Validation of a cloud-based tele-stroke system reliability in determining national institutes of health stroke scale scores for acute ischemic stroke screening in the emergency department
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Background and purpose: The National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) is the most recommended tool for objectively quantifying the impairment caused by a suspected stroke. Nevertheless, it is mainly used by trained neurologists in the emergency department (ED). To bring forward the NIHSS to the pre-hospital setting, a smartphone-based Telestroke system was developed. It captures the full NIHSS by video, transmits it off-line, and enables assessment by a distant stroke physician. We aimed to compare the reliability of an NIHSS score determined by a neurologist from afar, using the platform with a standard NIHSS assessment performed in the emergency departments.

Methods: A multi-center prospective study was conducted in two centers (Vall d’Hebron, Barcelona, and Rambam, Israel). Patients admitted to the ED with suspected stroke had a neurological exam based on the NIHSS, while being recorded by the system. A skilled neurologist rated the NIHSS according to the videos offline. The results were compared with the NIHSS score given by a neurologist at the bedside.

Results: A total of 95 patients with suspected stroke were included. The overall intraclass correlation coefficient was 0.936 (0.99 in VdH and 0.84 in Rambam), indicating excellent and good reliability, respectively.

Conclusion: Remote stroke assessment based on the NIHSS, using videos segments collected by a dedicated platform, installed on a standard smartphone, is a reliable measurement as compared with the bedside evaluation.
Introduction

Management of acute ischemic stroke (AIS) has changed dramatically over the last few years, following evidence on the superiority of endovascular treatment (EVT) in the treatment of large vessel occlusion (LVO) in patients treated within 6–8 hours from onset of symptoms (1). The window for treatment was further extended to 24 hours following trials that demonstrated the efficacy of EVT for selected patients in time frames up to 24 hours (2, 3). The immediate consequence was an increase in the number of patients eligible for EVT, requiring secondary transfer of those patients from primary stroke centers to comprehensive stroke centers, capable of preforming EVT.

Endovascular treatment requires accurate and rapid diagnosis in the pre-hospital setting, as it is only indicated in specific patients with LVO, making up a small percentage of AIS cases (4), and its beneficial effects are highly time dependent. The main ways of care for patients with suspected AIS are either the “drip-and-ship” approach or the “mothership” approach. The former consists of evacuating patients to the nearest primary stroke center to perform imaging, start intravenous thrombolysis (IVT), when indicated, and transfer patients for EVT. The mothership approach consists of evacuating patients directly to a comprehensive stroke center (5).

Since the mothership approach reduces the transfer time of patients to EVT, it was found to be beneficial for patients suffering from an LVO (6, 7). On the contrary, in non-LVO stroke and stroke mimics cases, which could be treated in the primary stroke centers, it may be redundant or even delay initiation of medical treatment, without any added benefit.

Of the existing diagnostic tools that accurately distinguish LVO cases from non-LVO ones, the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) is the most recommended tool by healthcare providers to objectively quantify the neurological impairment caused by a suspected stroke (8). Until recently it was assumed to be too complicated and time-consuming to be used by paramedics in the field (9). Several shorter derivatives were developed to identify patients with a high probability of LVO in the pre-hospital setting. However, there is no clear evidence for superiority of one scale over the others. So far, no scale was found to determine the presence vs. absence of LVO with both high sensitivity and specificity (10).

To resolve this issue, a smartphone-cloud-based Artificial Intelligence (AI) supported Telestroke system was developed. The aim of this system is to evaluate the patient’s neurological status, assessment of stroke severity, and prediction of LVO as the cause of stroke. The system first captures the full NIHSS by video while presenting instructions for the neurological examination on the screen to the medical professional operating it on a standard smartphone, and storing the data on a secure cloud storage. The system then enables a distant stroke physician to assess the patient’s status manually, without the need of online presence or real time interface with the patient. It is the first step toward an AI decision support tool.

Recent articles exploring the use of a smartphone application for in-hospital stroke treatment have shown promising results with reductions of patient management times, satisfaction of medical staff and similar neurological outcomes (11, 12). Those results strengthen the hypothesis that an application built for pre-hospital and ED decision making could aid medical personnel in such positions.

In this study, we aim to evaluate the reliability of an NIHSS score by a remote neurologist rating captured video segments examinations, compared with a standard NIHSS assessment done by a bedside neurologist in the emergency department.

Methods

Study design and participants

This multi-center prospectively controlled clinical trial includes patients admitted to the EDs in the Rambam Hospital in Haifa, Israel and the Vall d’Hebron Hospital in Barcelona, Spain. Inclusion criteria were: (1) age over 18 years, (2) symptoms suggestive of AIS, (3) had not received treatment (IVT or EVT) prior to the examination. Exclusion criteria were: (1) patient intubated upon arrival, (2) time from stroke symptoms onset >24 hours, (3) post-treatment (IVT or EVT), (4) patient diagnosed in the ED as suffering from a different condition which could simulate signs of AIS (such as hypoglycemia). Following the introduction by the researcher and signing an informed consent form, each subject was allocated a number by the application for anonymization.

Next, the subject was instructed by the researcher through a neurological exam based on the NIHSS with simple instructions presented on the screen, while being recorded. The application uses the smartphone’s built-in camera and microphone, to capture the clinical signs of the patient, and the data collected is uploaded in segments of the exam, using a secured network to the external server (Figure 1). The video is then sent in short segments representing each of the NIHSS tests to a remote physician, using an application enabling the stroke team to watch the full exams from a far. An independent neurologist blinded to the score obtained on site rated the NIHSS according to the videos remotely and offline. Both examinations were performed in a similar time frame before treatment (thrombolysis or EVT). The results were compared with the NIHSS score assigned by one of five independent bedside neurologists from the relevant hospital as part of the routine clinical practice. All the raters are NIHSS-certified.

Ethical considerations

The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Human Subjects Ethics Committee (IRB-0187-18). All the data were encrypted and transmitted in a highly secure manner,
adhering to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) regulations.

Statistical methods

In order to validate the reliability of the collected data, the digitalized total score of the NIHSS were correlated with the results of the standard, bedside NIHSS examination.

Inter-rater reliability of the total NIHSS score was quantified using an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) model (2,1) (13), namely, two-way random effects, absolute agreement, and single rates/measurement.

Inter-rater reliability of individual item scores was quantified using a conservative weighted Kappa (wK) coefficient. Based on the 95% CI of the ICC estimate, ICC values <0.5 are indicative of poor reliability, values between 0.5 and 0.75 indicate moderate reliability, values between 0.75 and 0.9 indicate good reliability, and values >0.90 indicate excellent reliability (10). We also examined if the difference between scores set from afar and from bedside was over two NIHSS points by using one sample Student’s t-test. Following that, we calculated the ICC considering successful correlation if bedside rating was within 2 points of the remote rating.

Sensitivity to detect change of the total NIHSS score was estimated at different levels of confidence using the Minimal Detectable Difference (MDD) and the Bland–Altman plots. Factors associated with absolute disagreement on individual scale items and magnitude of disagreement on the total NIHSS score between raters were investigated using logistic and linear regression, respectively (14).

The level of significance for all the statistical analysis was 5%. The data analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Health & Welfare Science for Windows (SPSS, version 25.0, Chicago, IL, USA).

Results

A total of 95 patients with suspected AIS were included, 44 in Rambam and 51 from Vall d’Hebron. Patient characteristics and results are summarized in Table 1. Total number of patients subsequently diagnosed with LVO was 32 (33.6%) with no differences in prevalence between centers. The percentage of males was slightly higher in Rambam compared with Vall d’Hebron. ICC (2,1) overall and in Vall d’Hebron was higher than 0.9, and for Rambam higher than 0.75, indicating excellent and good reliability, respectively (10).

One sample Student’s t-test showed the total NIHSS scores set from afar compared with those set at bedside did not differ significantly more than two points (p = 0.325, Figure 2). We then calculated the ICC (2,1) adjusted for the NIHSS scores with
disagreement within two NIHSS points. The results indicate excellent reliability (ICC = 0.939).

Subscale analysis for the individual reliability (wK) is summarized in Table 2. wK scores ranged from 0.285 to 0.646, indicating fair to the substantial agreement, with the highest individual reliability observed in item 1b Level of Consciousness (LOC) Questions, followed by item 3, Visual and item 11, Extinction and Inattention. The lowest was in item 7, Limb Ataxia. P-value for all the Kappa scores was <0.001.

One sample Student’s t-test showed the difference between scores differs from 0 significantly (p < 0.05), therefore, MDD and Bland–Altman plot were unnecessary.

Intra-rater reliability for the independent remote neurologists who rated the NIHSS according to the offline videos and for the five bedside neurologists who rated the NIHSS as part of the routine clinical practice, was high for both the raters’ groups (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient: 0.89 and 0.87, respectively).

### Discussion

In this study, we compared the reliability of an NIHSS score determined by a neurologist from afar, using smartphone cloud-based platform, to a standard NIHSS assessment done by a bedside neurologist in the emergency department and found it to be high, with the most scores falling within two points of those set at bedside.

Our results suggest that the total NIHSS determined by a neurologist from afar, using recorded, cloud-based video-segments of the exam, has a good to excellent reliability

| Subscale                        | wK (95% CI; n = 95) |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1a Level of consciousness       | 0.326* (0.045–0.607) |
| 1b LOC questions                | 0.646* (0.511–0.782) |
| 1c LOC commands                 | 0.407* (0.162–0.652) |
| 2 Gaze                          | 0.567* (0.37–0.764)  |
| 3 Visual                        | 0.633* (0.477–0.79)  |
| 4 Facial Palsy                  | 0.461* (0.325–0.597) |
| 5a Motor arm: Left arm          | 0.503* (0.355–0.65)  |
| 5b Motor arm: Right arm         | 0.355* (0.173–0.538) |
| 6a Motor leg: Left leg          | 0.432* (0.278–0.586) |
| 6b Motor leg: Right leg         | 0.398* (0.201–0.596) |
| 7 Limb ataxia                   | 0.285* (0–0.57)      |
| 8 Sensory                       | 0.491* (0.306–0.676) |
| 9 Language aphasia              | 0.499* (0.339–0.658) |
| 10 Dysarthria                   | 0.458* (0.314–0.602) |
| 11 Extinction and inattention   | 0.626* (0.432–0.819) |

CI, Confidence interval; LOC, Level of consciousness; wK, weighted Kappa. *p-Value < 0.001.
compared with a standard NIHSS assessment performed at bedside.

Interrater agreement on the total NIHSS score was consistent with preceding studies on real patients (0.91–0.98) (15–17). Similar variability in the subscale items’ reliabilities was seen, with lowest wk ranging between −0.07 and 0.35 in most articles, and the highest wk ranging between 0.83 and 1.

Agreement between raters ranged from fair to substantial, with most wk values falling in the moderate agreement range.

The dissimilarities probably stem from the target study population characteristics and scale, exclusion criteria, and technological variations. Shafqat et al. (18) showed comparable results for all the subscales except motor arm (5 a and b) and motor leg (6 a and b), which may be attributed to their use of a dual camera system (wide angle and zoom) in contrast to our use of smartphone camera.

The lowest reliability was observed in limb ataxia (7). Low reliability of limb ataxia was noted in many studies using telemedicine on patients with stroke (wk −0.07–0.35 in most studies), as well as in older studies conducted by Goldstein et al. (19) and Brott et al. (20) who studied the interrater agreement on bedside administered NIHSS. This finding suggests that this NIHSS item may have intrinsic inferior interrater agreement.

In most previous studies, the remote neurologist directed the examination while determining the NIHSS score in real time (21–24). The use of recordings rather than real time examination is an important part of the validation process of the platform, aiming for future AI predictions of stroke and LVO probability base on it.

The differences between the two centers need to be noted. The NIHSS at bedside was done in Rambam by on-call neurologists, usually residents. In Vall d’Hebron, it was performed by skilled neurologists from the stroke team. The NIHSS assessment from afar was done in both centers by skilled senior neurologists. Superior results in Vall d’Hebron suggest that the evaluation carried out through the system by a senior neurologist might be more accurate than the one done at bedside by a resident. If this is true, using the system, will increase the accuracy of stroke detection.

One limitation of this study is the lack of stroke mimics that may have decreased the variance and thus improved the results. Further research is needed for validation of the use of telestroke systems in such conditions, as well as their effect on treatment and outcomes for patients with diverse illnesses. Another limitation comes from the point that this study was built for validation of the reliability of the system, and therefore, time intervals were not assessed. Future research, based on the findings presented in this article, could include comparison of standard protocol vs. the usage of smartphone-based telestroke systems in measures such as time elapsed in determination of stroke probability and comparison of patients’ outcomes.

This study indicates that the NIHSS determination from afar on captured video segments is as good as (and maybe even superior to) bedside assessment. Thus, enabling the possibility for future studies regarding assessment of stroke and LVO utilizing artificial intelligence assisted program and a standard smartphone, without the need for special equipment or hardware.

Conclusion

Remote stroke assessment based on the NIHSS, using videos collected by a dedicated platform, installed on a standard smartphone, is a reliable measurement as compared with bedside evaluation.
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