Type of Anesthesia and Differences in Clinical Outcome After Intra-Arterial Treatment for Ischemic Stroke

Lucie A. van den Berg, MD; Diederik L.H. Koelman, BSc; Olvert A. Berkhemers, MD; Anouk D. Rozeman, MD; Puck S.S. Fransen, MD; Debbie Beumer, MD; Diederik W. Dippel, MD, PhD; Aad van der Lugt, MD, PhD; Robert J. van Oostenbrugge, MD, PhD; Wim H. van Zwam, MD, PhD; Patrick A. Brouwer, MD; Sjoerd Jenniskens, MD; Jelis Boiten, MD, PhD; Geert A. Lycklama à Nijeholt, MD, PhD; Jan Albert Vos, MD, PhD; Wouter J. Schonewille, MD, PhD; Charles B.L.M. Majoie, MD, PhD; Yvo B.W.E.M. Roos, MD, PhD; for the MR CLEAN pretrial study group*

Background and Purpose—Intra-arterial treatment (IAT) in patients with acute ischemic stroke (AIS) can be performed with or without general anesthesia (GA). Previous studies suggested that IAT without the use of GA (non-GA) is associated with better clinical outcome. Nevertheless, no consensus exists about the anesthetic management during IAT of AIS patients. This study investigates the association between type of anesthesia and clinical outcome in a large cohort of patients with AIS treated with IAT.

Methods—All consecutive patients with AIS of the anterior circulation who received IAT between 2002 and 2013 in 16 Dutch hospitals were included in the study. Primary outcome was functional outcome on the modified Rankin Scale at discharge. Difference in primary outcome between GA and non-GA was estimated using multiple ordinal regression analysis, adjusting for age, stroke severity, occlusion of the internal carotid artery terminus, previous stroke, atrial fibrillation, and diabetes mellitus.

Results—Three hundred forty-eight patients were included in the analysis; 70 patients received GA and 278 patients did not receive GA. Non-GA was significantly associated with good clinical outcome (odds ratio 2.1, 95% confidence interval 1.02–4.31). After adjusting for prespecified prognostic factors, the point estimate remained similar; statistical significance, however, was lost (odds ratio 1.9, 95% confidence interval 0.89–4.24).

Conclusions—Our study suggests that patients with AIS of the anterior circulation undergoing IAT without GA have a higher probability of good clinical outcome compared with patients treated with general anesthesia. (Stroke. 2015;46:1257-1262. DOI: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.115.008699.)
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Currently, no consensus exists about the optimal anesthetic management of AIS patients during IAT. Previous studies had several methodological limitations that prevent to draw definite conclusions. Most important was the imbalance in stroke severity at baseline in most studies, resulting in more severe strokes in the GA group as compared with the non-GA group. Furthermore, the majority of studies had small numbers of patients. In the absence of definite evidence, current practice is largely based on local protocols and preferences of the neurointerventionals. Possible advantages of GA are (1) immobilization of the patient to prevent wire-induced vessel injury and to facilitate navigation with a quicker recanalization; (2) adequate ventilation and airway protection; and (3) limiting patient discomfort. On the other hand, a non-GA approach (1) may reduce time to treatment initiation; (2) allow neurological assessments during and after the procedure, (3) does not induce blood pressure lowering, and (4) does not require intubation. Nonetheless, when using a non-GA approach, there is a chance of a need to convert acutely to GA accompanied by emergency intubation, which is associated with a higher rate of aspiration pneumonia and poor outcome.

In this retrospective study among 16 Dutch hospitals, we aimed to evaluate the relation between anesthetic management during IAT and clinical outcome. In most intervention centers in the Netherlands, a standard strategy regarding anesthetic management for acute stroke interventions is applied, thereby limiting bias through patient selection by baseline stroke severity in this study. We hypothesized that a non-GA approach during IAT in patients with AIS of the anterior circulation is associated with a better clinical outcome compared with GA based on a potentially shorter time from onset to treatment initiation, avoidance of potentially harmful blood pressure changes, and quicker recovery without the use of GA.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective cohort study in patients from the pretrial cohort of the Multicenter Randomized Clinical Trial of Endovascular Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke in The Netherlands (MR CLEAN), which consists of all consecutive patients with AIS treated with IAT in 16 stroke centers in The Netherlands. Information concerning procedures and treated patients was gathered to assess pre-trial experience in centers that were committed to participate in the MR CLEAN trial. The registry started in October 2002 and continued until a center started participation in the trial. The institutional review board from the coordinating institution approved registration and use of the data. We only included patients with an anterior circulation stroke in our analysis. Patients were treated intra-arterially with a thrombolytic agent, a dedicated clot retriever or a retrievable stent. The method of IAT was left to the discretion of the treating neurointerventionalists.

Results

We identified 369 patients with an anterior circulation stroke and available information on anesthetic management during IAT and functional outcome at discharge. Of these 369 patients, we excluded 21 patients for multiple reasons, for example, patients already under GA for other procedures, lack of information on timing of procedures, or cross over to no IAT (see online-only Data Supplement for patient flow-chart). Three hundred forty-eight patients were used for the analysis; 278 patients were treated without GA and 70 patients with GA. Information on the use of CS and specific agents were not available in most of the cases. Patients received non-GA based on standard strategy in 274 cases. In 4 cases, procedure was started without GA, despite the local standard strategy indicating GA. The majority of patients (N=63) received GA as initial treatment modality, based on the local standard strategy. Seven patients received GA because of agitation, respiratory insufficiency, or decreased level of consciousness before start of the treatment, whereas they would normally be treated without GA.
Ten patients (10/278 [4%]) in the non-GA group converted to GA during treatment. In 9 patients, reason for conversion was agitation and patient movement. One patient had respiratory insufficiency during treatment initiation. These converted cases were included in the non-GA group based on the intention to treat principle.

**Baseline**
Patients treated under GA were significantly younger (57 years versus 62 years) and less often had atrial fibrillation (9/70 [29%] versus 40/278 [16%]). Furthermore, patients in the GA group had a longer time from onset of symptoms to start of IAT of 00:20 hours (median 04:01; interquartile range 01:53 hours versus 03:40; interquartile range 01:41) and were more frequently treated with mechanical thrombectomy only (32/70 [46%] versus 61/278 [22%]). The distribution of baseline stroke severity (NIHSS), pretreatment with intravenous tissue-type plasminogen activator, and occlusion site was similar in both groups (Table 1).

**Clinical Outcome**
A total of 82 (82/348 [24%]) patients were functionally independent (mRS 0–2) at discharge. Good clinical outcome was seen in 26% (72/278) of patients in the non-GA group and in 14% (10/70) of patients in the GA group. A higher mortality rate was seen in the GA group (15/70 [21%]) compared with the non-GA group (46/278 [17%]); however, this difference was not statistically significant (Table 2). The distribution of the mRS in both treatment groups is presented in Figure.

In unadjusted logistic regression analysis, non-GA was significantly associated with good clinical outcome (odds ratio 2.1, 95% confidence interval 1.02–4.31). After adjusting for prespecified prognostic factors, the point estimate remained positive and, however, did not reach statistically significance (odds ratio 1.9, 95% confidence interval 0.89–4.24). The additional multivariable ordinal regression analysis showed a shift in distribution on the mRS in favor of the non-GA group (adjusted common odds ratio 1.6, 95% confidence interval 0.98–2.54). This also was not statistically significant.

**Periprocedural Complications**
Vessel perforation was seen in 4 patients (4/278 [1%]) treated without GA and did not occur in patients treated under GA. Two of these 4 patients had an accompanying SICH with an outcome of respectively 4 and 5 on the mRS at discharge. From one patient, neither SICH nor asymptomatic intracranial hemorrhage was reported and had an mRS of 3 at discharge, and one patient had an asymptomatic intracranial hemorrhage with mRS 4 at discharge. Dissection of the internal carotid artery during treatment was seen in both groups (non-GA: 12/278 [4%] versus GA: 2/70 [3%]), as well as device-related complications (non-GA: 6/278 [2%] versus GA: 3/70 [4%]). These included failure to deploy the retrievable stent, a broken guidewire, a broken stent, and a part of device unable to retrieve.

**Postprocedural Complications**
Postprocedural complications are summarized in Table 2. There was no difference in occurrence of SICH or asymptomatic intracranial hemorrhage between the 2 treatment groups.

---

**Table 1. Baseline Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No General Anesthesia (n=278)</th>
<th>General Anesthesia (n=70)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men, n (%)</td>
<td>149 (53.6)</td>
<td>35 (50.0)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years, mean (SD)</td>
<td>62 (14.0)</td>
<td>57 (17.7)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical history and risk factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus, n (%)</td>
<td>40 (14.8)</td>
<td>9 (13.4)</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension, n (%)</td>
<td>130 (51.7)</td>
<td>37 (44.8)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrial fibrillation, n (%)</td>
<td>79 (29.3)</td>
<td>11 (16.4)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypercholesterolemia or statin use, n (%)</td>
<td>63 (23.4)</td>
<td>22 (32.8)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior stroke or TIA, n (%)</strong></td>
<td>38 (14.1)</td>
<td>8 (11.9)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic heart disease, n (%)</td>
<td>43 (15.9)</td>
<td>16 (23.9)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline NIHSS, median, (IQR)</td>
<td>15 (7)</td>
<td>16 (5)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time from symptom onset to start IAT (hours), median (IQR)</td>
<td>03:40 (01:41)</td>
<td>04:01 (01:53)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intravenous thrombolysis with rt-PA, n (%)</td>
<td>211 (75.9)</td>
<td>45 (65.0)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most proximal site of occlusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 MCA, total n (%)</td>
<td>184 (66.2)</td>
<td>49 (70.0)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 MCA, total n (%)</td>
<td>62 (22.3)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3 MCA, total n (%)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA, total n (%)</td>
<td>8 (2.9)</td>
<td>3 (4.3)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA-T, total n (%)</td>
<td>23 (8.3)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical IA therapy only, n (%)</td>
<td>61 (21.9)</td>
<td>32 (45.7)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA thrombolysis only, n (%)</td>
<td>81 (29.1)</td>
<td>9 (12.9)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of IA thrombolysis and mechanical IA therapy, n (%)</td>
<td>136 (48.9)</td>
<td>29 (41.4)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion from non-GA to GA, n (%)</td>
<td>10 (3.7)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GA indicates general anesthesia; IA, intra-arterial; IAT, intra-arterial treatment; ICA, internal carotid artery; IQR, interquartile range; MCA, middle cerebral artery; NA, not applicable; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; r-PA, recombinant tissue-type plasminogen activator; SD, standard deviation; and TIA, transient ischemic attack.

Progression of ischemic stroke and seizures was seen more often in the GA group. Pneumonia and other infections were more frequent in the non-GA group. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

**Angiographic Reperfusion**

mTICI scores were not available for 13 patients in the non-GA group. Of the available scores, full recanalization (mTICI 2b/3) was reached in 113/265 (43%) of patients in the non-GA group versus 34/70 (49%) in the non-GA group. All scores on the mTICI are summarized in Table 2.

**Discussion**

Our study suggests that patients with anterior circulation AIS treated with IAT, who did not receive GA, have a higher...
Our findings are consistent with earlier findings in both terms of clinical and safety outcomes between the 2 treatment types. However, previous studies reported an imbalance in baseline NIHSS in favor of non-GA-treated patients, which could have influenced outcome. In contrast, our study had equal scores on baseline NIHSS. Hence, difference in baseline stroke severity is not the reason for improved clinical outcome after non-GA patients in our cohort.

How can we explain improved outcome in patients treated without the use of GA? First of all, it is known that inhaled or intravenous anesthetic agents can alter blood CO2 levels and blood pressure shifts, which can lead to changes in cerebral autoregulation and consequently in decrease of cerebral bloodflow, leading to extension of ischemic injury. Use of propofol and induction dosages of fentanyl predicted postinduction hypotension in a study of Reich and colleagues.19 Furthermore, some anesthetic gases might act as a vasodilator, resulting in the reverse Robin Hood syndrome, with steal from blood flow of the affected vascular territories toward unaffected territories, further compromising flow in the ischemic area.20 There are data that support these findings in AIS patients treated with IAT. Davis et al found that lower blood pressures were associated with worse outcomes in patients undergoing CS or GA, and the mean systolic blood pressure in patients undergoing CS was 135 mm Hg compared with 104 mm Hg in patients with GA.21 Additionally, in a retrospective study of 126 patients with a middle cerebral artery stroke treated with IAT, Jumaa et al showed that final infarct volume was significantly larger in intubated patients versus nonintubated patients (mean infarct volume [cm3] 147 versus 104, P=0.002).7 In our study, we were unable to collect adequate information on type of anesthetic agents, blood pressure, CO2, and cerebral bloodflow during treatment nor final infarct volumes to confirm these data.

Another reason often suggested for the difference in outcome could be a higher rate of aspiration and pneumonia in intubated patients and contribution of pneumonia to poor outcome.9 However, we found a lower rate of pneumonia in the intubated patients and contribution of pneumonia to poor outcome could be a higher rate of aspiration and pneumonia in non-GA patients. Moreover, previous studies reported an imbalance in baseline NIHSS in favor of non-GA-treated patients, which could have influenced outcome. In contrast, our study had equal scores on baseline NIHSS. Hence, difference in baseline stroke severity is not the reason for improved clinical outcome after non-GA patients in our cohort.

How can we explain improved outcome in patients treated without the use of GA? First of all, it is known that inhaled or intravenous anesthetic agents can alter blood CO2 levels and blood pressure shifts, which can lead to changes in cerebral autoregulation and consequently in decrease of cerebral bloodflow, leading to extension of ischemic injury. Use of propofol and induction dosages of fentanyl predicted postinduction hypotension in a study of Reich and colleagues.19 Furthermore, some anesthetic gases might act as a vasodilator, resulting in the reverse Robin Hood syndrome, with steal from blood flow of the affected vascular territories toward unaffected territories, further compromising flow in the ischemic area.20 There are data that support these findings in AIS patients treated with IAT. Davis et al found that lower blood pressures were associated with worse outcomes in patients undergoing CS or GA, and the mean systolic blood pressure in patients undergoing CS was 135 mm Hg compared with 104 mm Hg in patients with GA.21 Additionally, in a retrospective study of 126 patients with a middle cerebral artery stroke treated with IAT, Jumaa et al showed that final infarct volume was significantly larger in intubated patients versus nonintubated patients (mean infarct volume [cm3] 147 versus 104, P=0.002). In our study, we were unable to collect adequate information on type of anesthetic agents, blood pressure, CO2, and cerebral bloodflow during treatment nor final infarct volumes to confirm these data.

Another reason often suggested for the difference in outcome could be a higher rate of aspiration and pneumonia in intubated patients and contribution of pneumonia to poor outcome. However, we found a lower rate of pneumonia in the GA group, and therefore, this phenomenon cannot explain the differences in clinical outcome in our study. Conversely, lack of airway protection by the absence of intubation could lead to higher rates of pulmonary aspiration in non-GA patients. Patients with AIS of large cerebral artery may have a degree of dysphagia and are unlikely to have been fasted before intervention. The urgent need for conversion to GA may occur, accompanied by a higher risk of aspiration. Most previous studies did not examine the rate of conversion from non-GA to GA. In our study, only 10 patients in the non-GA group were converted to GA. No effect on clinical outcome was seen in these patients. The small number of converted patients in our study demonstrates that in current medical practice, the risk of conversion to GA is relatively small, thereby not clearly influencing clinical outcome in the non-GA group.

The most important factor leading to poor outcome could be that GA may lead to treatment delay resulting in a prolonged onset to recanalization time and therefore reduce the chance of good clinical outcome. However, 2 previous studies that investigated this perception found no difference in time to treatment between GA and non-GA and between intubated and

Table 2. Clinical, Radiographic, and Safety Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical outcome</th>
<th>No General Anesthesia (n=278)</th>
<th>General Anesthesia (n=70)</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mRS 0–2, n (%)</td>
<td>72 (25.9)</td>
<td>10 (14.3)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality, n (%)</td>
<td>46 (16.5)</td>
<td>15 (21.4)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mTICI 2a, n (%) 97 (36.6) 19 (27.1) 0.22
mTICI 2b/3, n (%) 113 (42.6) 34 (48.6) 0.37
mTICI 3, n (%) 78 (29.5) 20 (28.6) 0.93
mTICI score post treatment† 0, n (%) 36 (13.6) 11 (15.7) 0.55
1, n (%) 19 (7.2) 6 (8.6) 0.62
2a, n (%) 97 (36.6) 19 (27.1) 0.22
2b, n (%) 35 (13.2) 14 (20.0) 0.11
3, n (%) 78 (29.5) 20 (28.6) 0.93
Full recanalization (TICI 2b/3) 113 (42.6) 34 (48.6) 0.37

Procedural complications

Total complications, n (%) 50 (18) 9 (12.9) 0.31
Vessel perforation, n (%) 4 (1.4) 0 (0) 0.31
Dissection, n (%) 12 (4.3) 2 (2.9) 0.58
Device-related complications, n (%) 6 (2.2) 3 (4.3) 0.32
Hemodynamic and airway complications, n (%) 2 (0.7) 0 (0) 0.48
Reperfusion syndrome, n (%) 1 (0.4) 0 (0) 0.62
Migration of thrombus, n (%) 10 (3.6) 4 (5.7) 0.42
Seizures during treatment, n (%) 3 (1.1) 0 (0) 0.38
Groin hematoma, n (%) 12 (4.3) 0 (0) 0.08

Postprocedural complications

SICH, n (%) 33 (11.9) 8 (11.4) 0.92
AICH, n (%) 32 (11.5) 9 (12.9) 0.76
Progression of stroke†, n (%) 28 (10.1) 12 (17.1) 0.15
Pneumonia, n (%) 41 (14.7) 9 (12.9) 0.69
Other infection, n (%) 23 (8.3) 3 (4.3) 0.26
Cardiac arrhythmias‡, n (%) 6 (2.2) 0 (0) 0.38
Myocardial infarction, n (%) 1 (0.4) 0 (0) 0.62
Compromised heart failure, n (%) 2 (0.7) 1 (1.4) 0.57
Major extracranial hemorrhage, n (%) 4 (1.4) 2 (2.9) 0.42
PE/DVT, n (%) 2 (0.7) 1 (1.4) 0.57
Seizures, n (%) 10 (3.6) 5 (7.1) 0.19

AICH indicates asymptomatic intracranial hemorrhage; DVT, deep venous thrombosis; mRS, modified Rankin Scale; mTICI, modified Thrombolysis in Cerebral Infarction; PE, pulmonary embolism; SICH, symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage; and TIA, transient ischemic attack.

†mTICI scores were not available for 13 patients in the non-GA group.
‡Progression of stroke was defined as symptomatic (malignant) brain edema seen on noncontrast CT that could have required hemicraniectomy.
§mTICI scores were not available for 13 patients in the non-GA group.

*Seizures during treatment, n (%) 3 (1.1) 0 (0) 0.38

Postprocedural complications

SICH, n (%) 33 (11.9) 8 (11.4) 0.92
AICH, n (%) 32 (11.5) 9 (12.9) 0.76
Progression of stroke†, n (%) 28 (10.1) 12 (17.1) 0.15
Pneumonia, n (%) 41 (14.7) 9 (12.9) 0.69
Other infection, n (%) 23 (8.3) 3 (4.3) 0.26
Cardiac arrhythmias‡, n (%) 6 (2.2) 0 (0) 0.38
Myocardial infarction, n (%) 1 (0.4) 0 (0) 0.62
Compromised heart failure, n (%) 2 (0.7) 1 (1.4) 0.57
Major extracranial hemorrhage, n (%) 4 (1.4) 2 (2.9) 0.42
PE/DVT, n (%) 2 (0.7) 1 (1.4) 0.57
Seizures, n (%) 10 (3.6) 5 (7.1) 0.19

AICH indicates asymptomatic intracranial hemorrhage; DVT, deep venous thrombosis; mRS, modified Rankin Scale; mTICI, modified Thrombolysis in Cerebral Infarction; PE, pulmonary embolism; SICH, symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage; and TIA, transient ischemic attack.

†mTICI scores were not available for 13 patients in the non-GA group.
‡Progression of stroke was defined as symptomatic (malignant) brain edema seen on noncontrast CT that could have required hemicraniectomy.
§Cardiac arrhythmias did not include atrial fibrillation; atrial fibrillation seen on electrocardiography during admission was considered present before admission for stroke.

probability of good clinical outcome compared with patients who received GA. Furthermore, we observed that IAT was initiated sooner after symptom onset in patients treated without GA as compared with GA. We did not find major differences with regard to safety parameters between the 2 treatment modalities.
nonintubated state, respectively. In our cohort, IAT in patients treated under GA was started 20 minutes later than in patients treated without GA. Because time from stroke onset to treatment is an important factor for outcome after acute stroke treatment, this may account for difference in clinical outcome. To our knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate a difference in time to treatment between GA and non-GA. Future studies need to confirm this and should use specific time points to provide insight into the point at which most time is lost.

The main reason for neurointerventionalists to use GA is to minimize patient movement. Awake patients could be agitated during treatment, resulting in head movements that affect Digital Subtraction Angiography images. As a result, longer times to recanalization may occur. Major concern, of course, is increasing risk of procedural complications, such as vessel perforation or dissection and subsequent intracranial hemorrhage. In our group of non-GA patients, rate of vessel perforation was low and SICH was seen as often as in patients treated under GA. Other studies showed similar safety result, indicating that a non-GA approach seems to be a safe choice.

As we know from previous studies, higher recanalization leads to better clinical outcome. In a meta-analysis from Brinjikji et al, which included all available studies on anesthesia and IAT of AIS, a significant difference was found in recanalization grades in favor of non-GA. In our study, full recanalization was reached in similar percentages of patients in both treatment groups. So, we can conclude that higher recanalization may not account for better outcomes in the non-GA group in our cohort of patients.

The effect of anesthesia on clinical outcome in AIS patients remains a black box, containing several factors that could influence outcome. Our study did not answer the question which individual parameters are responsible for worse clinical outcome in patients treated under GA. Faster initiation of treatment from stroke onset could be one of the major factors in this study.

Limitations
Our study does have several limitations. One of the major limitations is the retrospective and nonrandomized nature. Choice of anesthesia was based on standard local strategy or preference of the neurointerventionalist. The latter could have led to selection bias or confounding by indication or center, although a standard strategy regarding anesthetic management for acute stroke interventions is applied in most centers. Also the majority of centers and operators preferred not to use GA; therefore, group sizes were unequal. Optimal method would include randomization between GA and non-GA. Currently, the ANSTROKE (Sedation Versus General Anesthesia for Endovascular Therapy in Acute Stroke—Impact on Neurological Outcome) trial is randomizing AIS patients between GA and sedation only. Furthermore, mRS scores were only available at discharge. It is preferable to assess the effect of anesthesia on clinical outcome over a longer period of time.

Conclusions
Overall, the results of our study are in line with previous studies and show that patients who do not receive GA have a higher probability of good clinical outcome and do not have higher complication rates than patients who undergo GA. Local anesthesia, with the possible use of CS, during IAT for AIS seems a good strategy if possible.

Appendix
The MR CLEAN pretrial study group.
Participating centers with local investigators in order of enrollment (N):
- Department of Neurology and Radiology, Sint Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, the Netherlands (136), Wouter Schonewille, MD, PhD, Jan Albert Vos, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Medical Center Haaglanden, the Hague, the Netherlands (108), Jelis Boiten, MD, PhD, Geert Lycklama à Nijeholt, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, HAGA Hospital, the Hague, the Netherlands (44) Sebastiaan de Bruijn, MD, PhD, Lukas van Dijk, MD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Maastricht University Medical Center and Cardiovascular Research Institute Maastricht, the Netherlands (34), Robert van Oostenbrugge, MD, PhD, Wim van Zwam, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Erasmus MC University Medical Center Rotterdam, the Netherlands (34), Diederik Dippel, MD, PhD, Aad van der Lugt, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, University Medical Center Utrecht, the Netherlands (30), Jaap Kappelle, MD, PhD, Rob Lo, MD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Academic Medical Center Amsterdam, the Netherlands (26), Yvo Roos, MD, PhD, Charles Majoie, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Sint Elisabeth Hospital, Tilburg, the Netherlands (24), Paul de Ketel, MD, PhD, Willem Jan van Rooij, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Rijnstate Hospital, Arnhem, the Netherlands (23), Jeanette Hofmeijer, MD, PhD, Jacques van Oostayen, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands (15) Ewoud van Dijk, MD, PhD, Joost de Vries, MD, PhD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, Atrium Medical Center, Heerlen, the Netherlands (13), Tobien Schreuder, MD, Roel Heijboer, MD; Department of Neurology and Radiology, University Medical Center Groningen, the
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Patient flow-chart

369 IA treated patients with AIS of the anterior circulation

11 patients who received IAT during elective procedure

5 patients who eventually did not receive IAT

4 patients with missing information

1 patient who received thrombectomy for cerebral venous thrombosis

348 patients used for the analysis

IA indicates intra-arterial; AIS, acute ischemic stroke, IAT, intra-arterial treatment
Black lines indicate shifts in mRS 0 to 1 and mRS 0 to 2, across treatment types. tPA indicates tissue-type plasminogen activator.

Figure. Ninety-day modified Rankin Scale (mRS) distribution for endovascular therapy vs intravenous tissue-type plasminogen activator in the Interventional Management of Stroke 3 trial stratified by good, intermediate, and poor collateral status as per the 3 collateral scores. Black lines indicate shifts in mRS 0 to 1 and mRS 0 to 2, across treatment types. tPA indicates tissue-type plasminogen activator.

Table 3. Total Number of Patients in Each Collateral Status by Treatment Type, Percentage of Patients With 90-Day Good Clinical Outcome (mRS 0–2), Difference in Rate of Good Outcome Between Treatment Types With 95% Confidence Interval Using the 3 Collateral Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collateral Scores</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0–1)</td>
<td>Endovascular</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-21.6, 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (2)</td>
<td>Endovascular</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>-7, 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (3)</td>
<td>Endovascular</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-13.4, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0–1)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-36.8, 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (2)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>-4.2, 93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (3)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-8.5, 38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0–1)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>-28.7, 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (2)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-8.5, 38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (3)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-3.5, 37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0–1)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-21.6, 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (2)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>-7, 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (3)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-3.5, 37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (0–1)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-9.5, 39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (2)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-9.5, 39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (3)</td>
<td>IV tPA alone</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>-9.5, 39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Type of Anesthesia and Differences in Clinical Outcome After Intra-Arterial Treatment for Ischemic Stroke

Lucie A. van den Berg, MD; Diederik L.H. Koelman, BSc; Olvert A. Berkhemer, MD; Anouk D. Rozeman, MD; Puck S.S. Fransen, MD; Debbie Beumer, MD; Diederik W. Dippel, MD, PhD; Aad van der Lugt, MD, PhD; Robert J. van Oostenbrugge, MD, PhD; Wim H. van Zwam, MD, PhD; Patrick A. Broeke, MD; Sjoerd Jenniskens, MD; Jelis Boiten, MD, PhD; Geert A. Lycklama à Nijeholt, MD, PhD; Jan Albert Vos, MD, PhD; Wouter J. Schonewille, MD, PhD; Charles B.L.M. Majoie, MD, PhD; Yvo B.W.E.M. Roos, MD, PhD; for the MR CLEAN pretrial study group

Background and Purpose

The effect of type of treatment (intravenous tPA alone versus endovascular therapy) was significant using scores 1 and 2 (P < 0.05 for all 3 models), whereas the 3 collateral scores were each significant predictors within their respective models (P < 0.05 for all 3 models). In univariate analysis, a statistically significant shift in 90-day mRS (P < 0.01) are significant predictors of 90-day mRS (P < 0.01). The model for score 1 is not reported because of a complete separation of data points.

Conclusion

348 patients with a good collateral status were included: 70 patients with GA and 278 patients without GA. A multivariable analysis revealed that non-GA treatment was not a significant predictor of 90-day mRS in similar models constructed for each collateral category (good, intermediate, and poor) in all 3 scores. In the final adjusted models, collateral status was a significant predictor of 90-day mRS (P < 0.05). The interaction term between collateral score and type of treatment was nonsignificant in all models (P > 0.1). The model for score 1 is not reported because of a complete separation of data points.

Key Words: acute stroke ■ anesthesia ■ conscious sedation ■ thrombectomy ■ thrombolytic therapy

결과

348명의 환자들에 분석에 포함되었다: GA를 받았고, 278명은 GA를 받지 않았다. non-GA가 좋은 임상 결과(OR 2.1, 95% CI 1.02-4.31)와 유의한 관련이 있었다. 미리 정한 예후인자를 보정한 이후, 점추정치(point estimate)는 유사하였다. 하지만, 통계적 유의성은 사라졌다(OR 1.9, 95% CI 0.89-4.24).

결론

본 연구는 GA 없이 IAT를 받은 앞순환 AIS 환자가 GA로 치료받 은 환자에 비해 좋은 임상 결과의 확률이 높을 것임을 시사한다.
**Abstract 10**

**Systolic Blood Pressure and Mortality After Stroke**

Too Low, No Go?

Michelle P. Lin, MD, MPH; Bruce Ovbiagele, MD, MSc, MAS; Daniela Markovic, MS; Amytis Towsfigh, MD

*(Stroke. 2015;46:1307-1313.)*
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**Table 4. Crude and Adjusted Hazard Ratios of All-Cause Mortality or Vascular Mortality by SBP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBP Category</th>
<th>All-Cause Mortality</th>
<th>Vascular Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR (95% CI)</td>
<td>P-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP 120–139 mmHg</td>
<td>1.05 (0.66–1.67)</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP &lt;120 mmHg</td>
<td>0.86 (0.46–1.62)</td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP ≥140 mmHg</td>
<td>1.43 (0.83–2.46)</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP 120–139 mmHg</td>
<td>1.43 (0.83–2.46)</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP &lt;120 mmHg</td>
<td>0.73 (0.45–1.18)</td>
<td>0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBP ≥140 mmHg</td>
<td>1.96 (1.13–3.39)</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HR indicates confidence interval; HR, hazard ratios; and SBP, systolic blood pressure.
*Adjusting for age, sex, race/ethnicity, poverty income ratio, hypertension, total serum cholesterol >200 mg/dL, coronary artery disease, angina, congestive heart failure, body mass index, use antihypertensive medication, smoking.

---

**Figure.** Distribution of outcomes on the modified Rankin Scale (mRS) in percentages in patients who received general anesthesia (GA; n=70) or no GA (non-GA; n=278). mRS 0 to 1 indicate excellent outcome; mRS 2 to 5, moderate disability; mRS 4 to 5, severe disability; and mRS 6, dead.