke diagnosis. We leveraged the ESO Data Collaborative research dataset
29 containing EHR data from 2019-2022 that has a subset of encounters with linked hospital
30 diagnostic codes. Our primary outcome was the presence of an EMS diagnosis of stroke. We
31 evaluated the association between demographic and clinical variables with EMS stroke
32 identification using Pearson χ^2 test for demographic variables and multivariable GLM for
33 clinical variables with adjustment for demographic variables.

34 RESULTS: We identified 34,504 EMS encounters for patients with ED stroke diagnosis. Of
35 these, 11,077 (32.1%) strokes had missed EMS stroke identification and instead had an EMS
36 impression of “Generalized Weakness” (25.9%), “Altered Level of Consciousness” (24.9%), and
37 “Dizziness” (7.2%). Patients more likely to have missed prehospital stroke identification were of
38 Black race (p=0.0001) and Hispanic ethnicity (p=0.0001). Clinical variables associated with
39 higher risk of missed EMS stroke identification were suspected alcohol or drug use (RR 1.48,
40 95% CI 1.37-1.59), low GCS (RR 1.17, 95% CI 1.10-1.24), tachycardia (RR 1.05, 95% CI 1.01-
41 1.09), and hypotension (RR 1.47, 95% CI 1.34-1.61).

42

43 CONCLUSIONS: Approximately 1-in-3 patients transported by EMS did not have their stroke

- 44 identified in the prehospital setting. Factors associated with lower odds of missed EMS stroke
- 45 identification provide a starting point for future performance improvement initiatives.

46 **Background.**

47 Emergency medical services (EMS) provide care for over 250,000 patients hospitalized with
48 stroke in the US annually. Prehospital stroke recognition and pre-arrival alerting are linked with
49 improved rates of time-sensitive treatment with thrombolysis and thrombectomy.¹⁻⁴ Conversely,
50 lack of EMS stroke recognition may result in transport to a facility not equipped to treat patients
51 with stroke and may result in delays in care.

52 Prior single-center studies estimate that 30% of strokes are not identified during EMS
53 evaluation.^{3,5} However, these studies were conducted before thrombectomy was established as
54 the standard of care for patients with stroke due to a large vessel occlusion. Work has been done
55 to improve EMS training on stroke recognition and the use of prehospital stroke screening
56 scales,⁶ but whether these efforts have improved rates of EMS stroke identification is unclear.^{7,8}

57 Moreover, the clinical and social factors associated with an increased risk of missed
58 stroke diagnosis during EMS evaluation are unknown, despite prior studies showing associated
59 delayed treatment and worse outcomes in people from historically underserved or marginalized
60 backgrounds.⁹⁻¹¹ Prior studies are largely limited to patients presenting to urban academic
61 hospitals with findings that may not be generalizable to non-academic or rural hospitals. This
62 study aimed to quantify the proportion of EMS transported patients who were diagnosed with
63 strokes that were not identified during prehospital evaluation. Secondarily we aimed to identify
64 the clinical and sociodemographic factors associated with missed prehospital stroke
65 identification using a geographically broad national dataset of linked EMS and hospital records.

66

67 **Methods.**

68 Study Design and Setting:

69 We conducted a retrospective analysis of adults who were transported by EMS after a
70 911 activation and were subsequently diagnosed with stroke during the emergency department
71 (ED) evaluation. We used the ESO Data Collaborative public-use research dataset. ESO is a
72 leading provider of pre-hospital Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems for EMS clinical
73 documentation in the US.¹² ESO EHR collects data in accordance with the National EMS
74 Information System. Data elements in the prehospital EHR include information related to EMS
75 dispatch and the prehospital clinical encounter. EMS clinicians document encounters using
76 prespecified data fields, which include diagnostic impressions and whether a ‘stroke treatment
77 protocol’ was used. The ESO Data Collaborative consists of all records from agencies who have
78 agreed to share their de-identified EHR data for the purposes of research. Annually, a de-
79 identified dataset is constructed with all records from participating agencies. This dataset
80 includes EMS responses in every region of the country. A subset of destination facilities (i.e.
81 hospitals) participate in the ESO Health Data Exchange (HDE) which allows prehospital data to
82 be directly linked with hospital EHR data using HL7 messaging including ICD-10 diagnosis
83 codes and discharge dispositions. This study was approved by the institutional review board of
84 the University of California, San Francisco.

85

86 Study Population:

87 We identified adult patients aged 18 years or older who were transported to a hospital following
88 a 9-1-1 EMS response, and were diagnosed with an acute ischemic stroke in the ED between
89 January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2022. A diagnosis of acute ischemic stroke in the ED was
90 defined as having an ICD-10 primary discharge diagnosis code of cerebral infarction (I63.x).

91

92

93 Outcome:

94 The primary outcome was missed EMS stroke identification. Missed EMS stroke identification
95 was defined as no recorded diagnostic impression of stroke during EMS evaluation and no
96 indication of stroke protocol use.

97 This definition assumes that the EMS diagnostic impression is an accurate reflection of
98 whether or not an EMS clinician suspects a patient is experiencing a stroke. To determine
99 whether this was a reasonable assumption, we examined the narrative history recorded by the
100 EMS clinician from a random sample of 300 encounters in the cohort and found that a minority
101 of patients were misclassified using this definition (Appendix; Supplemental Tables 1 & 2).

102

103 Measurements:

104 Demographics, diagnostic impressions, clinical information (e.g. vital signs and Glasgow
105 Coma Scale [GCS]), and the EMS agency treatment protocol associated with each encounter are
106 entered into the prehospital EHR by EMS clinicians as part of the required documentation
107 following a 911 call. We evaluated patient age, sex, race, ethnicity, Census region, urbanicity of
108 the community where the encounter took place, the first recorded prehospital vital sign
109 measurements, GCS, and whether the EMS clinician suspected alcohol or substance use. Age
110 was divided into ordinal groups of <40, 40–59, 60–79, and >80 years. Race was recorded by the
111 EMS clinicians and categorized as White, Black or African American, Asian or Pacific islander,
112 or Other/unknown. Ethnicity was categorized as Hispanic or non-Hispanic; these were collected
113 because of previously-reported disparities in stroke care for Hispanic patients.^{9,11} Social
114 vulnerability index (SVI) – a measure of socioeconomic factors associated with adverse

115 community-level hazards and stressors – was categorized into four quartiles from least to most
116 vulnerable. Urbanicity was determined by Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes and categorized
117 as: Metropolitan (population > 49,999) or Non-metropolitan (population < 50,000). Census
118 regions were categorized as Northeast, South, Midwest; or West. GCS and vital sign
119 measurements were divided into ordinal groups in alignment with conventionally accepted
120 normal and abnormal ranges for adults to ease the interpretation of effect estimates.

121

122 Statistical Analysis:

123 We calculated the proportion of patients with ED-diagnosed stroke where there was missed EMS
124 identification of stroke during prehospital evaluation. We identified sociodemographic and
125 clinical characteristics associated with missed EMS stroke identification using Pearson χ^2 test
126 for the unadjusted analyses and binomial family and log link generalized linear models for the
127 adjusted analyses. The models allowed us to examine the association of initial vital sign
128 measurements, level of consciousness, and suspected alcohol or drug use, with the risk of missed
129 EMS stroke identification. We calculated unadjusted and adjusted estimates separately for each
130 exposure, adding patient age, sex, race, GCS, and urbanicity in the adjusted analyses.

131 Because ED encounters in rural areas are not well represented in existing literature, we
132 sought to determine whether urbanicity modifies the likelihood and risk factors of having missed
133 EMS stroke identification. To do this, we repeated the models after stratifying by whether the
134 encounter originated in an urban or rural environment. All reported risk ratios (RRs) are from
135 adjusted models unless otherwise specified. Statistical analyses were performed using Stata
136 (version 15.1, StataCorp, College Station, TX).

137

138

Results

139 We analyzed 34,504 EMS encounters for patients that were diagnosed with stroke in the
140 ED. Most (94.7%) encounters that occurred in a metropolitan area. Approximately half were
141 female (51.3%). Two thirds (64.3%) of patients were White, and 16.9% were Black and 8.1%
142 had documentation of Hispanic ethnicity.

143 There were 11,077 (32.1%) encounters which did not have a prehospital diagnostic
144 impression of stroke by EMS evaluation. The most common EMS diagnostic impressions for
145 those without stroke recognition were “Generalized Weakness” (25.9%), “Altered Level of
146 Consciousness” (24.9%), “Dizziness” (7.2%), “Other Cardiovascular” (5.7%), and “Pain” (3.7%)
147 (Table 1).

148 A larger proportion of Black patients had missed EMS stroke identification compared to
149 White patients (34.9% vs 31.4%, $p < 0.001$). Similarly, a larger proportion of Hispanic patients
150 had missed EMS stroke identification compared to non-Hispanic patients (36.5% vs 31.7%,
151 $p < 0.001$). A larger proportion of patients with high SVI had missed EMS stroke identification
152 compared to patients with low SVI (28.2% vs 21.4%, $p < 0.001$) Stroke patients with missed EMS
153 stroke identification during EMS evaluation were otherwise similar with respect to age, sex, and
154 urbanicity. (Table 2).

155

156 **Clinical Risk Factors for Missed Prehospital Stroke Identification:**

157 Suspected alcohol or drug use, GCS score, and vital sign abnormalities were associated with risk
158 of missed EMS stroke identification. Suspected alcohol or drug use was associated with a 48%
159 increased risk of missed EMS stroke identification (RR 1.48, 95% CI, [1.37 to 1.59]). Severe
160 depression in consciousness (GCS 3-8) was associated with a 17% increased risk of missed EMS

161 stroke identification (RR 1.17, [1.10 - 1.24]). Tachycardia (RR 1.05, [1.01 – 1.09]), hypotension
162 (RR 1.22, [1.15 – 1.30]), and bradypnea (RR 1.44, [1.19 – 1.74]) were also associated with an
163 increased risk of missed EMS stroke identification (Table 3).

164 After stratifying the main analysis by whether the encounter occurred in a metropolitan
165 area, suspected alcohol or drug use, GCS, and vital sign abnormalities remained associated with
166 an increased risk of missed EMS stroke identification in both settings (Supplemental Table 3).

167

168 Discussion

169 This is the largest cohort study of the EMS stroke diagnostic sensitivity in the United
170 States; we found that nearly one-third of strokes were missed during EMS evaluation. Our
171 findings are consistent with estimates obtained before mechanical thrombectomy was established
172 as standard therapy for large vessel occlusive stroke.^{13,14} This suggests that the rates of missed
173 EMS stroke identification remain largely unchanged despite efforts to improve stroke
174 recognition in the prehospital setting.

175 Black and Hispanic patients had a significantly higher risk of missed EMS stroke
176 identification. Prehospital notification is already shown to be less likely to be used for Black and
177 Hispanic patients with stroke.^{3,5} Our findings suggest that the failure to recognize stroke in the
178 field may contribute to reduced rates of hospital pre-arrival stroke notification in Black and
179 Hispanic patients. We additionally found that a report of alcohol or substance use increased the
180 risk of missed EMS stroke identification. This novel finding suggests that alcohol use may
181 distract clinicians from developing a suspicion of stroke.

182 This is the first study to examine prehospital clinical characteristics that modulate the risk
183 of missed EMS stroke identification: we found that prehospital hypotension, tachycardia, and

184 loss of consciousness were associated with an increased risk of missed EMS stroke
185 identification. This may be related to incorrect clinical assumptions that hypotension and
186 tachycardia are reflective of a separate pathophysiological process – such as sepsis – that
187 misleads the clinician away from a stroke diagnosis.^{15,16} Patients with a low GCS (3-8) also was
188 associated with a higher risk of missed EMS stroke identification compared to patients with near
189 normal GCS. The inability to obtain a nuanced neurological assessment in nearly comatose
190 patients likely obscures ascertainment of stroke. While it is unlikely these patients are managed
191 with any less urgency than patients who have stroke recognized by EMS, it is possible that
192 patient triage and hospital destination decisions differ between the two groups. Further research
193 is needed to compare management between patients where the stroke was recognized versus
194 missed in those who present with disorders of consciousness.

195 We found that *half* of patients who had missed EMS stroke identification were given a
196 diagnostic impression of generalized weakness or altered level of consciousness. Attempts to
197 improve rates of EMS stroke identification and hospital prenotification have focused on
198 educational interventions targeted to EMS clinicians evaluating patients already suspected to
199 have a stroke.^{7,8} While shown to be useful in rates of EMS stroke identification, the benefit of
200 one brief educational module was not sustained after 3 months;¹⁷ a separate enhanced paramedic
201 stroke assessment method in patients with suspected stroke actually lengthened the time of
202 prehospital care episodes and delayed thrombolysis.¹⁸ Our finding suggests that educational
203 efforts should focus on expanding the use of prehospital neurological assessments to all patients
204 who present with weakness and altered level of consciousness.

205 Limitations to this study include the reliance on an EMS diagnostic impressions of stroke
206 and protocols used as a proxy for when EMS clinicians suspected stroke. This study did not

207 examine how EMS stroke identification influences downstream management – such as hospital
208 pre-arrival notification by EMS, hospital destination decisions, and in-hospital stroke care.
209 Finally, this study demonstrates but does not explain racial and ethnic disparities in EMS stroke
210 identification, and whether this is reflective of individual bias occurring on the part of the EMS
211 clinician or structural factors that drive disparate health characteristics in racialized populations
212 at-large.

213 Our findings highlight that a large proportion of patients with stroke do not have the
214 stroke identified by EMS. Patients who identify as Black and Hispanic are disproportionately
215 affected, and poor mental status and vital sign abnormalities not traditionally associated with
216 stroke are also associated with an increased risk of missed EMS stroke identification.

217 Educational interventions to improve EMS stroke identification can focus on maintaining a
218 suspicion of stroke in diverse clinical contexts to improve stroke identification.

219

220

221 Sources of Funding:

222 Dr. Caffarelli receives research support from the UCSF Department of Pediatrics, UCSF Clinical
223 and Translational Science Institute, Hellman Society, and Pediatric Epilepsy Research
224 Foundation.

225 Andrew Wood is supported by the National Institute on Aging (5R01AG074710) and the
226 National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (K23NS116128).

227 Dr. Amorim is a principal investigator in several active grants supported by the NIH
228 (1K23NS119794), the Department of Defense (EP220036), American Heart Association
229 (20CDA35310297 and Harold Amos Medical Faculty Development Award), Cures Within
230 Reach, and the Zoll Foundation.

231 Dr. Kim receives funding from NIH/NINDS, NIH/NCATS, NIH/NIMHD, and AHA.

232 Dr. Guterman receives funding from the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
233 (K23NS116128), National Institute on Aging (5R01AG056715), and American Academy of
234 Neurology.

235

236

237 Disclosures

238 Dr. Caffarelli is named as sole inventor on a patent on the use of electroencephalography for
239 stroke diagnosis with no associated licensing agreements.

240 Dr. Kamel has a PI role in the ARCADIA trial, which received in-kind study drug from the

241 BMS-Pfizer Alliance for Eliquis and ancillary study support from Roche Diagnostics; a

242 Deputy Editor role for *JAMA Neurology*; clinical trial steering/executive committee roles for

243 the STROKE-AF (Medtronic), LIBREXIA-AF (Janssen), and LAAOS-4 (Boston Scientific)

244 trials; consulting or endpoint adjudication committee roles for AbbVie, AstraZeneca,
245 ArthroSi Therapeutics, Boehringer Ingelheim, Eli Lilly, and Novo Nordisk; and household
246 ownership interests in TETMedical, Spectrum Plastics Group, and Ascential Technologies.

247 Dr. Kim is an Associate Editor of NEJM and Journal Watch: Neurology

248 Dr. Guterman receives personal compensation from JAMA Neurology and stock from REMO

249 Health, which are unrelated to the submitted work.

250

251

252

253

- 254 1. McKinney JS, Mylavarapu K, Lane J, Roberts V, Ohman-Strickland P, Merlin MA. Hospital
255 Prenotification of Stroke Patients by Emergency Medical Services Improves Stroke Time
256 Targets. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*. 2013;22(2):113-118.
257 doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2011.06.018
- 258 2. Oostema JA, Nasiri M, Chassee T, Reeves MJ. The Quality of Prehospital Ischemic Stroke
259 Care: Compliance with Guidelines and Impact on In-hospital Stroke Response. *Journal of*
260 *Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*. 2014;23(10):2773-2779.
261 doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2014.06.030
- 262 3. Lin CB, Peterson ED, Smith EE, et al. Emergency Medical Service Hospital Prenotification
263 Is Associated With Improved Evaluation and Treatment of Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Circ:*
264 *Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2012;5(4):514-522.
265 doi:10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.112.965210
- 266 4. Nielsen VM, Song G, DeJoie-Stanton C, Zachrison KS. Emergency Medical Services
267 Prenotification is Associated with Reduced Odds of In-Hospital Mortality in Stroke Patients.
268 *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2023;27(5):639-645. doi:10.1080/10903127.2022.2079784
- 269 5. Govindarajan P, Friedman BT, Delgadillo JQ, et al. Race and Sex Disparities in Prehospital
270 Recognition of Acute Stroke. Callaway C, ed. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2015;22(3):264-272.
271 doi:10.1111/acem.12595
- 272 6. Crocco TJ, Grotta JC, Jauch EC, et al. EMS Management of Acute Stroke—Prehospital
273 Triage (Resource Document to NAEMSP Position Statement). *Prehospital Emergency Care*.
274 2007;11(3):313-317. doi:10.1080/10903120701347844
- 275 7. Kidwell CS, Starkman S, Eckstein M, Weems K, Saver JL. Identifying Stroke in the Field:
276 Prospective Validation of the Los Angeles Prehospital Stroke Screen (LAPSS). *Stroke*.
277 2000;31(1):71-76. doi:10.1161/01.STR.31.1.71
- 278 8. Bray JE, Martin J, Cooper G, Barger B, Bernard S, Bladin C. An Interventional Study to
279 Improve Paramedic Diagnosis of Stroke. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2005;9(3):297-302.
280 doi:10.1080/10903120590962382
- 281 9. Levine DA, Duncan PW, Nguyen-Huynh MN, Ogedegbe OG. Interventions Targeting
282 Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Stroke Prevention and Treatment. *Stroke*. 2020;51(11):3425-
283 3432. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.030427
- 284 10. Hsia AW, Edwards DF, Morgenstern LB, et al. Racial Disparities in Tissue Plasminogen
285 Activator Treatment Rate for Stroke: A Population-Based Study. *Stroke*. 2011;42(8):2217-
286 2221. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.111.613828
- 287 11. Rinaldo L, Rabinstein AA, Cloft H, Knudsen JM, Castilla LR, Brinjikji W. Racial and Ethnic
288 Disparities in the Utilization of Thrombectomy for Acute Stroke: Analysis of Data From
289 2016 to 2018. *Stroke*. 2019;50(9):2428-2432. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.024651
- 290 12. ESO - EMS Homepage. Accessed September 28, 2022. <https://www.eso.com/ems/>

- 291 13. Albers GW, Marks MP, Kemp S, et al. Thrombectomy for Stroke at 6 to 16 Hours with
292 Selection by Perfusion Imaging. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(8):708-718.
293 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1713973
- 294 14. Nogueira RG, Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, et al. Thrombectomy 6 to 24 Hours after Stroke with
295 a Mismatch between Deficit and Infarct. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(1):11-21.
296 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1706442
- 297 15. Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, et al. 2001 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International
298 Sepsis Definitions Conference: *Critical Care Medicine*. 2003;31(4):1250-1256.
299 doi:10.1097/01.CCM.0000050454.01978.3B
- 300 16. Angus DC, Van Der Poll T. Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *N Engl J Med*.
301 2013;369(9):840-851. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1208623
- 302 17. Oostema JA, Chassee T, Baer W, Edberg A, Reeves MJ. Brief Educational Intervention
303 Improves Emergency Medical Services Stroke Recognition. *Stroke*. 2019;50(5):1193-1200.
304 doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.023885
- 305 18. Price CI, Shaw L, Islam S, et al. Effect of an Enhanced Paramedic Acute Stroke Treatment
306 Assessment on Thrombolysis Delivery During Emergency Stroke Care: A Cluster
307 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Neurol*. 2020;77(7):840.
308 doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.0611

309

310

311 Table 1: EMS primary impressions of patients without stroke recognition

EMS Primary Impression, n (%)	
Weakness	2866 (25.87)
Altered Level of Consciousness	2755 (24.87)
Dizziness	794 (7.17)
Other Cardiovascular	631 (5.70)
Pain	405 (3.66)
Headache	357 (3.22)
Syncope	324 (2.92)
Nausea/Vomiting	315 (2.84)
Other Injury	254 (2.29)
Malaise	190 (1.72)
Hyperglycemia	183 (1.65)
Respiratory Distress	174 (1.57)
Traumatic Brain Injury /Concussion	169 (1.53)
No Complaints or Injury/Illness Noted	166 (1.50)
Behavioral/Psychiatric Episode	154 (1.39)
Seizures	135 (1.22)
Visual Disturbance	131 (1.18)
Alcohol/Drug	83 (0.75)
Sepsis/Septic Shock	70 (0.63)
Urinary Tract Infection	59 (0.53)

312

313 EMS: Emergency Medical Services

314

315 Table 2. Patient Demographic Characteristics.
316

	Overall	EMS Impression		p-value*
		Stroke	Not Stroke	
N	34504	23427	11077	
Age, mean (SD)	71.6 (14.3)	71.9 (14.2)	70.9 (14.5)	<0.0001
Female, n (%)	17652 (51.3%)	11938 (51.1%)	5714 (51.8%)	0.29
Race, n (%)				<0.0001
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Isl.	645 (1.9%)	429 (1.8%)	216 (1.9%)	
Black or African American	5823 (16.9%)	3789 (16.2%)	2034 (18.4%)	
White	22185 (64.3%)	15211 (64.9%)	6974 (63.0%)	
Other, unknown, or American Native	5851 (17.0%)	3998 (17.1%)	1853 (16.7%)	
Hispanic ethnicity, n (%)	2351 (8.1%)	1493 (7.6%)	858 (9.0%)	<0.0001
Social Vulnerability Index Quartile, N (%)				<0.0001
Least Vulnerable	8307 (24.1%)	5944 (25.4%)	2363 (21.4%)	
Quartile 2	9083 (26.4%)	6319 (27.0%)	2767 (25.0%)	
Quartile 3	8625 (25.0%)	5810 (24.8%)	2815 (25.4%)	
Most Vulnerable	8452 (24.5%)	5333 (22.8%)	3119 (28.2%)	
Urbanicity, n (%)				0.22
Non-Metro Area	1834 (5.3%)	1221 (5.2%)	613 (5.5%)	
Metro Area	32617 (94.7%)	22168 (94.8%)	10449 (94.5%)	
Census Region, n (%)				<0.0001
Midwest	2052 (18.7%)	1380 (18.4%)	672 (19.4%)	
Northeast	716 (6.5%)	559 (7.4%)	157 (4.5%)	
South	5376 (49.0%)	3631 (48.3%)	1745 (50.4%)	
West	2827 (25.8%)	1941 (25.8%)	886 (25.6%)	

317

318

319 *p-values calculated using chi-square for categorical variables and t-test for means

320

321 Table 3. Patient Clinical Characteristics.
322

	EMS Impression		Risk of missed EMS stroke identification	
	Stroke (n = 23427)	Not Stroke (n = 11077)	RR (95% CI)*	aRR (95% CI)**
Alcohol and Drug Use				
None indicated	23013 (98.2%)	10696 (96.6%)	[ref]	[ref]
Indicated	414 (1.8%)	381 (3.4%)	1.51 (1.40, 1.63)	1.48 (1.37, 1.59)
GCS				
8 or less	1021 (4.5%)	658 (6.1%)	1.17 (1.10, 1.24)	1.17 (1.10, 1.24)
9 - 12	3696 (16.4%)	1051 (9.8%)	0.66 (0.63, 0.70)	0.67 (0.63, 0.70)
13 - 15	17905 (79.1%)	9018 (84.1%)	[ref]	[ref]
Heart Rate				
<60 (bradycardia)	1293 (5.5%)	590 (5.4%)	0.99 (0.92, 1.06)	1.01 (0.94, 1.08)
60-100 (normal)	17622 (75.5%)	8216 (74.5%)	[ref]	[ref]
> 100 (tachycardia)	4418 (18.9%)	2215 (20.1%)	1.05 (1.01, 1.09)	1.05 (1.01, 1.09)
Systolic Blood Pressure				
<90 (hypotension)	228 (1.0%)	241 (2.2%)	1.48 (1.35, 1.63)	1.47 (1.34, 1.61)
90-140 (normal)	6841 (29.4%)	3621 (32.9%)	[ref]	[ref]
>140 (hypertension)	16229 (69.7%)	72151 (64.9%)	0.88 (0.86, 0.91)	0.87 (0.84, 0.90)
Diastolic Blood Pressure				
<60 (hypotension)	1120 (4.9%)	750 (6.9%)	1.21 (1.14, 1.28)	1.22 (1.15, 1.30)
60-90 (normal)	12495 (54.3%)	6189 (56.9%)	[ref]	[ref]
>90 (hypertension)	9408 (40.9%)	3931 (36.2%)	0.89 (0.86, 0.92)	0.87 (0.84, 0.90)
Respiratory Rate				
<8	58 (0.3%)	56 (0.5%)	1.54 (1.27, 1.85)	1.44 (1.19, 1.74)
8-20	20223 (88.8%)	9502 (88.1%)	[ref]	[ref]
>20	2492 (10.9%)	1233 (11.4%)	1.04 (0.99, 1.09)	1.05 (1.00, 1.10)
Oxygen Saturation				
< 89	933 (4.1%)	476 (4.5%)	1.05 (0.98, 1.13)	1.09 (1.01, 1.18)
89 +	21561 (95.9%)	10215 (95.5%)	[ref]	[ref]
Fever				
<95	51 (0.6%)	38 (0.7%)	1.17 (0.92, 1.49)	1.24 (0.98, 1.56)
95-100.4	9043 (98.3%)	5197 (96.7%)	[ref]	[ref]
>100.4	106 (1.2%)	138 (2.6%)	1.55 (1.39, 1.73)	1.54 (1.37, 1.72)

323
324
325 *Unadjusted generalized linear models (GLMs) were run for each clinical characteristic as the
326 single clinical exposure

327 **Adjusted GLMs were calculated to include the single exposure along with covariates of
328 patient age, sex, race, GCS, and urbanicity.

329 ED: Emergency Department, EMS: Emergency Medical Services, GCS: Glasgow Coma Score,

330 GLM: Generalized Linear Model, RR: Relative Risk, aRR: adjusted Relative Risk.

331