



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

"\_"

---

## Is infarct core growth linear? Infarct volume estimation by computed tomography perfusion imaging

Suomalainen, Olli P.

John Wiley and Sons Inc

2022-06

---

Suomalainen, O P, Abou, A E, Martinez-Majander, N, Tiainen, M, Valkonen, K, Virtanen, P, Forss, N & Curtze, S 2022, 'Is infarct core growth linear? Infarct volume estimation by computed tomography perfusion imaging', *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica*, vol. 145, no. 6, pp. 684-691. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ane.13601>

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/354836>

10.1111/ane.13601

---

unspecified

acceptedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

1 Is infarct core growth linear? Infarct volume estimation by computed tomography perfusion imaging

2 Cover title: Follow-up infarct volume estimation by perfusion imaging

3 Authors: Olli P. Suomalainen<sup>1</sup>, MD; Ahmed Elseoud Abou<sup>2</sup>, MD, PhD; Nicolas Martinez-Majander<sup>1</sup>, MD, PhD; Marjaana Tiainen<sup>1</sup>, MD, PhD;

4 Kati Valkonen<sup>1</sup>, MD; Pekka Virtanen<sup>2</sup>, MD; Nina Forss<sup>1,3</sup>, MD, PhD; Sami Curtze<sup>1</sup>, MD, PhD

5 (1) Departments of Neurology and (2) Neuroradiology, Helsinki University Hospital and Clinical Neurosciences, University of Helsinki,

6 Helsinki, Finland, (3) Department of Neuroscience and Biomedical Engineering, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland

7 Corresponding Author: Olli Suomalainen, MD, Department of Neurology, Helsinki University Hospital; P.O. Box 340 (Haartmaninkatu 4), FI-

8 00029 HUS, Finland; , P.O. Box 340, E-mail: . olli.p.suomalainen@hus.fi.; Telephone: tel. +358-405568507

9 MESH key words: ischemic stroke, ischemic core, outcome, computed tomography, CT perfusion, endovascular thrombectomy

10 Word count: 3800, Tables 1 Figures 3

11

12 Objectives: Current guidelines for recanalization treatment are based on the time elapsed between symptom onset and treatment and  
13 visualization of existing penumbra in computed tomography perfusion (CTP) imaging. The time window for treatment options rely on linear  
14 growth of infarction although individual infarct growth rate may vary.

15 We aimed to test how accurately the estimated follow-up infarct volume (eFIV) can be approximated by using a linear growth model based on  
16 CTP baseline imaging. If eFIV did not fall within the margins of +/- 19% of the follow-up infarct volume (FIV) measured at 24 h from non-  
17 enhanced computed tomography images, the results would imply that the infarct growth is not linear.

18 Materials and Methods: All consecutive endovascularly treated (EVT) patients from 11/2015-9/2019 at the Helsinki University Hospital with  
19 large vessel occlusion (LVO), CTP imaging and known time of symptom onset were included. Infarct growth rate was assumed to be linear and  
20 calculated by dividing the ischemic core volume (CTP<sub>core</sub>) by the time from symptom onset to baseline imaging. eFIV was calculated by  
21 multiplying the infarct growth rate with the time from baseline imaging to recanalization or in case of futile recanalization to follow-up imaging  
22 at 24 h, limited to the penumbra. Collateral flow was estimated by calculating hypoperfusion intensity ratio (HIR).

23 Results: Of 5234 patients, 48 had LVO, EVT, CTP imaging and known time of symptom onset. In 40/48 patients (87%), infarct growth was not  
24 linear. HIR did not differ between patients with linear and non-linear growth ( $p>0.05$ ). As expected, in over half of the patients with successful  
25 recanalization eFIV exceeded FIV.

26 Conclusions: Infarct growth was not linear in most patients and thus time elapsed from symptom onset and CTP<sub>core</sub> appear to be insufficient  
27 parameters for clinical decision-making in EVT candidates.

## 28 Introduction

29 Patients with large vessel occlusion (LVO), small core infarct and salvageable penumbra are considered suitable for endovascular treatment  
30 (EVT).<sup>1,2,3</sup> Computed Tomography Perfusion (CTP) and comprehensive magnetic resonance imaging are recommended as selection tools for  
31 both intravenous thrombolysis (IVT) and EVT especially in acute stroke code patients presenting with symptoms more than 6 hours from stroke  
32 onset and in wake-up stroke patients. Patient selection for IVT and EVT in the prolonged time window utilizes cut-off values for the ischemic  
33 core and perfusion lesion volumes.<sup>1-4</sup>

34 Patient selection for acute recanalization treatments relies on time from symptom onset although the pace of ischemic core growth may vary  
35 individually.<sup>5,6,7,8</sup> Different guidelines concerning EVT are largely based on assumption of linear growth of the infarct and time from symptom  
36 onset beside volumes of ischemic core and perfusion lesion by CTP.<sup>1,2,3,9,10</sup> Hakimelahi et al have previously shown a poor correlation of infarct  
37 volume to time after stroke with comprehensive magnetic resonance imaging.<sup>10</sup>

38 The temporal evolution of ischemic lesion varies between individuals and hyperacute infarction growth depends on collaterals.<sup>7,8,10,11</sup> A CTP  
39 based imaging biomarker (hypoperfusion intensity ratio, HIR) has been shown to reflect collateral flow and eligibility for thrombectomy.<sup>12,13,14</sup>  
40 Further, patients with less robust collaterals and higher HIR values by CTP have been shown to develop larger infarcts than predicted at follow-

41 up imaging compared with more favorable HIR profile patients.<sup>15</sup> Although collateral flow may have an important effect on individual variance  
42 of ischemic core growth, other factors impacting ischemic core evolution remain poorly understood.<sup>9,14,17,17,18,19</sup>

43 As there are probably multiple factors affecting infarct core growth in addition to time, we wanted to test how often measured follow-up infarct  
44 volume (FIV) differs from estimated FIV (eFIV) from CTP baseline imaging with the linear growth model in acute stroke code patients treated  
45 with EVT. We aimed to determine whether baseline infarct growth rate alone could be used to prognosticate follow-up infarct volume from non-  
46 enhanced computed tomography (NCCT images).

## 47 Materials and Methods

48 A single-center, retrospective analysis was performed of imaging findings of all consecutive acute stroke patients (stroke code) from 17  
49 November 2015 to 30 September 2019 at Helsinki University Hospital (HUS) based on the Helsinki Stroke Quality Registry (HSQR). Ethical  
50 approval was not sought and informed consent was waived due to the retrospective nature of the study. This study was conducted in accordance  
51 with the Declaration of Helsinki as revised in 2013.

52 NCCT is the first-line imaging modality for stroke code patients in our hospital. The decision for multimodal imaging was made by the treating  
53 physician guided by our local guidelines which are in line with the current American Heart Association guidelines.<sup>1,2</sup> Visualization of penumbra  
54 by CTP is not usually required by the Helsinki protocol in the 0-6h time window for clinically obvious ischemic strokes.

55 Inclusion criteria were as follows:(1) patients presented to HUS with acute symptoms of stroke with a witnessed time of symptom onset (2)  
56 verified LVO (occlusion of a proximal anterior circulation artery occlusion; terminal internal carotid artery, proximal middle cerebral artery  
57 (MCA) [M1] or tandem occlusion (M1+terminal ICA)) on computed tomography angiography (CTA), (3) EVT of LVO, and (4) CTP imaging at  
58 baseline prior to any EVT therapy. The treating clinician decided whether to proceed to EVT based on clinical and radiological findings by  
59 applying our hospital guidelines. Recanalization was defined as modified on the Treatment in Cerebral Infarction (mTICI)) scale as successful  
60 (TICI 2b or 3) or futile (TICI 0,1,2a) and assessed by the performing interventional radiologist.<sup>20</sup>

61 Follow-up imaging of the brain at 24 h ( $\pm 6$  h) was available for all included patients. Demographic (sex, age) and clinical parameters  
62 (glucose,tandem occlusion), National Institute of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score at baseline and modified Rankin scale (mRS) at 3 months  
63 were registered. Favorable outcome was defined as mRS scores 0-2 and unfavorable outcome as scores 3-6.

#### 64 Imaging protocol

65 NCCT and CTP were performed on a Definition AS Siemens (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) 128-section scanner with slice thickness of 1 mm.  
66 The following parameters were used for the CTP acquisition: slice thickness of 5mm, collimator of  $32 \times 1.2$  mm, 70kVp and 135 mAs with total  
67 coverage of 100 mm. The plane of imaging was parallel to the floor of the anterior cranial fossa starting just above the orbits. Thirty cycles were  
68 obtained with a total scan time of 46 s. The CTP images were sent to RAPID® (iSchemaView Inc) to quantify ischemic core (CTP<sub>core</sub>) and  
69 volume of perfusion lesion (CTP<sub>penumbra</sub>).

70 The CTP<sub>core</sub> was defined as relative cerebral blood flow (CBF) below 30% of normal brain<sup>21</sup>. T<sub>max</sub> threshold of 6s was used as an estimate of  
71 tissue at risk of infarction in the absence of reperfusion (CTP<sub>penumbra</sub>)<sup>3</sup>. The volumes of CTP<sub>core</sub> and CTP<sub>penumbra</sub> were measured in milliliters (mL).  
72 Infarct growth rate was calculated by dividing baseline infarct core volume (CTP<sub>core</sub>) by the time difference from baseline imaging to onset of  
73 symptoms.

74 To test the accuracy of linear growth of infarction during the observed time course, we estimated the eFIV by multiplying the baseline infarct  
75 growth rate by the time difference from successful recanalization to onset of symptoms limited to CTP<sub>penumbra</sub>. A previous study by Campbell et  
76 al<sup>21</sup> has shown that relative CBF below 30% of normal with area under the curve of 0.81 is optimal for identifying infarct core using CTP  
77 compared with comprehensive magnetic resonance imaging. Based on this study, we assumed a +/- 19% accuracy to be sufficient for the eFIV  
78 assessment in comparison with FIV for linear growth of infarct. In case of futile recanalization baseline infarct growth was multiplied by the  
79 time to follow-up imaging or until eFIV reached the volume of CTP<sub>penumbra</sub>. In case of CTP<sub>core</sub> 0 mL at baseline imaging, CTP<sub>penumbra</sub> was divided  
80 by the time from baseline imaging to follow-up imaging (h) to approximate infarct growth rate. We calculated time (min) until linear infarct  
81 growth would result in a lesion consuming the whole penumbra (salvageable tissue time, CTP<sub>penumbra</sub>-CTP<sub>core</sub>/baseline infarct growth) in case of  
82 successful EVT after baseline imaging. The concept of ghost infarct core, in which CBF overestimates acute infarct core compared with FIV has  
83 been suggested by previous studies especially with hyperacute imaging.<sup>22-24</sup> Therefore, patients were divided into early (<100 min of symptom  
84 onset) and late imaging subgroups to examine the effect of imaging time among patients with linear and nonlinear infarct growth. As  
85 hypoperfusion intensity ratio (HIR) has been shown to reflect collateral flow, HIR (Tmax10s/Tmax6s) was calculated by CTP imaging.<sup>12-15</sup>

86 The neuroradiologist (AA) was blinded to any other imaging including RAPID software. He defined the territory and side of the infarction and  
87 measured semi-automatically the FIV from the follow-up NCCT by using the volume of interest (VOI) tool (syngo.via MM-Reading) and CT  
88 Neuro – workflow implemented in syngo.via (Siemens Healthineers). Ischemic changes were identified visually and marked as regions of  
89 interest (ROIs). Those ROIs had mean Hounsfield units (HU) ranging from 25 to 31, while normal cerebral parenchyma was measured at a  
90 mean >42 HU. The “create VOI tool” was applied to include all voxels situated within the afore mentioned threshold at different slices of the  
91 same infarction. Edges were manually adjusted when necessary.

## 92 Statistics

93 Descriptive statistics were performed using SPSS, version 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assure  
94 normality on continuous variables. Categorical variables are presented as absolute values and percentages, continuous variables as mean  $\pm$   
95 standard deviation (STD) if normally distributed or median (interquartile intervals, IQR) if not normally distributed. Statistical significance was  
96 assessed by using Mann-Whitney U-test and Pearson  $X^2$ -test. The absolute difference between eFIV and FIV and eFIV and  $CTP_{\text{penumbra}}$  was  
97 calculated. The association of HIR with the difference between eFIV and FIV was analyzed by linear regression model. A p value less than 0.05  
98 was defined as statistically significant.

## 99 Results

100

101 We screened 5254 consecutive acute stroke code patients (Figure 1). Of these, 209 (4%) had EVT due to LVO, 116 (56%) of whom had CTP  
102 baseline imaging available. Five patients with both CTP baseline imaging and LVO had to be excluded due to technical problems in RAPID  
103 output. One patient died after EVT and was excluded from analysis because of missing follow-up imaging data. Sixty-two patients with eligible  
104 CTP imaging and LVO were excluded as exact time of symptom onset was unknown.

105 The final analysis consisted of 48 LVO patients who had undergone EVT with CTP baseline imaging and had known time from symptom onset  
106 (Table 1). Of these, 25 (51%) had EVT and IVT and 23 (49%) EVT alone. In 13 patients (27%), IVT was initiated prior to baseline CTP  
107 imaging. Baseline CTP imaging and follow-up NCCT imaging in this cohort were done at HUS in all cases. The FIV was measured from follow-  
108 up NCCT at 24 h (median 23.9, IQR 22.1-25.7) after baseline imaging. Cohort characteristics and process measures are shown in Table 1.  
109 Median infarct growth rate was 11 mL/h (IQR 3-38) and median HIR 0.46 (0.15-0.60). Of 48 recanalization attempts, 42 (88%) were successful  
110 and 6 (12%) futile. Four patients (10%) with successful recanalization had baseline infarct growth rate of 0 mL/h.

111 Figure 2 illustrates examples of linear (A) and nonlinear (B) infarct core growth<sup>7,9,11</sup>. Figure 2A illustrates linear growth model in a 57-year-old  
112 male patient with M1-occlusion and successful recanalization. In this patient eFIV accurately predicted FIV and salvageable tissue time in  
113 minutes agreed with linear infarct core growth. Figure 2B illustrates nonlinear infarct growth in a 70-year-old male patient with tandem-  
114 occlusion and successful recanalization. In this patient, linear model leads to underestimation of eFIV compared with FIV and fails to show +/-  
115 19% for the accuracy of FIV (grey area). eFIV also exceeds  $CTP_{penumbra}$ ,

116 Figure 3 illustrates volumes of  $CTP_{core}$ ,  $CTP_{penumbra}$ , eFIV, and FIV, difference between eFIV and FIV in milliliters, and HIR in all 48 patients.  
117 eFIV predicted FIV accurately in only 8 patients (17%), whereas 40 (83%) showed nonlinear growth of infarct. All eight patients (Patients 14,  
118 26, 28, 29, 30, 32, 35, and 40) with linear infarct growth are marked with yellow in Figure 3. Patients with linear and nonlinear infarct core  
119 growth showed no significant difference in medians of salvable tissue time, onset to imaging time, onset to recanalization, or onset to follow-up  
120 imaging ( $p>0.05$ ). No significant difference observed between baselines of NIHSS score, glucose (mmol/L), infarct growth,  $CTP_{core}$ , HIR  
121  $T_{max}>6$  s, and eFIV and FIV volumes (mL) or in successful recanalization, T-occlusion or early vs. late imaging among patients with nonlinear  
122 infarct core growth compared with patients with linear infarct core growth ( $p>0.05$ ). Twenty-three (58%) of 40 patients with nonlinear infarct  
123 core growth had poor outcome compared with 6 (75%) of 8 patients with linear infarct core growth ( $p>0.05$ ).  
  
124 Among 42 patients with successful recanalization, eFIV exceeded FIV in 25 (60%) (median absolute difference 25 mL, IQR 7-73). The median  
125 HIR did not differ between patients with eFIV>FIV and those with eFIV<FIV ( $p>0.05$ ). Of all 48 EVT patients, 3 (6%) (Patients 37, 44, and 48)  
126 showed larger FIV than  $CTP_{penumbra}$  and none of them had linear growth of infarct. Patients 37 and 48 had hemorrhagic transformation of infarct  
127 and edema in the MCA territory.  
  
128 To evaluate the effect of possible ghost core as bias, the patients were divided into early and late imaging subgroups. Among the 22 patients with  
129 successful recanalization and early imaging, eFIV exceeded FIV in 18 patients (82%) (median absolute difference 28 mL, IQR 18-85). Among  
130 the 20 patients with successful recanalization and late imaging, eFIV exceeded FIV in 7 patients (35%) (median absolute difference 13 mL, IQR

131 (2-52). For all patients with successful recanalization, the absolute difference between eFIV and FIV or HIR did not differ between patients with  
132 early and late imaging ( $p>0.05$ ).

133 A possible association of HIR with the difference between eFIV and FIV was analyzed by linear regression model. HIR alone was significantly  
134 associated with the difference between eFIV and FIV ( $B=134.4$ ,  $CI\ 31.0-237.8$ ,  $p=0.012$ ). After adjusting the model for time from symptom  
135 onset to baseline imaging, baseline NIHSS, ischemic core volume and volume of perfusion lesion, no significant association was remained ( $B$   
136  $62.7$ ,  $CI\ -92.7-218.1$ ,  $p>0.05$ ).

## 137 Discussion

138 eFIV from a linearly extrapolated growth model failed to predict the follow-up infarct volume in a reliable manner. In our model, eFIV  
139 overestimated FIV in over half of the patients with successful recanalization, especially when imaged early after symptom onset. In a few  
140 patients (6% of all patients), FIV exceeded even  $CTP_{penumbra}$  due to hemorrhagic transformation and edema, which can hamper FIV estimation  
141 from NCCT. No significant difference was present among patients with linear and nonlinear infarct core growth in baseline core or perfusion  
142 lesion volumes, HIR, NIHSS core, T-occlusion, outcome or onset times to imaging, recanalization, or follow-up imaging. None of the examined  
143 demographic or clinical parameters were associated with nonlinear growth of infarct core, but it is likely that the collaterals have an important  
144 role.<sup>7,8,13-16</sup>

145 Our study suggests that the linear model of infarct core growth is too simplistic, decisions on recanalization should therefore be based more on  
146 individual status of brain perfusion rather than on time elapsed from symptom onset particularly in the early time window after stroke.<sup>7,10</sup>  
147 Collateral flow has important role in ischemic core growth.<sup>7,8,10-15</sup> In our cohort, the median HIR was 0.46, suggesting that in most patients the  
148 collateral flow was weak. However, a clear association of HIR with difference between eFIV and FIV was not found after adjusting for relevant  
149 clinical parameters.

150 The transition from ischemic core at baseline imaging to actual infarction can be partly nonlinear especially in the hyperacute phase and difficult  
151 to estimate from a snapshot of baseline ischemic growth rate, which can vary individually.<sup>7,10,25,26</sup> The possible nonlinear phase at the beginning  
152 and the end of infarct growth can still be considered short lived, with most of the infarct growth following a linear path which is not contrary to  
153 non-linear growth of infarct core.<sup>7,8,25,26</sup> Earlier studies have shown, that infarct growth rate and CTP imaging might be more accurate several  
154 hours after stroke onset as suggested by guidelines and RAPID has been successfully used in large clinical trials in predicting FIV.<sup>1,2,3,13,22,23</sup> It is  
155 likely that in the hyperacute stage the baseline infarct growth is faster and potentially recruited collateral flow and other factors affect the  
156 perfusion more than at the later stage and thus linear extrapolation of follow-up infarct volume based on initial infarct growth rate can lead to  
157 overestimation of the eFIV.<sup>7</sup>

158 Hyperacute infarction growth has been shown to strongly associate with leptomeningeal collateral status although to our knowledge follow-up  
159 infarct estimation based on a mathematical model and CTP baseline infarct growth rate only has not been investigated previously.<sup>8,10</sup> A recent  
160 study in the DEFUSE3 cohort showed that the volume of the estimated ischemic core combined with the volume of persistent hypoperfusion can  
161 predict the infarct volume 24 h after randomization with reasonable accuracy in patients who present 6-16 hours after last seen well<sup>14</sup>. Further,  
162 Rao et al showed that patients with 24-h infarcts larger than predicted at baseline had evidence of less favorable baseline collaterals that fail  
163 within 24 h.<sup>15</sup> In our cohort, eFIV seemed to overestimate FIV in 60% of patients with successful recanalization especially when imaged early  
164 after symptom onset as we only included patients with known symptom onset. Although we did have a higher median core volume than in the  
165 DEFUSE3 cohort, there was no significant difference in baseline core volume among patients with linear and nonlinear infarct growth. Median  
166 HIR of our cohort was 0.46, which is higher than the median HIR of 0.43 of patients who developed larger infarct than predicted at 24h in the  
167 study by Rao et al study.<sup>15</sup> Further, most of our patients were imaged early after symptom onset.<sup>14-15</sup> It has been shown earlier that CTP might  
168 overestimate acute infarct core especially in the hyperacute time window.<sup>7,22,23,24</sup> An overestimation of infarct core at baseline would result in a  
169 larger infarct growth rate, which would also result in a larger eFIV than FIV (Figure 2B).<sup>22</sup> Our study showed no significant absolute difference

170 (eFIV and FIV) among patients with early baseline imaging and successful recanalization compared with other patients with successful  
171 recanalization nor was HIR associated with overestimation or underestimation of eFIV.

172 Previous studies have also shown that a 30% CBF threshold in large clinical trials might also slightly overestimate follow-up infarct volume by  
173 comprehensive magnetic resonance imaging among patients with successful recanalization compared with larger CBF thresholds.<sup>23,27</sup> It has been  
174 suggested that lower CBF thresholds could depict an irreversibly damaged core more accurately in the early time window. We did not have any  
175 other CBF threshold volume but failed to show a statistically significant difference between eFIV and FIV between subgroups of early vs. late  
176 imaging and nonlinear and linear infarct growth. FIV was measured from NCCT which is not as accurate as comprehensive magnetic resonance  
177 imaging. NCCT is, however, widely available and often used as the main screening tool for acute recanalization treatments. Difference between  
178 eFIV and measured FIV at 24 h may also be due to inaccuracy in FIV measurement, as follow-up infarct volumes by NCCT may in some cases  
179 underestimate FIV if imaged <24 hours of symptom onset.<sup>7</sup> In our study, median time from baseline to follow-up imaging was 23.9 (22.1-25.7)

180 h. It is likely that in this time period the infarct is fully developed and is readily measured from NCCT. In addition, there was no significant  
181 difference between with patients of linear infarct growth and those with nonlinear infarct growth in onset or baseline to follow-up imaging  
182 ( $p>0.05$ ). Finally, there was no significant difference in outcome between patients of linear and nonlinear growth. A previous study by de

183 Havenon et al showed no effect of good collaterals by CTA on outcome although this was associated with reduced core growth which is in line  
184 with our results as potential factor by collateral flow in eFIV estimation.<sup>28</sup>

185 The major limitation of this study are its retrospective nature and the relatively small number of patients despite the large number of screened  
186 acute recanalization candidates. We included only patients with known symptom onset, comprehensive baseline imaging (CTP and CTA and  
187 NCCT follow-up imaging at 24 h), LVO and EVT (exact time of recanalization) to examine the linearity of infarct growth as accurately as  
188 possible and to avoid any deviations that could hamper the interpretation of the data. Further, all patients were treated in one comprehensive  
189 stroke center (HUS) avoiding possible protocol deviation. Despite the relatively small number of patients in the cohort, we are confident that  
190 individual treatment decisions should not be based solely on calculations of remaining time for recanalization. In 13 patients (27%), IVT was  
191 given prior to baseline CTP imaging which could result in partial recanalization and affect cerebral blood flow. However, all patients were  
192 studied with digital subtraction angiography confirming the presence of LVO, and treated with EVT and none were recanalized prior to EVT.

193 New imaging biomarkers as surrogates for infarct growth rate are needed since tertiary stroke centers are facing increasing number of candidates  
194 screened for EVT. Our results show that a linear model is not an accurate tool to predict follow-up infarct volume in EVT candidates. Although  
195 we did not find a statistically significant difference in HIR between patients with linear and non-linear growth of infarct core, other studies have

196 shown HIR to reflect collateral flow accurately compared with CTA.<sup>12,13,15,28-31</sup> As collaterals likely play a major role in infarct core growth<sup>15</sup>,  
197 the association of HIR with infarct growth should be further studied in a larger cohort with various HIR profiles.

198 To conclude, linear extrapolation of the CTP<sub>core</sub> appeared to be an oversimplified approach to estimate FIV. We cannot recommend using his  
199 approach in clinical decision making. Infarct growth was not linear in most of the patients here, and thus, time elapsed from symptom onset  
200 alone appears insufficient for clinical decision-making in recanalization candidates.

## 201 Acknowledgements

202 -

## 203 Sources of funding

204 This project was granted funding for 2019 and 2020 by the Helsinki University Hospital governmental subsidiary funds for clinical research  
205 (Y1249NEUR1), the Maire Taponen foundation and the South Karelian Medical Association.

## 206 Conflicts of Interest

207 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare in connection with this article.

## 208 References

209 1.Nogueira RG,Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, et al. Thrombectomy 6 to 24 hours after stroke with a mismatch between deficit and infarct. N Engl J  
210 Med. 2018;378(1):11-21.

211 2.Albers GW,Marks MP, Kemp S, et al. Thrombectomy for stroke at 6 to 16 hours with selection by perfusion imaging.N Engl J Med.  
212 2018;378(8):708-718.

213 3.Campbell BCV, Parsons MW. Imaging selection for acute stroke intervention. International Journal of Stroke. 2018; 13(6):554-567

214 4.Campbell BCV, Ma H, Ringleb PA, et al. Extending thrombolysis to 4-5-9 h and wake-up stroke using perfusion imaging: A systematic  
215 review and meta-analysis of individual patient data. The Lancet. 2019;394(10193):139-147

216 5.Saver JL. Time is Brain—Quantified. Stroke. 2006;37(1):263-266

217 6.Campbell BCV, Khatri P. Stroke. The Lancet. 2020;396(10244):129-142.


- 218 7. Goyal M, Ospel JM, Menon B, et al. Challenging the ischemic core concept in acute ischemic stroke imaging. *Stroke*. 2020;51(10):3147-  
219 3155.
- 220 8. Puhr-Westerheide D, Tiedt S, Rotkopf LT, et al. Clinical and imaging parameters associated with hyperacute infarction growth in large vessel  
221 occlusion stroke. *Stroke*. 2019;50(10):2799-2804
- 222 9. Christoforidis GA, Vakil P, Ansari SA, Dehkordi FH, Carroll TJ. Impact of pial collaterals on infarct growth rate in experimental acute  
223 ischemic stroke. *AJNR. American journal of neuroradiology*. 2017;38(2):270-275
- 224 10. Hakimelahi R, Vachha BA, Copen WA, et al. Time and diffusion lesion size in major anterior circulation ischemic strokes. *Stroke*.  
225 2014;45(10):2936-2941
- 226 11. Jiang B, Ball RL, Michel P, et al. Factors influencing infarct growth including collateral status assessed using computed tomography in acute  
227 stroke patients with large artery occlusion. *Int J Stroke*. 2019;14(6):603-61
- 228 12. Longting L, Chushuang C, Huiqiao T, et al. Perfusion computed tomography accurately quantifies collateral flow after acute ischemic stroke.  
229 *Stroke*. 2020;51(3):1006-1009.

- 230 13. Guenego A, Marcellus David G, Martin Blake W, et al. Hypoperfusion intensity ratio is correlated with patient eligibility for thrombectomy.  
231 Stroke. 2019;50(4):917-922.
- 232 14. Rao VL, Christensen S, Amarnath Y, et al. Ischemic core and hypoperfusion volumes correlate with infarct size 24 hours after  
233 randomization in DEFUSE 3. Stroke. 2019;50(3):626-63
- 234 15. Rao VL, Mlynash M, Christensen S, et al. Collateral status contributes to differences between observed and predicted 24-h infarct volumes in  
235 DEFUSE 3. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab. 2020; 40(10):1966-1974.
- 236 16. Faizy TD, Kabiri R, Christensen S, et al. Favorable venous outflow profiles correlate with favorable tissue-level collaterals and clinical  
237 outcome. Stroke. 2021; 2021;52:1761–1767
- 238 17. Campbell BCV, Majoie, Charles B. L. M., Albers GW, et al. Penumbra imaging and functional outcome in patients with anterior circulation  
239 ischaemic stroke treated with endovascular thrombectomy versus medical therapy: A meta-analysis of individual patient-level data. The Lancet  
240 Neurology. 2019;18(1):46-55
- 241 18. Mazighi M, Thomalla G. Endovascular therapy for patients with large ischemic strokes: Does age matter? Stroke. 2021; 52:2229–2231.

- 242 19. Olivot JM, Mlynash M, Thijs VN, et al. Geography, structure, and evolution of diffusion and perfusion lesions in diffusion and perfusion  
243 imaging evaluation for understanding stroke evolution (DEFUSE). *Stroke*. 2009;40(10):3245-325
- 244 20.Zaidat Osama O, Yoo Albert J, Pooja K, et al. Recommendations on angiographic revascularization grading standards for acute ischemic  
245 stroke. *Stroke*. 2013;44(9):2650-2663
- 246 21.Campbell BC, Christensen Søren, Levi CR, et al. Cerebral blood flow is the optimal CT perfusion parameter for assessing infarct core.  
247 *Stroke*. 2011;42(12):3435-3440
- 248 22.Martins N, Aires A, Mendez B, et al. Ghost infarct core and admission computed tomography perfusion: Redefining the role of neuroimaging  
249 in acute ischemic stroke. *Intervent Neurol*.2018;7(6):513-521
- 250 23. Rotem S, Mor S, Chen B, et al. Infarct core reliability by CT perfusion is a time-dependent phenomenon. *Journal of Neuroimaging*.  
251 2020;30(2):240-245
- 252 24. 1. Boned S, Padroni M, Rubiera M, et al. Admission CT perfusion may overestimate initial infarct core: The ghost infarct core concept. *J*  
253 *NeuroIntervent Surg*.2017;9(1):66

- 254 25. Broocks G, Rajput F, Hanning U, et al. Highest lesion growth rates in patients with hyperacute stroke. *Stroke*. 2019;50(1):189-192.
- 255 26. Hakimelahi R, Copen WA, Yoo AJ et al. Time is brain, but each patient has his own time. *European congress of radiology*, 2010
- 256 27. Vagal A, Wintermark M, Nael K, et al. Automated CT perfusion imaging for acute ischemic stroke. *Neurology*. 2019;93(20):88
- 257 28. de Havenon A, Mlynash M, Kim-Tenser MA, et al. Results from DEFUSE 3: Good collaterals are associated with reduced ischemic core
- 258 growth but not neurologic outcome. *Stroke*. 2019;50(3):632-638
- 259 29. Guenego A, Fahed R, Albers GW, et al. Hypoperfusion intensity ratio correlates with angiographic collaterals in acute ischaemic stroke with
- 260 M1 occlusion. *Eur J Neurol*. 2020;27(5):864-870
- 261 30. Guenego A, Mlynash M, Christensen S, et al. Hypoperfusion ratio predicts infarct growth during transfer for thrombectomy. *Ann Neurol*.
- 262 2018;84(4):616-620
- 263 31. Amrou S, Hassan Ameer E, James G, et al. Early infarct growth rate correlation with endovascular thrombectomy clinical outcomes. *Stroke*.
- 264 2021;52(1):57-69
- 265


266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280




281 Figure 1 Flowchart of study patients. LVO; large vessel occlusion (internal carotid artery, M1-branch of middle cerebral artery, tandem-  
282 occlusion), EVT; endovascular Treatment, CTP; computed tomography perfusion imaging, NCCT; non-enhanced computed tomography

283

284 a



302



318

319 Figure 2. Examples of linear (a) and nonlinear (b) infarct core growth. Times from symptom onset (A) to imaging (B) recanalization  
320 (D) and salvageable tissue time ( $CTP_{penumbra} - CTP_{core} / \text{baseline infarct growth}$ , E) are shown in minutes.  $CTP_{core}$  (B), follow-up infarct  
321 volume (FIV) (C), estimated FIV (eFIV) based on baseline infarct growth rate and CTP RAPID (D) and  $CTP_{penumbra}$  (E) measured in  
322 milliliters.

323 a An example of linear growth of the infarct core in a 57-year-old male patient with M1-occlusion and successful recanalization. In  
324 case of successful recanalization and linear infarct core growth, eFIV accurately predicts FIV and salvageable tissue time in  
325 minutes until the infarction reaches the entire volume of  $CTP_{penumbra}$ .

326 b An example of nonlinear growth with underestimation of eFIV compared with FIV in a 70 year-old male patient with tandem  
327 occlusion and successful recanalization. In this nonlinear growth example, the measured infarct size from follow-up imaging (FIV)  
328 exceeds the 19% margins (gray area) of linear growth based on the linear growth model.

Table 1 Cohort characteristics of all patients, and a comparison of patients who had a follow-up infarct volume (FIV) within and not within the margins of linear infarct core growth.

mTICI classification; modified treatment in cerebral infarction , IVT; intravenous thrombolysis, Salvageable tissue time (minutes);  $CTP_{penumbra}$  ( $(T_{max} > 6s, \text{volume of perfusion lesion}) - CTP_{core}(\text{cerebral blood flow (CBF) below 30\% of normal brain}) / \text{baseline infarct growth}$ ), mRS; modified rankin scale, NIHSS; NIH stroke scale, CTP; computed tomography perfusion, Hypoperfusion intensity ratio (HIR); ratio of delay time  $>10$  s/delay time  $>6$  s volume, Successful recanalization (mTICI; modified treatment in cerebral infarction 2b or 3), EVT; endovascular treatment. eFIV; extrapolated follow-up infarction volume (infarction growth rate, mL/h x time (hours) to recanalization), Potentially saved tissue ( $CTP_{penumbra} - FIV$ ).

	All patients	Linear	Nonlinear	P-value
Patients	48 (100)	8 (17)	40 (83)	
Age in years, mean (SD)	67 (+/- 13)	72 ((+/- 14)	66 (+/13)	0.26†

Male	28 (58)	5 (63)	23 (58)	0.79§
Glucose in mmol/L	6.6 (6.2-8.0)	6.6 (5.9-8.3)	6.7 (6.3-7.9)	0.95†
IVT	25 (52)	6 (75)	19 (48)	0.16§
Process measures				
Onset to baseline imaging, min	101 (68-142)	138 (68-174)	97 (68-133)	0.38†
Onset to recanalization, min	210 (147-260)	209 (113-315)	210 (147-254)	0.89†
Baseline imaging to recanalization, min	102 (66-131)	73 (23-130)	104 (76-131)	0.20†
Baseline imaging under 100 min	25 (52)	5 (63)	20 (50)	0.52§
Salvageable tissue time, h	9.0 (3.1-26.2)	43.4 (2.6-57.7)	9.7 (4.5-27.4)	0.96†
Onset to follow-up imaging, h	25.8 (23.4-28.6)	1448 (1346-1552)	1556 (1427-1721)	0.10†

Baseline to follow-up imaging, h	23.9 (22.1-25.7)	1365 (1191-1459)	1443 (1343-1542)	0.15†
Poor outcome (mRS 3-6)	29 (60)	6 (75)	23 (58)	0.36§
Baseline NIHSS	16 (11-22)	15 (11-21)	16 (10-22)	0.90†
Baseline CTP <sub>core</sub> volume*, mL	24 (4-51)	27 (2-96)	24 (4-49)	0.89†
Baseline CTP <sub>penumbra</sub> volume*, mL	157 (94-193)	159 (94-185)	157 (94-199)	0.96†
CTP <sub>penumbra</sub> >15 mL*	48 (100)	8 (100)	40 (100)	-
Infarction growth rate, mL/h	11 (3-38)	9 (2-74)	11 (3-38)	0.85†
HIR	0.46 (0.15-0.60)	0.42 (0.15-0.64)	0.46 (0.15-0.59)	0.78†
Successful recanalization	42 (88)	7 (88)	35 (88)	1.00§

EVT attempts	1 (1-3)	1 (0-2)	2 (1-3)	0.20§
M1/ICA+M1	41 (85)/7 (15)	7 (88)/1 (13)	34 (85)/ 6 (15)	0.86§
eFIV, mL	42 (15-116)	37 (7-168)	44 (18-116)	0.80†
FIV, mL	28 (8-79)	38 (7-180)	25 (8-74)	0.48†
Potentially saved tissue, mL	83 (58-155)	74 (110)	88 (58-175)	0.35†

\*CTP RAPID. Data are n (%) or median (interquartile range, IQR) unless otherwise stated

†Two-tailed Mann-Whitney U test

§ Pearson X<sup>2</sup>-test




Figure 3 Volumes (mL) of estimated relative cerebral blood flow (CBF) below 30% of normal brain ( $CTP_{core}$ , red bars), volumes of perfusion lesion ( $CTP_{penumbra}$ , gray bars), estimated follow-up infarct volumes (eFIV, blue dots) and follow-up infarct volumes (FIV, black dots) in 24 h follow-up non-contrast computed tomography images in all 48 patients. In cases where infarct growth is linear (n=8), patients appear in yellow. Patients are organized by descending order of difference between eFIV and FIV. The eFIV is limited to  $CTP_{penumbra}$  in cases 1,2,4,13,14 and 40.

BtR; baseline imaging to recanalization (h), FR; futile recanalization, TL; time left for salvageable tissue ( $CTP_{penumbra} - CTP_{core} / \text{baseline infarct growth, h}$ ), D; difference between eFIV and FIV (mL), HIR; hypoperfusion intensity ratio