

Title

Delayed Stroke Treatment during COVID-19 Pandemic in China

Running Head

COVID-19 Pandemic and Stroke

Authors and Affiliations

Shiyuan Gu, MD^{1,2}; Zhengze Dai, MD³; Huachao Shen, MD⁴; Yongjie Bai, MD⁵;

Xiaohao Zhang, MD⁶; Xinfeng Liu, MD^{1,6}; Gelin Xu, MD, PhD^{1,6}

¹ Department of Neurology, Jinling Clinical College of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing 210002, China

² Department of Neurology, The Affiliated Yixing Hospital of Jiangsu University, Yixing, 214200, China

³ Department of Neurology, The Fourth Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing Pukou Hospital, Nanjing 210031, China

⁴ Department of Neurology, BenQ Medical Center, Affiliated BenQ Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, 210031, China

⁵ Department of Neurology, First Affiliated Hospital and College of Clinical Medicine of Henan University of Science and Technology, Luoyang, 471003, China

⁶ Department of Neurology, Jinling Hospital, Medical School of Nanjing University, Nanjing 210002, China

Address for Correspondence and Reprints

Professor Gelin Xu, Department of Neurology, Jinling Clinical College of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing 210002, China. Tel: +86-25-84801861; Fax:

+86-25-84805169. Email: gelinxu@nju.edu.cn.

Xinfeng Liu, Department of Neurology, Jinling Clinical College of Nanjing Medical

University, No.305 East Zhongshan Road, Nanjing, 210002, Jiangsu Province, China.

Telephone number: +86-25-84801861

Fax number: +86-25-84805169

E-Mail address: xfliu2@vip.163.com

Tables: 3

Word Count: 3271

Number of references: 18

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Background:** Social distance, quarantine, pathogen testing and other preventive
3 strategies implemented during COVID-19 pandemic may negatively influence the
4 management of acute stroke. **Objective:** The current study aimed to evaluate the
5 impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on treatment delay of acute stroke in China.

6 **Methods:** This study included patients with acute stroke admitted in two hospitals in
7 Jiangsu, China. Patients admitted before and after the COVID-19 epidemic outbreak
8 (January 31, 2020, as officially announced by Chinese government) were compared
9 for pre- (measured as onset-to-door time) and post-hospital delay (measured as
10 door-to-needle time). The influence factors for delayed treatment (indicated as
11 onset-to-needle time >4.5 hours) were analyzed with multivariate logistic regression
12 analysis.

13 **Results:** Onset-to-door time increased from 202 min (IQR 65-492) before to 317 min
14 (IQR 75-790) after the COVID-19 pandemic ($P=0.001$). Door-to-needle time
15 increased from 50min (IQR 40-75) before to 65 min (IQR 48-84) after the COVID-19
16 pandemic ($P=0.048$). The proportion of patients with intravenous thrombolysis in
17 those with acute ischemic stroke was decreased significantly after the pandemic (15.4%
18 vs 20.1%; $P=0.030$). Multivariate logistic regression analysis indicated that patients
19 after COVID-19 pandemic, lower educational level, rural residency, mild symptoms
20 and transported by other means than ambulance were associated with delayed
21 treatment.

22 **Conclusions:** COVID-19 pandemic has remarkable impacts on the management of
23 acute ischemic stroke. Both pre- and post-hospital delays were prolonged significantly,
24 and proportion of patient arrived within the 4.5-hour time window for intravenous
25 thrombolysis treatment was decreased. Given that anti-COVID-19 measures are

26 becoming medical routines, efforts are warranted to shorten the delay so that the

27 outcomes of stroke could be improved.

28

29 **Key words:** acute stroke; COVID-19; intravenous thrombolysis; treatment delay

30

31

32 **Introduction**

33 Recently developed treatments, such as intravenous thrombolysis and mechanical
34 thrombectomy, can significantly improve the outcomes of acute ischemic stroke. But
35 the effects of these treatments were highly time-dependent, which emphasize the
36 importance of rapid pre- and post-hospital managements. For selected patients with
37 onset-to-needle time (ONT) shorter than 4.5 hours, intravenous thrombolysis could be
38 applied. But those with ONT shorter than 3 hours had a higher likelihood of 90-day
39 favorable outcome [1]. For selected patients with onset-to-puncture time (OPT)
40 shorter than 6 hours, mechanical thrombectomy could be applied. Although patients
41 with OPT between 6 and 24 hours still could be screened for mechanical
42 thrombectomy, the effects attenuate rapidly with time delay. Current guidelines
43 recommended that extra imaging examinations should be performed for selecting
44 patients with OPT between 6 and 24 hours for mechanical thrombectomy [2,3].
45 Therefore, when applying intravenous thrombolysis and mechanical thrombectomy in
46 acute ischemic stroke patients, the shorter the treatment delays, the better the
47 functional outcomes.

48 Since the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemic, China has implemented several
49 nation-wide strategies for preventing and containing the spread of the disease [4].
50 Social distance, quarantine, pathogen testing and other strategies were taken from
51 January 31, 2020, as officially announced by Chinese government. These measures
52 influenced not only the regular medical procedures, but also the health-seeking
53 behaviors. All these changes may have influenced the management of stroke, but the
54 impacts are largely undetermined [5]. This study aimed to explore the impact and
55 extent of COVID-19 pandemic on treatment delay of acute stroke in China.
56 Additionally, we probed potential factors responsible for the treatment delay.

57 **Methods**

58 *Study design and patient population*

59 This study is a part of an on-going program for analyzing pre- and post-hospital delay
60 in managing stroke patients. Patients with acute stroke were enrolled in 2 tertiary
61 hospitals in Jiangsu Province. On January 31, 2020, Chinese government announced
62 several nation-wide strategies for preventing the COVID-19 pandemic. To evaluate
63 the impacts of the pandemic on stroke management, patients with acute stroke within
64 2 months before and after this time point were analyzed in this study. Acute stroke
65 was diagnosed based on clinical symptoms and CT or MRI scans. Patients who
66 reached the hospitals within 7 days after stroke onset were included. All participants
67 and their relatives provided written informed consent, and the study was approved by
68 the ethics committees of the participated hospital.

69 *Treatment Delay Assessment*

70 Demographic and clinical data were collected after hospitalization. Onset-to-door
71 time (ODT) was defined as the duration from stroke symptom onset or time last
72 known well to hospital arrival, which included awareness time, decision time and
73 transporting time. Decision time is defined as the duration from symptom onset to the
74 decision being made to go to hospital. Door-to-needle time (DNT) was defined as the
75 time from hospital arrival to the start of intravenous thrombolysis. For those who did
76 not meet the criteria of intravenous thrombolysis, DNT was based on a presumed
77 thrombolytic therapy of earliest possibility. Door-to-puncture (DPT) time was defined
78 as the duration from hospital arrival to groin puncture for mechanical thrombectomy.
79 For those who did not meet the criteria of mechanical thrombectomy, DPT was based
80 on a presumed mechanical thrombectomy of earliest possibility. Potential influencing

81 factors for treatment delay, such as residency, means of transportation and level of the
82 first visited hospital, were retrieved and analyzed. The severity of stroke was
83 measured with National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS). In this study, we
84 choose a 4.5 hours as the cut point for defining delayed treatment because that 4.5
85 hours is the accepted deadline for rt-PA intravenous thrombolysis at present [1].

86 *Statistical Analysis*

87 Continuous variables were expressed as mean± standard deviation (SD) or median
88 and interquartile range (IQR) as appropriate. Categorical variables were presented as
89 frequency and percentage. Continuous variables with normal distribution were
90 compared using the Student's t-test. The Chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used
91 for comparing categorical values. Multiple-variable stepwise logistic regression was
92 used to determine the main influencing factors of treatment delay. A two sided *P*
93 value of <0.05 was deemed as statistical significance. All statistical analyses were
94 performed using SPSS 25.

95 **Results**

96 A total of 267 patients were included during the described time frames, of which 161
97 (60.3%) were arrived before and 106 (39.7%) after the COVID-19 pandemic. The
98 mean age of the included patients was 69.1 ± 11.3 years, and 167 (62.5%) of them
99 were male. The median (IQR) NIHSS score at admission was 6 (3–13) in the
100 Pre-COVID-19 group and 8 (5–16) in the Post-COVID-19 group ($P=0.040$). However,
101 no significant differences concerning age, sex, residence, education level, stroke
102 subtypes and comorbidities were detected between patients arrived before and after
103 the COVID-19 pandemic (**Table 1**).

104 The ODT, a proxy of pre-hospital delay, was significantly longer in post- than
105 pre-COVID-19 pandemic patients (317 [IQR 65-790] vs 202 [IQR 25-492] min;
106 $P=0.010$). The decision time for patients after the COVID-19 pandemic was
107 significantly longer than that of those before COVID-19 pandemic (129 [IQR 55-430]
108 vs 244 [IQR 80-710] min, $P<0.001$). Time used for transportation was similar
109 between patients before and after the COVID-19 pandemic (67 [IQR 33-88] vs 73
110 [IQR 31-93] min; $P=0.316$). DNT was prolonged significantly after the
111 implementation of anti-pandemic strategies (65 [IQR 48-84] vs 50 [IQR 40-75] min,
112 $P=0.048$). The proportion of patients from onset to treatment within 4.5 hours was
113 significantly decreased after the COVID-19 pandemic (29.0% vs 34.8%, $P=0.032$).
114 The proportion of patients with intravenous thrombolysis in those with acute ischemic
115 stroke was decreased significantly after the pandemic (15.4% vs 20.1%; $P=0.030$).
116 While the proportion of patients with mechanical thrombectomy in those with acute
117 ischemic stroke remained unchanged (12.1% vs 15.7%, $P=0.115$, **Table 1**).

118 When compared with patients who arrived hospital within 4.5 hours ($\text{ONT} \leq$
119 4.5 hours), those who arrived hospital latter ($\text{ONT} >4.5\text{h}$) had lower education level

120 (elementary education: 18.4% vs 37.2%, $P=0.018$), more likely lived in rural areas
121 (26.4% vs 33.9%, $P=0.044$), less likely had hemorrhagic stroke (18.4% vs 14.4%,
122 $P=0.041$), had lower NIHSS scores (8 vs 3, $P=0.031$), less likely transferred by EMS
123 (43.7% vs 16.1%, $P<0.001$), more likely had self-management after stroke onset (9.2%
124 vs 87.8%, $P<0.001$), and more likely had stroke after the COVID-19 pandemic (27.6%
125 vs 45.6%, $P=0.031$, **Table 2**).

126 **Table 3** presents the potential influencing factors for delayed treatment
127 (ONT>4.5h) by multivariate logistic regression analysis. Compared with patients
128 before COVID-19 pandemic, patients after COVID-19 pandemic had an OR of 1.52
129 (95% CI, 1.02–2.94) for treatment delay. Compared with patients with advanced
130 education, those with elementary education had an odds of 1.41 (95% CI, 1.08–2.31)
131 for treatment delay. Compared with patients living in urban, those living in rural area
132 had an odds of 1.20 (95% CI, 1.01–1.42) for treatment delay. Patients who firstly
133 chose to self-manage stroke after onset had an OR of 2.03 (95% CI, 1.40–3.76) for
134 treatment delay. Patients transported by EMS had an OR of 0.76 (95% CI, 0.68–0.86)
135 for treatment delay. Patients with baseline NIHSS >10 had an OR of 0.64 (95% CI,
136 0.45–0.89) for treatment delay.

137 **Discussion**

138 The current study highlights the impact of COVID-19 pandemic on treatment delay in
139 patients with acute stroke. ODT and DTN were significantly prolonged, and
140 proportion of patients arrived within the time window for intravenous thrombolysis
141 was significantly decreased after COVID pandemic.

142 During COVID-19, patients may be reluctant to seek medical help for fear of
143 being infected. Patients with mild symptoms may stay at home and managing stroke
144 be themselves or their relatives. This speculation was partly confirmed by the higher
145 NIHSS score in post-COVID-19. A similar pattern of delay in seeking medical care
146 due to fear of being infected within the hospitals was observed in the Ebola epidemic
147 in West Africa [6].

148 During the COVID-19 pandemic, the onset to needle time was significantly
149 prolonged than before. Traffic control during the pandemic may delay the patient
150 transportation. Social distance may influence the management of stroke patients.
151 Procedures for COVID-19 prevention, such as information inquiring concerning
152 travel and contact history, temperature measuring, chest X-ray or CT scanning,
153 coronavirus nucleic acid or antibody testing, blood cell counting, and
154 multidisciplinary consultation may all delay the management of stroke. On the other
155 hand, medical staff may need more time to wear protective devices before they could
156 manage stroke patients during the COVID-19 pandemic.

157 This study associated higher NIHSS score with shorter pre-hospital delay. This
158 is consistent with some previous studies [7, 8], but not with others [9]. Patients with
159 severe symptoms may be more obvious to be identified, but severe symptoms may
160 render patients from seeking for help when alone. Transferred with ambulance was
161 associated with shorter pre-hospital delay [10-13]. Early awareness of stroke onset

162 and rapid response are crucial to shorten the treatment delay [14, 15]. Previous studies
163 [16] indicated that major factors for pre-hospital delay included unawareness of stroke
164 symptoms, lack of understanding on importance of early response, and lack of
165 knowledge on early management. Previous studies demonstrated that only 15.6% of
166 respondents knew stroke warning signs [17]. A large proportion of respondents think
167 that stroke symptoms may not warrant emergent management [18].

168 Several limitations should be addressed when interpreting the results of current
169 study. Firstly, patients were enrolled outside the epicenter of COVID-19 pandemic in
170 China, which may have under-estimated the impacts of the pandemic on stroke
171 management. Secondly, with the accumulation of coping experiences, the impacts of
172 COVID-19 pandemic on stroke management may be relieved. Finally, although the
173 impacts of COVID-19 on intravenous thrombolysis and mechanical thrombectomy
174 were analyzed, the impacts on stroke outcomes (e.g. 90-day modified Rankin Scale)
175 were not analyzed.

176 In conclusion, COVID-19 pandemic has a remarkable influence on the
177 management of acute ischemic stroke. Both pre- and post-hospital delays were
178 prolonged significantly, and proportion of patient arrived within the 4.5-hour time
179 window for intravenous thrombolysis treatment was decreased. Given that
180 anti-COVID-19 measures are becoming medical routines, efforts are warranted to
181 shorten the delay so that stroke outcome could be improved in this complex time.

182
183
184

185

186 **Statement of Ethics**

187 Subjects (or their parents or guardians) have given their written informed consent for
188 being treated for IV tPA. The article is exempt from ethical committee approval since
189 IV tPA is considered the standard of care for treating AIS and there has been no
190 disclosure of the patients' information in this article.

191 **Funding Statement**

192 The work was supported by [National Natural Science Foundation of China] grant
193 numbers [81870947].

194 **Conflicts of Interest Statement**

195 None declared.

196 **Author Contributions**

197 SG and ZD: study design, interpretation of results and manuscript drafting. SG, YB
198 and HS: study design and interpretation of results. SG, ZD, YB, HS and XZ: data
199 collection. GX and SG: study design, statistical analysis and critical revision of
200 manuscript. SG: interpretation of results and critical revision of manuscript. GX and
201 XL have full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the
202 integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

203

204 **References**

- 205 1. Hacke W KM, Bluhmki E, Brozman M, et al. Thrombolysis with alteplase 3 to 4.5 hours
206 after acute ischemic stroke. *New England journal of medicine*. 2008;359(13):1317-29.
- 207 1. Hacke W KM, Bluhmki E, Brozman M, et al. Thrombolysis with alteplase 3 to 4.5 hours
208 after acute ischemic stroke. *New England journal of medicine*. 2008;359(13):1317-29.
- 209 2. Nogueira RG, Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, Bonafe A, Budzik RF, Bhuva P, et al.
210 Thrombectomy 6 to 24 Hours after Stroke with a Mismatch between Deficit and Infarct. *New*
211 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2018;378(1):11-21.
- 212 3. William J, Alejandro A, Teri A, Opeolu M, Nicholas C, Kyra B. 2018 Guidelines for the
213 Early Management of Patients with Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Stroke*. 2018;49:e6–e99.
- 214 4. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta bio-medica : Atenei*
215 *Parmensis*. 2020;91(1):157-60.
- 216 5. Yang B, Wang T, Chen J, Chen Y, Wang Y, Gao P, et al. Impact of the COVID-19
217 pandemic on the process and outcome of thrombectomy for acute ischemic stroke. *Journal of*
218 *NeuroInterventional Surgery*. 2020:neurintsurg-2020-016177.
- 219 6. McQuilkin P, Udhayashankar K, Niescierenko M, Maranda L. Health-Care Access during
220 the Ebola Virus Epidemic in Liberia. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*.
221 2017;97(3):931-6.
- 222 7. Jin H, Zhu S, Wei JW, Wang J, Liu M, Wu Y, et al. Factors associated with prehospital
223 delays in the presentation of acute stroke in urban China. *Stroke*. 2012;43(2):362-70.
- 224 8. Fang J, Yan W, Jiang GX, Li W, Cheng Q. Time interval between stroke onset and
225 hospital arrival in acute ischemic stroke patients in Shanghai, China. *Clinical neurology and*

- 226 neurosurgery. 2011;113(2):85-8.
- 227 9. Huang Q, Ma QF, Jia JP, Feng J, Cheng WY, Chang H, et al. Referral leads to
228 prehospital delay of intravenous thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke in Beijing.
229 International journal of stroke : official journal of the International Stroke Society.
230 2015;10(7):E80-1.
- 231 10. Minnerup J, Wersching H, Unrath M, Berger K. Effects of emergency medical service
232 transport on acute stroke care. European journal of neurology. 2014;21(10):1344-7.
- 233 11. Jiang B, Ru X, Sun H, Liu H, Sun D, Liu Y, et al. Pre-hospital delay and its associated
234 factors in first-ever stroke registered in communities from three cities in China. Scientific
235 reports. 2016;6(1).
- 236 12. Yang H, Zhang J, Xie J, Yang C, Dong X, Gong Y, et al. Factors influencing pre-hospital
237 delay among acute ischemic stroke patients in the midlands of China. International journal of
238 cardiology. 2014;172(2):533-4.
- 239 13. Price C, Rae V, Duckett J, Wood R, Gray J, McMeekin P, et al. An observational study of
240 patient characteristics associated with the mode of admission to acute stroke services in
241 North East, England. PloS one. 2013;8(10):e76997.
- 242 14. Bouckaert M, Lemmens R, Thijs V. Reducing prehospital delay in acute stroke. Nature
243 reviews Neurology. 2009;5(9):477-83.
- 244 15. Mattew J. Reducing the Delay Between Stroke Onset and Hospital Arrival: Is It an
245 Achievable Goal? Journal of the American Heart Association. 2012;1:e002477
- 246 16. Sun H, Chen S, Jiang B, Zhao X, Wu S, Liu Y, et al. Public knowledge of stroke in
247 Chinese urban residents: a community questionnaire study. Neurological research.

248 2011;33(5):536-40.

249 17. Yang J, Zheng M, Cheng S, Ou S, Zhang J, Wang N, et al. Knowledge of stroke

250 symptoms and treatment among community residents in Western Urban China. Journal of

251 stroke and cerebrovascular diseases : the official journal of National Stroke Association.

252 2014;23(5):1216-24.

253 18. Le Bonniec A, Haesebaert J, Derex L, Porthault S, Preau M, Schott AM. Why Patients

254 Delay Their First Contact with Health Services After Stroke? A Qualitative Focus

255 Group-Based Study. PloS one. 2016;11(6):e0156933.

256

257

Table 1. Characteristics and treatment delay of stroke patients before and after COVID-19 pandemic

Characteristics	Pre-COVID-19 (n=161)	Post-COVID-19 (n=106)	<i>P</i> Value
Age, year, mean	69.5±11.1	70.1±12.2	0.334
Male gender, n (%)	97 (60.2)	70(66.0)	0.133
Education, n (%)			0.242
Elementary education	48 (29.8)	35 (33.0)	
Secondary education	90 (55.9)	59 (55.6)	
Higher education	23 (14.3)	12 (11.4)	
Residence, n (%)			0.411
Urban	108 (67.1)	75 (70.8)	
Rural	53 (32.9)	31 (29.2)	
Stroke subtype, n (%)			0.532
Ischemic stroke	134 (83.2)	91 (85.8)	
Hemorrhagic stroke	27 (16.8)	15 (14.2)	
NIHSS, median (IQR)	6 (3-13)	8 (5-16)	0.040
Stroke history, n (%)	35 (21.7)	24 (22.6)	0.871
Hypertension, n (%)	103 (67.0)	67 (63.2)	0.642
Diabetes, n (%)	72 (44.7)	50 (47.2)	0.556
Hyperlipidemia, n (%)	53 (32.9)	33 (31.1)	0.734
Atrial fibrillation, n (%)	18 (11.1)	14 (13.2)	0.799
Coronary heart disease, n (%)	22 (13.6)	18 (17.0)	0.677
Smoking, n (%)	75 (46.6)	43 (40.5)	0.143
Alcohol drinking, n (%)	55 (34.1)	40 (37.7)	0.400
ODT, median (IQR) min	202 (25-492)	317 (65-790)	0.010
Decision time	129 (55-430)	244 (80-710)	<0.001
Transportation	73 (31-93)	67 (33-88)	0.316
DTN, median (IQR) min	50 (40-75)	65 (48-84)	0.048
Onset to treatment within 4.5h, %	56 (34.8)	31 (29.0)	0.032
Intravenous thrombolysis, %*	27 (20.1)	14 (15.4)	0.030
Mechanical thrombectomy, %*	21 (15.7)	11 (12.1)	0.115

IQR indicates interquartile range; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale;

ODT, onset-to door time; DTN, door-to-needle time.

*Patients with ischemic stroke.

Table 2. Influencing factors for delayed treatment

Characteristics	Onset-to-needle time		P Value
	≤4.5 hour (n=87)	>4.5 hour (n=180)	
Age, y, mean	67.5±12.2	70.1±11.8	0.134
Male gender, n (%)	56 (64.4)	111 (61.6)	0.736
Education, n (%)			0.018
Elementary education	16 (18.4)	67 (37.2)	
Secondary education	50 (57.5)	99 (55.0)	
Higher education	21 (24.1)	14 (7.8)	
Residence, n (%)			0.044
Urban	64 (73.6)	119 (66.1)	
Rural	23 (26.4)	61 (33.9)	
Stroke subtype, n (%)			0.041
Ischemic stroke	71 (81.6)	154 (85.6)	
Hemorrhagic stroke	16 (18.4)	26 (14.4)	
NIHSS at admission, median (IQR)	8 (3-14)	3 (2-7)	0.031
Stroke history, n (%)	21 (24.1)	38 (21.1)	0.523
Hypertension, n (%)	58 (66.6)	112 (62.2)	0.278
Diabetes, n (%)	39 (44.8)	73 (40.6)	0.298
Hyperlipidemia, n (%)	27 (31.0)	59 (32.7)	0.776
Atrial fibrillation, n (%)	13 (14.9)	19 (10.6)	0.165
Coronary heart disease, n (%)	14 (14.9)	28 (15.6)	0.679
Current smoker, n (%)	42 (48.3)	76 (42.2)	0.108
Regular drinker, n (%)	34 (39.1)	61 (33.9)	0.182
Self-management after onset, n (%)	8 (9.2)	158 (87.8)	<0.001
Transporting by EMS, n (%)	38 (43.7)	29 (16.1)	<0.001
Post-COVID-19 period, n (%)	24 (27.6)	82 (45.6)	0.035

IQR, interquartile range; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; EMS,

emergency medical services.

Table 3. Multivariate logistic regression analysis of influencing factors for delayed treatment (ONT>4.5h)

Variables	OR	95% CI	<i>P</i>
Elementary vs higher education	1.41	1.08-2.31	0.045
Rural vs urban residency	1.20	1.01-1.42	0.030
NIHSS > 10 vs ≤10	0.64	0.45-0.89	<0.001
Self-management after onset	2.03	1.40-3.76	<0.001
Transporting by ambulance vs other means	0.76	0.68-0.86	0.038
Onset after COVID-19 pandemic	1.52	1.02-2.94	0.010

ONT indicates onset-to-needle time; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale.