Pontine Infarction: A Prospective Cohort Study on Its Clinical Features, Prognosis, and Association with Branch Atheromatous Disease

Authors:

Ryota Motoie, MD; Kotaro Ono, MD; Hiroshi Oketani MD; Yosuke Kawano, MD; Shintaro Nagaoka, MD; Kazushi Maeda, MD; Yoshio Suyama, MD, PhD; Hidefuku Gi, MD, PhD, Yukihide Kanemoto, MD, PhD

Affiliations:

Baba Memorial Hospital, 4-244, Hamaderafunaochohigashi, Nishi-ku Sakai-shi, Osaka, 592-8341, Japan; 072-265-5558

Corresponding author: Ryota Motoie MD

E-mail: motoie3ryota@gmail.com

Phone number: +819039453006

Abstract

Introduction: This study aimed to analyse disease characteristics and prognostic factors among a cohort of 407 patients with pontine infarction, focusing on the effect of branch atheromatous disease (BAD).

Patients and Methods: A retrospective analysis of patients diagnosed with brainstem stroke at Baba Memorial Hospital from 2012 to 2022 was conducted. The study included patients with pontine stroke, excluding those with missing data, chronic or multiple cerebral infarctions, non-brainstem stroke, or without timely MRI. Patient analysis involved age, sex, Japan Coma Scale (JCS) score, medical history, symptoms at admission, and MRI findings. Prognostic groups were classified based on the modified Rankin Scale (mRS) and Functional Independence Measure (FIM) scores at admission and discharge.

Results: Of the 407 patients, 66.1% belonged to the good prognosis group (mRS 0–2) and 33.9% to the poor prognosis group (mRS 35). Younger patients tended to have a better prognosis. JCS scores correlated with prognosis severity. Significant differences in dysarthria, paralysis, and admission FIM scores were observed between patients with and without BAD. Logistic regression analysis identified the FIM score at admission as an independent predictor of prognosis.

Discussion: BAD was not directly related to prognosis. The absence of differences in discharge FIM scores and similar prognoses to other stroke types suggested effective rehabilitation. However, due to the lack of pre-stroke FIM measurements and specific treatment details, further research is needed.

Conclusion: Age and JCS scores were significant prognostic factors, with BAD not directly affecting prognosis. There is need for investigation into treatment methods and detailed prognostic factors.

Keywords: branch atheromatous disease, Functional Independence Measure score, Japan Coma Scale score, pontine infarction, stroke

Background

Despite the availability of studies on brainstem infarction, comprehensive studies specifically focusing on pontine infarction, especially single-facility continuous case series, remain scarce. While pontine infarction generally has a relatively favourable prognosis, certain cases demonstrate increased risk and poor outcomes.[1,2]

Pontine infarction frequently involves branch atheromatous disease (BAD), a specific type of small vessel disease; however, research in this area remains inadequate. BAD primarily occurs in the basal ganglia and pons, indicating the involvement of the lenticulostriate artery (LSA) and paramedian pontine artery (PPA).[3,4] An important event influencing prognosis is the early neurological deterioration (END), which is a characteristic feature of BAD.[5] Hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidaemia, and smoking have been identified as risk factors for END in BAD within the LSA region; however, the individual contribution of each factor remains unclear.[6, 7] Despite accumulating studies on the characteristics and treatment of BAD in the LSA-related basal ganglia region, research on pontine infarction involving PPA has been limited.[8, 9]

Herein, we report the results of a prospective cohort study, focusing on the characteristics, prognosis, and prognosis-determining rehabilitation aspects of pontine infarction inclusive of BAD.

Patients and Methods

Patients

We identified 751 patients diagnosed with brainstem stroke, including midbrain, pons, and medulla oblongata infarctions, from the electronic medical records of the Baba Memorial Hospital(Sakai-shi, Japan) from 2012 to 2022. We excluded cases with missing data (26 cases), chronic brainstem infarctions (26 cases), multiple cerebral infarctions, including basilar artery occlusions (62 cases), non-brainstem stroke (92 cases), cases without magnetic resonance imaging

(MRI) within 3 d of hospitalisation (38 cases), and asymptomatic cases (15 cases). Finally, a focused analysis was conducted on 407 pontine stroke cases, excluding 84 non-pontine brainstem stroke cases (Figure 1). All medical records were stored in the electronic database of the Baba Memorial Hospital. The institutional clinical medical ethics committee of Baba Memorial Hospital approved this study (2024-01). All patients or their relatives provided written informed consent before treatment.

Study Design and Population

The collected clinical information of patients included age, sex, initial Japan Coma Scale (JCS) score, medical history (hypertension, diabetes mellitus, dyslipidaemia, and stroke), history of antithrombotic drug use, symptoms at admission (ataxia, dysarthria, and hemiparesis), smoking history, daily drinking habits, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) findings indicating BAD at or around the time of admission. The discharge modified Rankin Scale (mRS) and functional independence measure (FIM) scores at admission and discharge were also obtained.

BAD was defined as high signal intensity in the basal part of the pons on diffusion-weighted imaging.[10] Prognostic groups were classified based on discharge mRS scores, with a mRS score of 0–2 indicating favourable prognosis and a score of 3–6 indicating poor prognosis.[11]

FIM scores were assessed by clinicians at admission and discharge. The FIM scoring system was developed in 1983 by the American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine and the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation[12] and comprises 13 items assessing physical function and five items evaluating cognitive function; each item is scored from 1 to 7. This scoring system facilitates the precise assessment of the daily activities of a patient, making it a frequently used tool for determining the effectiveness of rehabilitation and predicting outcomes.[13,14]

In this study, patients with brainstem infarction were stratified into groups with favourable

and poor prognoses. Univariate analysis was conducted to delineate the background characteristics of each group. Subsequently, based on previous studies, logistic regression analysis was utilised to assess the extent to which various prognostic factors influence the likelihood of patient outcomes.[15–19]

In addition, this study aimed to determine whether pontine infarction with BAD leads to worse prognosis, similar to cases with BAD in the basal ganglia, by comparing patients with and without BAD. To compare patient backgrounds, variables such as age, sex, medical history (hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidaemia, and stroke), lifestyle habits (smoking and regular alcohol use), symptoms at admission (paralysis, ataxia, and dysarthria), length of hospital stay, and FIM scores at admission and discharge were analysed. Given the lack of clarity on risk factors for BAD, multivariate analysis was conducted to identify independent risk factors, based on previous studies.[5,20]

Most patient data are expressed as categorical variables, except for age and FIM scores, which are expressed as continuous variables. All groups were tested using Fisher's exact test for categorical variables or Mann-Whitney U test for continuous variables. All statistical analyses were performed using R (version 4.3.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). A P-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Baba Memorial Hospital and was reported following the Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology statement.

Figure 1. Flow diagram of the study selection process.

Results

Comparison between Groups with Good and Poor Prognosis

In this analysis of 407 patients with brainstem stroke, 269 (66.1 %) were classified in the good prognosis group (mRS 0–2) and 138 (33.9 %) in the poor prognosis group (mRS 3–5). Notably, we observed that patients in the good prognosis group were younger, with a median age of 72 years (interquartile range [IQR], 65–79 years), than those in the poor prognosis group, with a median age of 79 years (IQR, 70–85 years) ($p < 0.001$).

When examining prognosis in relation to JCS scores, we detected that 24.6 % of patients with a JCS of 0 were in the good prognosis category, whereas 53.5 % were in the poor prognosis category. We observed a trend in which an increase in JCS score corresponded to a decrease in the rate of good prognosis and an increase in the rate of poor prognosis. This was especially pronounced in patients with high JCS scores, who exhibited a markedly lower rate of good prognosis and a significantly higher rate of poor prognosis ($p < 0.001$).

In terms of medical history, we identified that the prevalence of hypertension, dyslipidaemia, and diabetes was not significantly different between the two groups. However, we noticed that a prior history of stroke was more prevalent in the poor prognosis group (20.4 % vs 34.1 %, $p = 0.004$). With respect to symptoms at admission, we did not observe any significant differences in the occurrence of dysarthria and ataxia between the groups. Nevertheless, the incidence of paralysis was notably lower in the good prognosis group (53.9 % vs 65.9 %, $p = 0.02$) (Table 1).

In logistic regression analysis, we considered various factors as independent variables: age, sex, presence of BAD, hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidaemia, smoking history, habitual alcohol consumption, and FIM score at admission. Our analysis revealed that the FIM score at admission was the sole independent predictive factor (admission FIM odds ratio [OR] = 1.060, 95 % confidence interval [CI] = 1.050–1.070) (Table 2). Utilising this model to determine the optimal cutoff point (cutoff = 0.568), we identified that the admission FIM threshold was 60.39. This

threshold demonstrated a sensitivity of 93.0 % and specificity of 76.0 % in predicting prognosis (Figure 2).

In BAD analysis, we identified that out of the total cohort, 119 (29.2 %) patients had BAD, whereas 288 (70.8 %) did not exhibit BAD. Our analysis revealed no significant differences in age and sex between the BAD and non-BAD groups. Notably, we observed that the BAD group presented a higher incidence of paralysis and dysarthria compared with those in the non-BAD group (paralysis: 70.6 % vs 52.8 %, $p = 0.001$; dysarthria: 76.5 % vs 59.4 %, $p = 0.001$). Additionally, we determined that the FIM score at admission was significantly lower in the BAD than in the non-BAD group ($p < 0.001$). However, we did not observe any differences in the discharge FIM scores or duration of hospital stay between the two groups. The results of mRS comparison between BAD and non-BAD groups showed no significant differences (Figure 3).

In the multivariate analysis, we evaluated variables such as age, underlying diseases, and presenting symptoms as independent factors for the occurrence of BAD. However, we did not definitively find a direct association of these factors with the development of BAD (Table 3).

Discussion

The cohort of 407 patients in this study was divided into different prognosis groups, with 66.1 % classified into the good prognosis category (mRS 0–2) and 33.9 % into the poor prognosis category (mRS 3–5), as shown in Table 1. A statistically significant younger median age was observed in the good prognosis group (72 years) than that in the poor prognosis group (79 years) ($p < 0.001$). This suggested a tendency for younger patients to have a better prognosis. Reflecting upon the findings of a study from 2016, which indicated that approximately 63 % of patients with stroke over the age of 70 were discharged home, our data implied that the prognosis for patients with pontine infarction may be similar to, or potentially better than that for patients with other types of strokes.[21]

Analysis of the JCS scores revealed a trend in which an increase in severity was associated with a higher likelihood of poor prognosis, indicating that the JCS score is a reliable indicator of stroke severity. Regarding medical history, we observed that the incidences of hypertension, dyslipidaemia, and diabetes were not significantly different between groups. However, it is noteworthy that a history of stroke was more commonly observed in the poor prognosis group ($p = 0.004$). Among admission symptoms, hemiplegia emerged as a significant factor influencing prognosis ($p = 0.02$), highlighting the need for further investigation into the relationship between stroke history and hemiplegia in future studies.

Several factors were considered in the logistic regression analysis, with the FIM score at admission standing out as an independent predictor of prognosis (OR = 1.060, 95 % CI = 1.050–1.070). Nevertheless, caution is warranted in interpreting these results due to the lack of pre-stroke FIM score measurements. This suggested a probable trend in which patients with more severe conditions are likely to experience poorer prognoses; though further validation is necessary. The study model calculated a cutoff point for the admission FIM score of 60.39, exhibiting a sensitivity of 93.0 % and a specificity of 76.0 %. This finding implied that an admission FIM score above 61

could serve as a useful independent predictor of prognosis; however, additional investigations are required to verify its potential in clinical application.

The general prognosis of BAD is typically poor, as established in prior studies.[9,12] Consequently, this study posited that BAD might contribute to a poor prognosis in pontine infarction cases. Contrary to this hypothesis, the findings of this study revealed no correlation between BAD and prognosis. For a more nuanced understanding of BAD, patients were categorised into two groups based on the presence or absence of BAD. Subsequent univariate analysis yielded significant differences in the prevalence of dysarthria and paralysis, as well as in the FIM scores at admission, between patients with and without BAD (Table 3). However, no significant differences were observed in the FIM scores at discharge between the two groups. This indicated that while dysarthria and paralysis in pontine infarction with BAD may contribute to lower FIM scores at admission, these disparities tend to diminish by discharge, likely due to effective rehabilitation. Given the scarcity of specific literature on pontine infarction, direct comparison with existing studies is challenging. Nonetheless, this investigation, focusing on BAD in the pontine region, suggested that the presence of BAD does not influence prognosis, aligning with the results of previous studies that based prognosis on MRI findings.[22] This outcome could be hypothesised to result from successful BAD treatment in the pontine region; however, as the treatment aspect was not specifically examined in this study, this explanation remains speculative. Further research is warranted to delve into these aspects.

Conclusion

This study, which focused on prognostic factors in a cohort of 407 patients with stroke, identified age as a significant determinant. Additionally, analysis of the JCS scores revealed a correlation between higher severity and poorer prognosis. Notably, the presence or absence of BAD

did not directly impact prognosis, suggesting the potential effectiveness of rehabilitation. However, the specifics of the treatment methods used remain undefined, underscoring the necessity for further investigation in this area.

Limitations

The treatment of pontine infarction was not specifically investigated; therefore, potential variations in treatment modalities and their outcomes remain unexplored. Additionally, the impact of END on prognosis has not been established due to a lack of research in this area. Consequently, further research is essential to elucidate the characteristics and prognosis of pontine infarction, particularly in relation to BAD.

Declarations

Conflicting interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Informed consent and Ethical approval

The institutional clinical medical ethics committee of Baba Memorial Hospital approved this study (2024-01). All patients or their relatives provided written informed consent before treatment.

Guarantor

RM

Contributorship

RM wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments:

We express our profound gratitude to the SCU staff and Medical Information Management Department of the Baba Memorial Hospital.

References

1. Kumral E, Bayülkem G, Evyapan D. Clinical spectrum of pontine infarction. Clinical-MRI correlations. *J Neurol*. 2002;249(12):1659-1670.

2. Oh S, Bang OY, Chung CS, Lee KH, Chang WH, Kim GM. Topographic location of acute pontine infarction is associated with the development of progressive motor deficits. *Stroke*. 2012;43(3):708-713.

3. Intracranial branch atheromatous disease: A neglected, understudied, and underused concept: Neurology: Vol 39, No 9. Neurology. Accessed December 22, 2023. https://www.neurology.org/doi/abs/10.1212/WNL.39.9.1246

4. H P AdamsJr, B H Bendixen, L J Kappelle, J Biller, B B Love, D L Gordon and E E Marsh3rd. Classification of subtype of acute ischemic stroke. Definitions for use in a multicenter clinical trial. TOAST. Trial of Org 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment. *StrokeVolume 24, Issue 1*. 1993;24(1):35-41.

5. Petrone L, Nannoni S, Del Bene A, Palumbo V, Inzitari D. Branch Atheromatous Disease: A Clinically Meaningful, Yet Unproven Concept. *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2016;41(1-2):87-95.

6. Nakase T, Yamazaki T, Ogura N, Suzuki A, Nagata K. The impact of inflammation on the pathogenesis and prognosis of ischemic stroke. *J Neurol Sci*. 2008;271(1-2):104-109.

7. Kwan MWM, Mak W, Cheung RTF, Ho SL. Ischemic stroke related to intracranial branch atheromatous disease and comparison with large and small artery diseases. *J Neurol Sci*. 2011;303(1-2):80-84.

8. Deguchi I, Takahashi S. Pathophysiology and Optimal Treatment of Intracranial Branch

Atheromatous Disease. *J Atheroscler Thromb*. 2023;30(7):701-709.

9. Ha SH, Jeong S, Park JY, et al. Association between arterial tortuosity and early neurological deterioration in lenticulostriate artery infarction. *Sci Rep*. 2023;13(1):19865.

10. Deguchi I, Hayashi T, Kato Y, et al. Treatment outcomes of tissue plasminogen activator infusion for branch atheromatous disease. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2013;22(7):e168-72.

11. Banks JL, Marotta CA. Outcomes validity and reliability of the modified Rankin scale: implications for stroke clinical trials: a literature review and synthesis. *Stroke*. 2007;38(3):1091-1096.

12. Men X, Hu M, Guo Z, et al. Culprit plaques of large parent arteries, rather than cerebral small vessel disease, contribute to early neurological deterioration in stroke patients with intracranial branch atheromatous disease. *Cerebrovasc Dis*. Published online March 30, 2023. doi:10.1159/000530371

13. Sonoda S, Tsubahara A, Tajiri H, et al. Functional Evaluation after Stroke Using the FIM (Functional Independence Measure). *The Japanese Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*. 1992;29(3):217-222.

14. Gueye T, Dedkova M, Rogalewicz V, Grunerova-Lippertova M, Angerova Y. Early post-stroke rehabilitation for upper limb motor function using virtual reality and exoskeleton: equally efficient in older patients. *Neurol Neurochir Pol*. 2021;55(1):91-96.

15. Iosa M, Morone G, Antonucci G, Paolucci S. Prognostic Factors in Neurorehabilitation of Stroke: A Comparison among Regression, Neural Network, and Cluster Analyses. *Brain Sci*. 2021;11(9). doi:10.3390/brainsci11091147

16. Faraji F, Ghasami K, Talaie-Zanjani A, Mohammadbeigi A. Prognostic factors in acute stroke, regarding to stroke severity by Canadian Neurological Stroke Scale: A hospital-based study. *Asian J Neurosurg*. 2013;8(2):78-82.

17. Sennfält S, Norrving B, Petersson J, Ullberg T. Long-Term Survival and Function After Stroke: A Longitudinal Observational Study From the Swedish Stroke Register. *Stroke*. 2019;50(1):53-61.

18. Lee TK, Huang ZS, Ng SK, et al. Impact of alcohol consumption and cigarette smoking on stroke among the elderly in Taiwan. *Stroke*. 1995;26(5):790-794.

19. Mukamal KJ. The effects of smoking and drinking on cardiovascular disease and risk factors. *Alcohol Res Health*. 2006;29(3):199-202.

20. Tokuda K, Hanada K, Takebayashi T, Koyama T, Fujita T, Okita Y. Factors associated with prognosis of upper limb function in branch atheromatous disease. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*. 2022;218:107267.

21. Dutrieux RD, van Eijk M, van Mierlo ML, van Heugten CM, Visser-Meily JMA, Achterberg WP. Discharge home after acute stroke: Differences between older and younger patients. *J Rehabil Med*. 2016;48(1):14-18.

22. Zhao FL, Mi DH, Zhang CQ, et al. A cohort study of isolated brainstem infarction based on head MR imaging and clinical findings. *J Int Med Res*. 2018;46(12):4974-4984.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Favorable versus Unfavorable Outcomes in in Pontine Infarction

	All patients	**Good prognosis (mRS 0-2)**	**Poor prognosis (mRS 3-5)**	***p* Value**
Number (%)	407	269 (66.1)	138 (33.9)	
Sex (%), male	278	87 (63.0)	191 (71.0)	0.115
Age, median (IQR)	76 (54-93)	72 (65-79]	79 (70-85)	<0.001
BAD	119	70 (26.0)	49 (35.5)	0.660
JCS (%)				
0		34 (24.6)	144 (53.5)	<0.001
1		99 (36.8)	42 (30.4)	
2		17 (6.3)	34 (24.6)	
3		8 (3.0)	19 (13.8)	
10		1 (0.4)	5 (3.6)	
20		0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	
100		0 (0.0)	1 (0.7)	
200		0 (0.0)	2 (1.4)	
Hypertension (%)	266	178 (66.2)	88 (63.8)	0.914
Diabete mellitus (%)	161	108 (40.1)	53 (38.4)	0.749
Dyslipidemia (%)	76	56 (20.8)	20 (14.5)	0.140
pre-Stroke (%)	102	55 (20.4)	47 (34.1)	0.004
Smoking history (%)	192	62 (44.9)	130 (48.3)	0.531
Daily alcohol use (%)	136	100 (37.2)	36 (26.1)	0.027
Antithrombotic drugs (%)	113	68 (25.3)	45 (32.6)	0.129
Paralysis (%)	236	145 (53.9)	91 (65.9)	0.020
Ataxia (%)	25	18 (6.7)	7 (5.1)	0.664
Dysarthria (%)	262	175 (65.1)	87 (63.0)	0.83

BAD: Branched atheromatous disease; JCS: Japan Coma Scale; IQR: Interquartile range.

Table 2. Multivariate Analysis of Variables in Patients with Good prognosis versus Poor prognosis.

	OR	**SE**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Age	0.979	0.014	0.953-1.01	0.134
Sex	1.330	0.319	0.71-2.48	0.376
BAD	0.800	0.286	0.457-1.4	0.436
Hypertension	0.937	0.298	0.523-1.68	0.827
Diabetes mellitus	0.960	0.286	0.548-1.68	0.888
Dyslipidemia	1.310	0.368	0.638-2.7	0.460
Smoking history	0.657	0.317	0.353-1.22	0.185
Daily alcohol use	0.920	0.308	0.503-1.68	0.787
Admission FIM	1.060	0.007	1.05-1.08	<0.001

OR: Odds ratio; SE: Standard error; CI: Confidence limit; BAD: Branched atheromatous disease; JCS: Japan Coma Scale; FIM: Functional independence measure.

Multivariate Analyses of Variables in Patients with Brainstem Auditory Dysfunction (BAD) Versus Non-BA

		Univariate Analysis				Multivaria
	All patients	**BAD(-)**	**BAD(+)**	**p value**	**OR**	**SE**
	407	288(70.8)	119 (29.2)	-	-	-
	278	199 (69.1)	79 (66.4)	0.640	-	-
)	73 (67-81)	73 (66.0-81.0)	75 (68.0-82.0)	0.299	1.010	0.010
	266	189 (65.6)	77 (64.7)	0.909	1.040	0.237
	161	121 (42.0)	40 (33.6)	0.120	0.738	0.241
	76	54 (18.8)	22 (18.5)	1.000	1.060	0.290
	102	79 (27.4)	23 (19.3)	0.102	0.654	0.272
	192	141 (49.0)	51 (42.9)	0.277	-	-
	136	99 (34.4)	37 (31.1)	0.565	-	-
)	113	86 (29.9)	27 (22.7)	0.147	-	-
	236	152 (52.8)	84 (70.6)	0.001	-	-
	25	20 (6.90)	5 (4.20)	0.368	-	-
	262	171 (59.4)	91 (76.5)	0.001	-	-
IQR)	14 (9-19)	12 (9-17)	16 (11-24)	<0.001	-	-
(IQR)	76 (54-93)	79(56-94)	72 (52-87)	0.010	-	-
IQR)	102(77-115)	104 (80-116)	96 (75-114)	0.109	-	-


751 cases
(Jan 1, 2012- Dec 31, 2022)
Data Missing (n=27)
Chronic Brainstem infarctions (n=26)
Multiple infarctions (n=62)
Not brain stem infarctions (n=92)
No MRI within 3 Days (n=38)
Asymptomatic infarctions (n=15)
Not pons lesion (n=84)
Included in Analysis
(n=407)


Cutoff: 60.39
Sensitivity: 0.93
Specificity: 0.76
ROC curve
True Positive Rate
False Positive Rate
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0


Modified Rankin Score at discharge
mRS 0
mRS 1
mRS 2
mRS 3
mRS 4
mRS 5
mRS 6
non BAD (n=288)
14
147
38
16
66
6
BAD (n=119)
6
49
15
10
38
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%
70%
80%
90%
100%
Patients, %