

1 **Thrombolysis in Acute Ischaemic Stroke Patients with Chronic Kidney Disease**

2 *Running Title: Thrombolysis in Stroke with CKD*

3
4 Tiberiu A Pana^{a,b}, MB ChB (Hons.) MRes* (*Research Associate*); Jonathan Quinn^{a,b}, BSc*
5 (*Research Associate*); Mohamed O Mohamed^a, MRCP (UK) (*Doctoral Research Fellow*);
6 Mamas A Mamas^a, DPhil (*Professor of Cardiology*); Phyo K Myint^{a,b}, MD (*Chair in Old Age*
7 *Medicine*);

8
9 *Authors Pana and Quinn should be considered joint first authors

10
11 ^aKeele Cardiovascular Research Group, Centre for Prognosis Research, Institute for Primary
12 Care and Health Sciences, Keele University, Stoke-on-Trent, United Kingdom

13 ^bInstitute of Applied Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Medical Sciences & Nutrition,
14 University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 **Correspondence to:**

28 Professor Phyo Kyaw Myint
29 Room 4:013,
30 Polwarth Building,
31 School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition,
32 Foresterhill, Aberdeen,
33 AB25 2ZD, Scotland, UK.
34 Tel: +44 (0) 1224 437841
35 Fax: +44 (0) 1224 437911
36 Mail to: phyo.myint@abdn.ac.uk

37
38
39
40 Tables: 4, Figures: 2

41 References: 30

42 Word Count: 3760

43 Abstract Word Count: 247

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Objective:** We aimed to determine whether chronic kidney disease (CKD) is associated with
3 adverse in-hospital outcomes after acute ischaemic stroke (AIS) and whether this association
4 is dependent on thrombolysis administration.

5 **Methods:** 885,537 records representative of 4,283,086 AIS admissions were extracted from
6 the US National Inpatient Sample (2005-2015) and categorised into 3 mutually exclusive
7 groups: no CKD, CKD without end-stage renal disease (ESRD) and ESRD. Outcomes
8 (mortality, prolonged hospitalisation >4 days and disability on discharge -derived using
9 discharge destination as a proxy) were compared between groups using multivariable logistic
10 regressions. Separate models containing interaction terms with thrombolysis were also
11 computed.

12 **Results:** The median age (interquartile range) of the cohort was 73 (61-83) years and 47.32%
13 were men. Compared to the no CKD group, both CKD/no ESRD group (odds ratio (99%
14 confidence interval) = 1.04 (1.0003-1.09), $P=0.009$) and the ESRD groups (2.06 (1.90-2.25),
15 $P<0.001$) had significantly increased odds of in-hospital mortality. Patients with CKD/No
16 ESRD (1.03 (1.02-1.06), $P<0.001$) and ESRD (1.44 (1.37-1.51), $P<0.001$) were at higher
17 odds of prolonged hospitalisation. Patients with CKD/No ESRD (1.13 (1.10-1.15), $P<0.001$)
18 and ESRD (1.34 (1.26-1.41), $P<0.001$) were also at higher odds of moderate-to-severe
19 disability on discharge. Interaction terms between thrombolysis and the CKD/ESRD groups
20 were not statistically significant ($P>0.01$) for any outcome.

21 **Conclusions:** Renal dysfunction was independently associated with worse in-hospital
22 outcomes in the acute phase of AIS. These associations were not influenced by the use of
23 thrombolysis as emergency treatment for AIS. CKD/ESRD should not represent sole
24 contraindications to thrombolysis for AIS.

25 **Keywords:** Ischaemic Stroke; Chronic Kidney Disease; Thrombolysis; In-hospital Mortality;

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Chronic kidney disease (CKD) affects more than 20 million Americans, of which over
3 500,000 have end-stage renal disease (ESRD) ¹, while an estimated 795,000 people
4 experience a new or recurrent stroke every year in the United States, of which an estimated
5 140,000 are fatal ². Current American Heart Association/American Stroke Association
6 (AHA/ASA) guidelines recommend that thrombolysis should be given up to 4.5 hours
7 following acute ischaemic stroke (AIS) as first line therapy, provided there are no
8 contraindications ^{3,4}. Whilst CKD is not currently listed as either an absolute or relative
9 contraindication for thrombolysis in the AHA/ASA guidelines, Japanese Guidelines from
10 2012 included “significant renal disorder” as a relative contraindication for thrombolysis ⁵.
11 CKD is known to increase the risk of bleeding, raising the question whether caution should
12 be exercised when undertaking thrombolysis in patients with CKD ⁶.

13 While CKD has been previously established as a poor prognostic factor in AIS ⁷,
14 previous studies evaluating the association between CKD and thrombolysis outcomes in
15 patients with AIS have remained equivocal. Observational study findings are conflicting,
16 with some studies concluding that renal dysfunction should not be a contraindication to
17 thrombolysis ^{6,8-10}, whilst others reporting the contrary ¹¹⁻¹⁴. A systematic review including
18 60,486 AIS patients undergoing thrombolysis concluded that moderate-to-severe CKD was
19 independently associated with intracranial haemorrhage and worse functional outcomes ¹⁵.
20 Given that the clinical trials assessing the safety of thrombolysis in AIS have provided no
21 subgroup analyses for renal disease ¹⁶⁻¹⁸, it remains unknown whether the association
22 between CKD and adverse AIS outcomes differs based on thrombolysis administration.
23 Furthermore, given the uncertainty regarding thrombolysis use in this patient subgroup, the
24 real-world patterns of thrombolysis use in AIS patients with renal dysfunction remain
25 unknown.

1 In this study, we aimed to determine (1) whether thrombolysis use for AIS was
2 dependent on the level of renal dysfunction, (2) whether renal dysfunction was associated
3 with adverse in-hospital outcomes (mortality, prolonged hospitalisation and moderate-to-
4 severe disability on discharge) in this population and (3) whether the associations between
5 renal dysfunction and adverse in-hospital outcomes were dependent on thrombolysis
6 administration.

7 8 **METHODS**

9 This study was conducted in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of
10 Helsinki (1975) and later amendments. As the National Inpatient Sample is a publicly
11 available database with no patient identifiable information, ethical approval was not
12 necessary for this project. The data that support the findings of this study are available from
13 the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

14 15 **Data Source and Inclusion Criteria**

16 The National Inpatient Sample (NIS) is a large publicly available database
17 containing >7 million annual hospital admission records. The NIS contains admission records
18 representing a 20% stratified sample of all community hospital admissions in the United
19 States in a given timeframe. Hospital sampling strata in the NIS are defined by geographic
20 regions, hospital location and teaching status, hospital ownership and hospital size¹⁹. Each
21 record sampled in the NIS is assigned a sampling weight which is a measure inversely related
22 to the probability of each hospital discharge being selected into the sample^{20,21}. Using the
23 provided sampling weights and information regarding NIS strata, this dataset can be used to
24 provide national estimates for the sampling population, representative of ~95% of the US
25 population^{27,28}. Accounting for the complex stratified sample design of the NIS in this

1 manner is essential in order to provide accurate and unbiased results, as each record may be
2 representative of a different number of admissions, depending on its assigned sampling
3 weight¹⁹. Furthermore, this approach ensures equal representation of all sampling strata in
4 analyses¹⁹

5 Prior to undertaking this project, all authors completed the online HCUP Data Use
6 Agreement Training Tool. All authors also read and signed the Data Use Agreement for
7 Nationwide Databases. Using data files containing annual admissions between 2005-2015,
8 International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Edition, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM)
9 disease codes 433.01, 433.11, 433.21, 433.31, 433.81, 433.91, 434.01, 434.11, 434.91 and
10 437.1 were used to identify all those admissions with a primary diagnosis of AIS ^{14,22}, after
11 the exclusion of elective admissions.

12 Figure 1 details the patient population flowchart: 934,638 records of ischaemic stroke
13 admissions between January 2005-September 2015 were extracted. After the exclusion of
14 49,101 records either due to missing data, age <18 years or elective admissions, 885,537
15 records were included. Elective admissions were excluded to ensure that only admissions
16 triggered by the acute stroke were included and not follow-up admissions. The *svy* survey
17 data commands in Stata were employed in order to account for the complex survey design²³.
18 Strata containing only one sampling unit were identified using the *svydescribe* command and
19 subsequently excluded from analyses using the *subpop* option, as their inclusion precludes
20 the computation of variance estimates²³. After the application of sampling weights as
21 probability weights and stratifying for NIS stratum and year of admission ²⁴ using the *svyset*
22 command²³ as well as the exclusion of strata with single sampling units, included records
23 were used to provide estimates for the population from which they were sampled: 4,283,086
24 admissions with a primary diagnosis of AIS.

25

1 **Definition of Exposure, Grouping Variables, Confounders and Outcomes**

2 Thrombolysis was defined using the procedural ICD-9 code 99.10. The included
3 patient population was divided into three mutually exclusive groups: no CKD, CKD/no
4 ESRD and ESRD. CKD was identified using ICD-9-CM codes 585.1, 585.3, 585.4, 585.5,
5 585.6 and 585.9, while ESRD was identified using the ICD-9-CM code 585.6. Patients with
6 code 585.9 (Chronic Kidney Disease, unspecified) who also had ICD-9-CM codes for
7 haemodialysis (39.95) or peritoneal dialysis (54.98) and did not have an Acute Kidney Injury
8 (AKI) (584.5, 584.6, 584.7, 584.8 and 584.9) were also assigned to the ESRD group. All
9 other patients from the “CKD, unspecified group” (585.9) were assigned to the CKD/no
10 ESRD group. This method of patient selection has been used previously to accurately identify
11 those patients with CKD and ESRD ^{25,26}. Comorbidities were determined using the HCUP
12 Elixhauser comorbidity software ²⁷ or using the ICD-9-CM codes detailed in Supplementary
13 Table 1 and represent diagnoses assigned before or during the index acute ischaemic stroke
14 hospitalisation.

15 The primary outcome of interest was all-cause in-hospital mortality. Secondary
16 outcomes were length of hospital stay (LOS) greater than or equal to the median (4 days) and
17 moderate-to-severe disability on discharge. The NIS discharge destination was employed as a
18 proxy for discharge disability, using an approach that has been previously validated ²⁸.
19 Briefly, all patients who died in hospital (n=206,893), those who were discharged alive to an
20 unknown destination (n=4381) and those who were discharged against medical advice (n=
21 30,667 patients) were excluded and the discharge disability was dichotomised based on the
22 discharge destination of the remainder, comprising of ~94.4% of the included sample. Thus,
23 routine discharge was equated to none-or-minimal disability, whilst a moderate-to-severe
24 disability status was assigned to all other discharge statuses: ‘home health care’, ‘short-term
25 hospital’ and ‘other facilities including intermediate care and skilled nursing home’. This

1 method has previously shown that discharge to a rehabilitation facility or nursing home to
2 have a positive predictive value of 89% for a modified Rankin scale score of 2-6 at 3 months
3 poststroke²⁸.

4 Intracranial haemorrhage (ICH) was defined using the ICD-9 comorbidity codes 430,
5 431, 432.0, 432.1; and 432.9 and was employed as outcome in secondary analyses including
6 only AIS patients undergoing thrombolysis. While the ICD-9 comorbidity codes used in NIS
7 do not allow differentiation between comorbidity diagnoses and in-hospital complications, it
8 is reasonable to assume that the vast majority of ICH diagnoses recorded in patients
9 undergoing thrombolysis most likely occurred during the index admission given that previous
10 ICH is an absolute contraindication to thrombolytic therapy⁴.

11

12 **Statistical Analysis**

13 Data were analysed using Stata 15.1 SE (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical Software:
14 Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC). All analyses were performed according to
15 the Healthcare Cost and Utilisation Project (HCUP) guidelines²⁹, utilising the provided
16 discharge weights as probability weights and survey data analysis techniques stratifying by
17 NIS stratum and year of admission²⁴ in order to account for patient clustering within
18 hospitals and produce US-wide estimates³⁰. Given the large sample size, a 1% threshold for
19 statistical significance ($P < 0.01$) was used in all analyses to minimise the type I error rate.

20

21 *Descriptive Statistics*

22 The Pearson χ^2 test, the independent sample t-test and the Mann-Whitney U tests
23 were used to compare differences between patients receiving thrombolysis and those who did
24 not amongst each group of renal dysfunction, for categorical, normally distributed continuous
25 and non-normally distributed continuous variables, respectively. Whether a continuous

1 variable was normally distributed was ascertained by visual inspection of the corresponding
2 histogram. The yearly (2005-2015) rates of thrombolysis usage were computed for each level
3 of renal dysfunction.

4

5 *Associations between renal dysfunction and receipt of thrombolysis*

6 Multivariable logistic regressions were performed modelling the association between
7 the levels of renal dysfunction and the odds of receiving IVT or ET therapy, using the no
8 CKD group as a reference category. The models were adjusted for the covariates listed
9 below.

10

11 *Associations between renal dysfunction and adverse outcomes as a function of receipt of* 12 *thrombolysis*

13 Multivariable logistic regressions were performed modelling the associations between
14 the level of renal dysfunction (no CKD – reference; CKD/no ESRD; ESRD) and in-hospital
15 outcomes. Separate models containing an interaction term between the level of renal
16 dysfunction and receipt of thrombolytic therapy were constructed in order to ascertain
17 whether the relationship between renal dysfunction and in-hospital outcomes varies
18 depending on receipt of thrombolysis. All models were adjusted for the covariates listed
19 below.

20

21 *Association between renal dysfunction and intracranial haemorrhage in patients receiving* 22 *thrombolysis*

23 A further multivariable logistic regression model was employed to analyse the
24 association between renal dysfunction (no CKD – reference; CKD/no ESRD; ESRD) and
25 intracranial haemorrhage amongst AIS patients receiving thrombolysis.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Post-hoc analyses

Given the observed increases in thrombolysis use with time, a secondary *post-hoc* analysis was performed in order to explore any differences in the associations between renal dysfunction and adverse in-hospital outcomes with time. Similarly, given the marked differences in thrombolysis use by hospital location and teaching status, a *post-hoc* analysis was also performed to explore differences the associations between renal dysfunction and adverse in-hospital outcomes with hospital location and teaching status. Separate multivariable logistic regressions were therefore performed adding interaction terms between the levels of renal dysfunction and (i) a variable indicating whether an admission occurred either before 2011 or from 2011 onwards as well as (ii) the hospital location/status (urban teaching vs. urban nonteaching vs. rural).

Adjusting co-variates

All models were adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of comorbidities. These included the Elixhauser comorbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease, coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders, metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss) as well as additional comorbidities which were considered important confounders of the relationship between renal disease and stroke in-hospital outcomes (atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease, smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia). The

1 Elixhauser comorbidity index is a well-established list of important predictors of in-hospital
2 outcomes and has been developed³¹ and validated³² on large administrative datasets,
3 including the NIS³³. Adjusting variables other than Elixhauser comorbidities were identified
4 as potential confounders based on previous literature^{12,22,34} and clinical judgement.

5

6 **RESULTS**

7 **Descriptive Statistics**

8 A total sample representative of 4,283,086 AIS admissions was included in the study:
9 47.32% were men, with a median (inter-quartile range) age of 73 (61-83) years. There were
10 3,755,784 (87.69%) admissions with no CKD, 452,802 (10.57%) admissions with CKD but
11 no ESRD, and 74,499 (1.74%) admissions with ESRD. Table 1 and Supplementary Table 2
12 show the baseline characteristics and outcome measures of the entire cohort, stratified by
13 receipt of thrombolysis and level of renal dysfunction. There were fewer patients receiving
14 thrombolysis treatment with increasing severity of renal dysfunction: 5.36% for no CKD,
15 4.91% for CKD/no ESRD and 3.70% for ESRD. Patients receiving thrombolysis had a
16 significantly lower proportion of female patients than those not receiving thrombolysis
17 amongst the no CKD group (50.44% versus 53.53%, $P<0.001$), but not amongst the CKD/no
18 ESRD (45.91% versus 46.82%, $P=0.233$) or ESRD group (52.30% versus 54.53%, $P=0.307$).
19 A significantly higher proportion of white patients received thrombolysis across all levels of
20 renal dysfunction: 64.93% versus 61.10%, $P<0.001$ amongst the no CKD group, 63.24%
21 versus 59.10%, $P<0.001$ amongst the CKD/no ESRD group and 45.15% versus 39.42%,
22 $P=0.005$ amongst the ESRD group. The proportion of patients with hypertension (78.28% for
23 no CKD, 91.87% for CKD/no ESRD and 95.50% for ESRD), diabetes mellitus (28.02% for
24 no CKD, 32.30% for CKD/no ESRD and 32.79% for ESRD), congestive heart failure
25 (12.18% for no CKD, 28.21% for CKD/no ESRD and 29.61% for ESRD) and coagulopathy

1 (2.62% for no CKD, 4.50% for CKD/no ESRD and 6.33% for ESRD) increased with
2 declining renal function. The percentage of patients that were current smokers (16.66% for
3 no CKD, 10.24% for CKD/no ESRD and 7.32% for ESRD) decreased with declining renal
4 function. The groups receiving thrombolysis had higher prevalence of atrial fibrillation than
5 the groups not receiving thrombolysis, across all levels of renal function: 31.81% versus
6 22.13% for no CKD, 42.45% versus 29.49% for CKD/no ESRD and 33.89% versus 21.71%
7 for ESRD. The groups receiving thrombolysis had a higher proportion of patients treated at
8 urban teaching hospitals than the groups not receiving thrombolysis, across all levels of renal
9 function: 63.98% versus 47.24% for no CKD, 63.48% versus 49.48% for CKD/no ESRD and
10 69.096% versus 52.56% for ESRD.

11 Figure 2 details the yearly trends in thrombolysis use between 2005-2015, stratified
12 by level of renal dysfunction. Since 2005, thrombolysis use has increased from 1.96% (99%
13 CI 1.58-2.43) to 8.54% (99% CI 8.17-8.93) in 2014 in the no CKD group. Over the same
14 time frame, thrombolysis use has increased from 2.40% (99% CI 1.37-4.17) to 7.11% (99%
15 CI 6.45-7.83) in the CKD/no ESRD group and from 2.94% (99% CI 1.24-6.84) to 5.34%
16 (99% CI 3.94-7.21) in the ESRD group.

17 **Association between renal dysfunction and odds of receiving thrombolysis**

18 Supplementary Table 3 details the adjusted odds of receiving thrombolysis treatment
19 stratified by level of renal dysfunction. Compared to the no CKD group, CKD/no ESRD was
20 not significantly associated with the odds of receiving thrombolysis: OR (99% CI) = 1.01
21 (0.95-1.06). Nevertheless, ESRD was associated with significantly decreased odds of
22 receiving thrombolysis: 0.81 (0.70-0.94).

23

24 **Association between thrombolysis and adverse outcomes as a function of renal** 25 **dysfunction**

1 Table 2 details the adjusted odds ratios underlying the association between renal
2 dysfunction and the outcome measures. Compared to the no CKD group, both CKD/no
3 ESRD group (1.04 (1.0003-1.09)) and the ESRD groups (2.06 (1.90-2.25)) had significantly
4 increased odds of in-hospital mortality. Similarly, patients with CKD/No ESRD (1.03 (1.02-
5 1.06)) and ESRD (1.44 (1.37-1.51)) were at higher odds of prolonged hospitalisation. Finally,
6 patients with CKD/No ESRD (1.13 (1.10-1.15)) and ESRD (1.34 (1.26-1.41)) were also at
7 higher odds of moderate-to-severe disability on discharge. Table 3 details the separate models
8 containing interaction terms between thrombolysis treatment and the level of renal
9 dysfunction, which revealed that these associations were independent of receipt of
10 thrombolysis.

11

12 **Association between renal dysfunction and intracranial haemorrhage in patients** 13 **receiving thrombolysis**

14 Table 4 details the associations between renal dysfunction and ICH amongst patients
15 receiving thrombolysis. The number of ICH events was 18,028 (8.95%) in those with no
16 CKD, 2218 (9.97%) in those with CKD/no ESRD and 233 (8.47%) in those with ESRD. The
17 logistic regression models revealed no statistically significant differences in this outcome
18 between the different levels of renal dysfunction upon confounder adjustment.

19

20 ***Post-hoc analyses***

21 Supplementary Tables 4 and 5 detail the results of the secondary post-hoc analyses.
22 There were no significant interactions between renal dysfunction and either (i) year of
23 admission (before 2011 vs. 2011 onwards) or (ii) the hospital location/status and the
24 association in terms of adverse in-hospital outcomes.

1 **DISCUSSION**

2 In this study including a sample representative of ~4.3 million AIS admissions
3 between 2005-2015, we determined that while compared to the no CKD group, CKD without
4 ESRD was not associated with decreased odds of receiving thrombolysis for AIS, ESRD was
5 associated with 19% lower odds of receiving thrombolysis. Furthermore, our analyses also
6 showed that CKD was associated with increased odds of in-hospital mortality, prolonged
7 hospitalisation and moderate-to-severe disability on discharge. Patients with ESRD were at
8 even higher odds of all adverse in-hospital outcomes than those with CKD without ESRD.
9 Our results nevertheless show that thrombolysis was not associated with any increases in the
10 CKD/ESRD-associated excess odds of adverse outcomes. Furthermore, we found no
11 association between the different levels of renal dysfunction and intracranial haemorrhage in
12 AIS patients undergoing thrombolysis.

13 The results of our study are consistent with previous literature highlighting the
14 association between CKD and adverse AIS in-hospital outcomes ⁷. Furthermore, our results
15 highlight that CKD patients without ESRD exhibited relatively small increases (4-13%) in
16 the odds of adverse outcomes, while ESRD was associated with higher increases (34-106%),
17 consistent with the previously reported dose-response relationship between decreasing
18 glomerular filtration rate and adverse AIS outcomes ⁷. In terms of thrombolysis for AIS,
19 previous investigations found that CKD was associated with adverse outcomes amongst AIS
20 patients receiving thrombolysis ^{11-13,22,35,36}, thus highlighting CKD as a potential
21 contraindication to thrombolysis for stroke. Nevertheless, other investigations have not found
22 an association between CKD and adverse AIS outcomes, including intracranial haemorrhage,
23 in patients undergoing thrombolysis ^{6,8-10}. Including a large, representative sample of AIS
24 patients across the United States, our study brings further clarification to these conflicting
25 results. Our results underline for the first time that the association between CKD, ESRD and

1 adverse AIS outcomes does not differ based on whether thrombolytic therapy was
2 administered, suggesting that the safety of thrombolysis treatment remains constant across
3 levels of renal dysfunction. Furthermore, in a secondary analysis only including AIS patients
4 undergoing thrombolysis, we found no association between renal dysfunction and intracranial
5 haemorrhage, an important acute complication of thrombolytic therapy.

6 The conflicting evidence regarding thrombolysis use in CKD, accompanied by
7 divided expert opinion ^{37,38}, may also result in lower overall utilisation of thrombolysis in
8 AIS patients with renal dysfunction. Our results highlight that in the United States, patients
9 with CKD and ESRD had lower raw rates of thrombolysis than those without CKD, trend
10 which persisted despite the constant yearly increase in thrombolysis utilisation between 2005
11 and 2015. Nevertheless, our multivariable analyses adjusting for a wide range of confounders
12 including age, sex, ethnicity and a wide range of comorbidities, showed that CKD without
13 ESRD was not independently associated with lower odds of receiving thrombolysis for AIS,
14 while ESRD was associated with 19% lower odds of receiving thrombolysis.

15 Our study is powered by several strengths such as including a large sample
16 representative of ~4.3 million AIS admissions across the United States between 2005 and
17 2015. Thus, the results of our study may have several implications for clinical practice. Our
18 results suggest that whilst CKD and ESRD were associated with increased odds of in-hospital
19 mortality, prolonged hospitalisation and increased disability on discharge, these associations
20 were not influenced by thrombolysis use. Therefore, our study suggests that renal dysfunction
21 should not represent a contraindication to emergency thrombolytic therapy for AIS in itself.
22 Furthermore, these results further underline that patients with renal dysfunction, especially
23 those with end-stage disease, are at significantly higher odds of mortality and complications
24 in the acute phase of AIS. These results not only warrant caution in the acute management of

1 AIS in patients with renal dysfunction, but also highlight the importance of appropriate stroke
2 prevention in this particularly vulnerable patient population.

3 These clinical implications should nevertheless be interpreted in the light of the
4 limitations of our study. As a study of administrative data, we based the ascertainment of
5 CKD/ESRD, comorbidities and thrombolysis on ICD-9 codes. Furthermore, we lacked data
6 quantifying stroke severity, such as the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, and we
7 were thus unable to stratify our analyses by stroke severity. We were also unable to evaluate
8 any changes in neurological disability associated with thrombolysis in patients with renal
9 dysfunction. However, we used the patient discharge destination (discharges to ‘home health
10 care’, ‘short-term hospital’ and ‘other facilities including intermediate care and skilled
11 nursing home’) as a proxy for moderate-to-severity disability on discharge, which has been
12 previously validated ²⁸. Nevertheless, this approach may bias the results as the discharge
13 destination in the US setting is also dependent on health insurance status and not only clinical
14 need. Furthermore, given the administrative nature of our data source, it was not possible to
15 establish the temporal relationship between bleeding events coded using ICD-9 codes and the
16 incident AIS event. Nevertheless, given that previous ICH is an absolute contraindication to
17 thrombolytic therapy, we performed a secondary analysis of ICH events post-thrombolysis
18 assuming that the majority of AIS patients receiving thrombolysis would not have a history
19 of ICH. The results of this analysis should therefore be interpreted in the light of this
20 assumption and further research ascertaining ICH occurring only after the index AIS event is
21 needed in order to further clarify the relationship between renal dysfunction and this
22 outcome. We also lacked laboratory data quantifying renal dysfunction, such as creatinine
23 clearance or the estimated glomerular filtration rate. Nevertheless, we employed ICD-9 codes
24 to classify admissions into 3 mutually exclusive categories: no CKD, CKD without ESRD
25 and ESRD, as previously described ^{25,26}. We were thus able to draw differentiate between

1 admissions with ESRD and those with less severe CKD in all our analyses. Finally, our
2 administrative data source did not provide any information on certain contraindications to
3 thrombolysis such as time from stroke onset to first medical contact, blood pressure on
4 admission and laboratory data such as platelet count or coagulation studies. We were thus
5 unable to determine whether the reduced odds of receiving thrombolysis associated with
6 ESRD were driven by a higher prevalence of such contraindications amongst this group.

7 In conclusion, in this study of real-world data representative of ~95% of AIS
8 admissions in the United States between 2005-2015, renal dysfunction was independently
9 associated with higher in-hospital mortality, prolonged hospitalisation and moderate-to-
10 severe disability on discharge in the acute phase of AIS. These associations were not
11 influenced by the use of thrombolysis as emergency treatment for AIS, thus suggesting that
12 previous findings of increases in the risk of adverse outcomes after thrombolysis in patients
13 with CKD/ESRD were mainly driven by renal dysfunction and were comparable to those
14 recorded amongst their counterparts not undergoing thrombolysis. In conjunction with
15 previous findings suggesting that the higher rates of haemorrhagic complications recorded in
16 patients with renal dysfunction after thrombolysis were driven by non-CKD related factors ⁹,
17 the results of this study suggest that renal dysfunction in itself should not represent a
18 contraindication to thrombolysis for AIS.

19

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 We would like to acknowledge the HCUP Data Partners ([https://www.hcup-](https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/db/hcupdatapartners.jsp)
3 [us.ahrq.gov/db/hcupdatapartners.jsp](https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/db/hcupdatapartners.jsp)).

4

5 **FUNDING**

6 JQ received the Leslie Wilson Scholarship as part of the Aberdeen Summer Research
7 Scholarship Programme of the Aberdeen Clinical Academic Training (ACAT) Pathways. The
8 Leslie Wilson Scholarship is funded by the Department of Medicine for the Elderly, NHS
9 Grampian

10 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

11 There are no conflicts of interest.

12

13 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

14 TAP, JQ and PKM conceived the study. Data were analysed by JQ and TAP under the
15 supervision of MOM and PKM. TAP, JQ and PKM drafted the article, and all the authors
16 contributed to writing the article. PKM is the guarantor.

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 1. Drawz P, Rahman M. Chronic kidney disease. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162:ITC1–ITC14.
- 3 2. Benjamin EJ, Muntner P, Alonso A, Bittencourt MS, Callaway CW, Carson AP,
4 Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, Das SR, Delling FN, Djousse L, Elkind MSV,
5 Ferguson JF, Fornage M, Jordan LC, Khan SS, Kissela BM, Knutson KL, Kwan TW,
6 Lackland DT, Lewis TT, Lichtman JH, Longenecker CT, Loop MS, Lutsey PL, Martin SS,
7 Matsushita K, Moran AE, Mussolino ME, O’Flaherty M, Pandey A, Perak AM, Rosamond
8 WD, Roth GA, Sampson UKA, Satou GM, Schroeder EB, Shah SH, Spartano NL, Stokes A,
9 Tirschwell DL, Tsao CW, Turakhia MP, VanWagner LB, Wilkins JT, Wong SS, Virani SS.
10 Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2019 Update: A Report From the American Heart
11 Association. *Circulation* 2019;139:e56–e66.
- 12 3. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, Biller J,
13 Brown M, Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, Jauch EC, Kidwell CS, Leslie-Mazwi TM, Ovbiagele
14 B, Scott PA, Sheth KN, Southerland AM, Summers D V, Tirschwell DL. 2018 Guidelines for
15 the Early Management of Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Guideline for Healthcare
16 Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*
17 2018;49:e46–e110.
- 18 4. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, Biller J,
19 Brown M, Demaerschalk BM, Hoh B, Jauch EC, Kidwell CS, Leslie-Mazwi TM, Ovbiagele
20 B, Scott PA, Sheth KN, Southerland AM, Summers D V, Tirschwell DL. Guidelines for the
21 Early Management of Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke: 2019 Update to the 2018
22 Guidelines for the Early Management of Acute Ischemic Stroke: A Guideline for Healthcare
23 Professionals From the American Heart Association/American Stroke . *Stroke* 2019;50:e344–
24 e418.
- 25 5. Minematsu K, Toyoda K, Hirano T, Kimura K, Kondo R, Mori E, Nakagawara J, Sakai N,

1 Shiokawa Y, Tanahashi N, Yasaka M, Katayama Y, Miyamoto S, Ogawa A, Sasaki M, Suga
2 S, Yamaguchi T. Guidelines for the Intravenous Application of Recombinant Tissue-type
3 Plasminogen Activator (Alteplase), the Second Edition, October 2012: A Guideline from the
4 Japan Stroke Society. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2013;22:571–600.

5 6. Sobolewski P, Kozera G, Kaźmierski R, Michalak S, Szczuchniak W, Śledzińska-Dźwigal
6 M, Nyka WM. Intravenous rt-PA in patients with ischaemic stroke and renal dysfunction.
7 *Clin Neurol Neurosurg* 2013;115:1770–4.

8 7. Vart P, Barlas RS, Bettencourt-Silva JH, Metcalf AK, Bowles KM, Potter JF, Myint PK.
9 Estimated glomerular filtration rate and risk of poor outcomes after stroke. *Eur J Neurol*
10 2019;26:1455–1463.

11 8. Hsieh C-Y, Lin H-J, Sung S-F, Yang Y-HK, Lai EC-C, Hsieh H-C, Chen C-H. Does renal
12 dysfunction modify the effect of intravenous thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke within
13 4.5 hours of onset? A multicenter observational study. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*
14 2015;24:673–9.

15 9. Ovbiagele B, Smith EE, Schwamm LH, Grau-Sepulveda M V, Saver JL, Bhatt DL,
16 Hernandez AF, Peterson ED, Fonarow GC. Chronic kidney disease and bleeding
17 complications after intravenous thrombolytic therapy for acute ischemic stroke. *Circ*
18 *Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2014;7:929–35.

19 10. Hao Z, Yang C, Liu M, Wu B. Renal dysfunction and thrombolytic therapy in patients
20 with acute ischemic stroke: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*
21 2014;93:e286.

22 11. Carr SJ, Wang X, Olavarria V V., Lavados PM, Rodriguez JA, Kim JS, Lee TH, Lindley
23 RI, Pontes-Neto OM, Ricci S, Sato S, Sharma VK, Woodward M, Chalmers J, Anderson CS,
24 Robinson TG. Influence of Renal Impairment on Outcome for Thrombolysis-Treated Acute
25 Ischemic Stroke: ENCHANTED (Enhanced Control of Hypertension and Thrombolysis

- 1 Stroke Study) Post Hoc Analysis. *Stroke* 2017;48:2605–2609.
- 2 12. Sadeghi-Hokmabadi E, Baş DF, Farhoudi M, Taheraghdam A, Savadi Oskouei D,
3 Yazdchi M, Hashemilar M, Uzuner N, Mirnour R, Colak E, Özdemir AÖ. Renal Dysfunction
4 Is an Independent Risk Factor for Poor Outcome in Acute Ischemic Stroke Patients Treated
5 with Intravenous Thrombolysis: A New Cutoff Value. *Stroke Res Treat* 2017;2017:2371956.
- 6 13. Jung J-M, Kim HJ, Ahn H, Ahn IM, Do Y, Choi J-Y, Seo W-K, Oh K, Cho K-H, Yu S.
7 Chronic kidney disease and intravenous thrombolysis in acute stroke: A systematic review
8 and meta-analysis. *J Neurol Sci* 2015;358:345–50.
- 9 14. Alqahtani F, Berzingi CO, Aljohani S, Hajji M Al, Diab A, Alvi M, Boobes K, Alkhouli
10 M. Temporal Trends in the Outcomes of Dialysis Patients Admitted With Acute Ischemic
11 Stroke. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2018;7.
- 12 15. Malhotra K, Katsanos AH, Goyal N, Tayal A, Gensicke H, Mitsias PD, Marchis GM De,
13 Berge E, Alexandrov AW, Alexandrov A V, Tsivgoulis G. Intravenous thrombolysis in
14 patients with chronic kidney disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurology*
15 2020;95:e121–e130.
- 16 16. ECASS III: Guidetti D, Larrue V, Lees KR, Medeghri Z, Machnig T, Schneider D,
17 Kummer R Von, Wahlgren N, Toni D, Investigators E. Thrombolysis with Alteplase 3 to 4.5
18 Hours after Acute Ischemic Stroke (ECASS III). *N Engl J Med* 2008:1317–1329.
- 19 17. Wahlgren N, Ahmed N, Dávalos A, Ford GA, Grond M, Hacke W, Hennerici MG, Kaste
20 M, Kuelkens S, Larrue V, Lees KR, Roine RO, Soenne L, Toni D, Vanhooren G, SITS-
21 MOST investigators. Thrombolysis with alteplase for acute ischaemic stroke in the Safe
22 Implementation of Thrombolysis in Stroke-Monitoring Study (SITS-MOST): an
23 observational study. *Lancet (London, England)* 2007;369:275–82.
- 24 18. Sandercock P, Wardlaw JM, Lindley RI, Dennis M, Cohen G, Murray G, Innes K,
25 Venables G, Czlonkowska A, Kobayashi A, Ricci S, Murray V, Berge E, Slot KB, Hankey

1 GJ, Correia M, Peeters A, Matz K, Lyrer P, Gubitza G, Phillips SJ, Arauz A. The benefits and
2 harms of intravenous thrombolysis with recombinant tissue plasminogen activator within 6 h
3 of acute ischaemic stroke (the third international stroke trial [IST-3]): a randomised
4 controlled trial. *Lancet (London, England)* 2012;379:2352–2363.

5 19. Houchens R, Ross D, Elixhauser A, Jiang J. *Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS) Redesign*
6 *Final Report Report # 2014-04. HCUP Methods Series.*; 2014. Available at:
7 <http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/reports/methods/methods.jsp>. HCUP. Accessed June 4, 2021.

8 20. (HCUP) Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. HCUP NIS Description of Data
9 Elements. *Agency Healthc Res Qual Rockville, MD* 2008. Available at: <https://hcup->
10 [us.ahrq.gov/db/vars/discwt/nisnote.jsp](https://hcup-us.ahrq.gov/db/vars/discwt/nisnote.jsp).

11 21. Bell BA, Onwuegbuzie AJ, Ferron JM, Jiao QG, Hibbard ST, Kromrey JD. Use of design
12 effects and sample weights in complex health survey data: a review of published articles
13 using data from 3 commonly used adolescent health surveys. *Am J Public Health*
14 2012;102:1399–1405.

15 22. Tariq N, Adil MM, Saeed F, Chaudhry SA, Qureshi AI. Outcomes of thrombolytic
16 treatment for acute ischemic stroke in dialysis-dependent patients in the United States. *J*
17 *Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis* 2013;22:e354-9.

18 23. StataCorp. *Stata 15 Survey Data Reference Manual*. College Station, TX; 2017. Available
19 at: <https://www.stata.com/manuals15/svy.pdf>. Accessed June 4, 2021.

20 24. (HCUP) Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. HCUP NIS Description of Data
21 Elements. *Agency Healthc Res Qual Rockville, MD* 2008. Available at: www.hcup-
22 [us.ahrq.gov/db/vars/dispuniform/nisnote.jsp](http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/db/vars/dispuniform/nisnote.jsp). Accessed April 28, 2020.

23 25. Gupta T, Paul N, Kolte D, Harikrishnan P, Khera S, Aronow WS, Mujib M, Palaniswamy
24 C, Sule S, Jain D, Ahmed A, Cooper HA, Frishman WH, Bhatt DL, Fonarow GC, Panza JA.
25 Association of chronic renal insufficiency with in-hospital outcomes after percutaneous

1 coronary intervention. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2015;4:e002069.

2 26. Kumar G, Sakhuja A, Taneja A, Majumdar T, Patel J, Whittle J, Nanchal R. Pulmonary
3 embolism in patients with CKD and ESRD. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2012;7:1584–1590.

4 27. (HCUP) Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. HCUP Elixhauser Comorbidity
5 Software. *Agency Healthc Res Qual Rockville, MD* 2017. Available at: www.hcup-
6 us.ahrq.gov. Accessed April 28, 2020.

7 28. Qureshi AI, Chaudhry SA, Sapkota BL, Rodriguez GJ, Suri MFK. Discharge destination
8 as a surrogate for Modified Rankin Scale defined outcomes at 3- and 12-months poststroke
9 among stroke survivors. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 2012;93:1408-1413.e1.

10 29. (HCUP) Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project. Checklist for Working with the NIS.
11 *Agency Healthc Res Qual Rockville, MD* 2017. Available at: www.hcup-
12 us.ahrq.gov/db/nation/nis/nischecklist.jsp. Accessed April 28, 2020.

13 30. Houchens R, Ross D, Elixhauser A. Final Report on Calculating National Inpatient
14 Sample (NIS) Variances for Data Years 2012 and Later. 2015.

15 31. Elixhauser A, Steiner C, Harris DR, Coffey RM. Comorbidity measures for use with
16 administrative data. *Med Care* 1998;36:8–27.

17 32. Tang J, Wan JY, Bailey JE. Performance of comorbidity measures to predict stroke and
18 death in a community-dwelling, hypertensive Medicaid population. *Stroke* 2008;39:1938–
19 1944.

20 33. Potts J, Nagaraja V, Suwaidi J Al, Brugaletta S, Martinez SC, Alraies C, Fischman D,
21 Kwok CS, Nolan J, Mylotte D, Mamas MA. The influence of Elixhauser comorbidity index
22 on percutaneous coronary intervention outcomes. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv Off J Soc*
23 *Card Angiogr Interv* 2019;94:195–203.

24 34. Pana TA, Mohamed MO, Clark AB, Fahy E, Mamas MA, Myint PK. Revascularisation
25 therapies improve the outcomes of ischemic stroke patients with atrial fibrillation and heart

- 1 failure. *Int J Cardiol* 2020.
- 2 35. Rao Z-Z, Gu H-Q, Wang X-W, Xie X-W, Yang X, Wang C-J, Zhao X, Xian Y, Wang Y-
3 L, Li Z-X, Xiao R-P, Wang Y-J. Renal Dysfunction and In-Hospital Outcomes in Patients
4 With Acute Ischemic Stroke After Intravenous Thrombolytic Therapy. *J Am Heart Assoc*
5 2019;8:e012052.
- 6 36. Zhu J, Shen X, Han C, Mei C, Zhou Y, Wang H, Kong Y, Jiang Y, Fang Q, Cai X. Renal
7 Dysfunction Associated with Symptomatic Intracranial Hemorrhage after Intravenous
8 Thrombolysis. *J stroke Cerebrovasc Dis Off J Natl Stroke Assoc* 2019;28:104363.
- 9 37. Power A, Fogarty D, Wheeler DC. Acute stroke thrombolysis in end-stage renal disease:
10 A national survey of nephrologist opinion. *Nephron - Clin Pract* 2013;124:167–172.
- 11 38. Palacio S, Gonzales NR, Sangha NS, Birnbaum LA, Hart RG. Thrombolysis for acute
12 stroke in hemodialysis: International survey of expert opinion. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*
13 2011;6:1089–1093.
- 14

1 **TABLES**

2
3
4
5
6

Table 1. Baseline characteristics and outcomes of AIS patients receiving/not receiving thrombolysis, stratified by level of renal dysfunction. Further descriptive statistics are detailed in Supplementary Table 2.

	No CKD			CKD/No ESRD			ESRD		
	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value
N	3554367	201417		430548	22254		71743	2757	
Age, median (IQR) †	70.00 (58.00-81.00)	72.00 (60.00-82.00)	<0.001	78.00 (69.00-86.00)	77.00 (67.00-85.00)	<0.001	69.00 (59.00-78.00)	68.00 (58.00-77.00)	0.078
Length-of-stay, median (IQR) †	4.00 (3.00-7.00)	4.00 (2.00-6.00)	<0.001	5.00 (3.00-8.00)	4.00 (3.00-7.00)	<0.001	7.00 (4.00-11.00)	5.00 (3.00-9.00)	<0.001
Sex Female, N (%)‡	1902492 (53.53)	101601 (50.44)	<0.001	201573 (46.82)	10217 (45.91)	0.233	39124 (54.53)	1442 (52.30)	0.307
Ethnicity ‡			<0.001			<0.001			0.005
White	2171771 (61.10)	130770 (64.93)		254440 (59.10)	14073 (63.24)		28278 (39.42)	1245 (45.15)	
Black	476284 (13.40)	24653 (12.24)		82799 (19.23)	3566 (16.02)		21769 (30.34)	820 (29.74)	
Hispanic	228607 (6.43)	13532 (6.72)		26227 (6.09)	1224 (5.50)		8799 (12.26)	366 (13.26)	
Asian or Pacific Islander	79531 (2.24)	5070 (2.52)		11207 (2.60)	744 (3.34)		2422 (3.38)	79 (2.88)	
Native American	14565 (0.41)	602 (0.30)		1603 (0.37)	84 (0.38)		619 (0.86)	<11	
Other	77518 (2.18)	5529 (2.75)		8585 (1.99)	580 (2.60)		1468 (2.05)	55 (2.01)	
Comorbidities ‡									
Congestive heart failure	429186 (12.07)	28305 (14.05)	<0.001	120089 (27.89)	7639 (34.32)	<0.001	21127 (29.45)	933 (33.83)	0.028
Chronic Pulmonary Disease	515690 (14.51)	28983 (14.39)	0.523	78057 (18.13)	4129 (18.55)	0.472	11593 (16.16)	488 (17.69)	0.346

Diabetes Mellitus, Uncomplicated	1004763 (28.27)	47538 (23.60)	<0.001	139424 (32.38)	6819 (30.64)	0.015	23582 (32.87)	850 (30.85)	0.306
Diabetes Mellitus, Chronic Complications	155582 (4.38)	5451 (2.71)	<0.001	68198 (15.84)	2749 (12.35)	<0.001	22456 (31.30)	782 (28.36)	0.138
Hypertension	2785066 (78.36)	155103 (77.01)	<0.001	395230 (91.80)	20742 (93.21)	<0.001	68466 (95.43)	2678 (97.17)	0.050
Liver Disease	36920 (1.04)	1882 (0.93)	0.044	6310 (1.47)	293 (1.31)	0.414	1854 (2.58)	64 (2.33)	0.702
Metastatic Cancer	53273 (1.50)	1507 (0.75)	<0.001	5075 (1.18)	201 (0.90)	0.095	571 (0.80)	28 (1.02)	0.555
Peripheral Vascular Disease	289670 (8.15)	16011 (7.95)	0.166	62305 (14.47)	3164 (14.22)	0.648	12637 (17.61)	437 (15.84)	0.269
Solid Tumour (without metastasis)	60175 (1.69)	2739 (1.36)	<0.001	8438 (1.96)	322 (1.45)	0.017	877 (1.22)	20 (0.74)	0.310
Valvular Disease	346070 (9.74)	21152 (10.50)	<0.001	56180 (13.05)	3216 (14.45)	0.007	7969 (11.11)	307 (11.15)	0.975
Atrial Fibrillation	786723 (22.13)	64062 (31.81)	<0.001	126988 (29.49)	9447 (42.45)	<0.001	15572 (21.71)	934 (33.89)	<0.001
Previous stroke	316791 (8.91)	19227 (9.55)	<0.001	55461 (12.88)	2630 (11.82)	0.042	6722 (9.37)	253 (9.19)	0.890
Coronary Heart Disease	864809 (24.33)	51025 (25.33)	<0.001	163496 (37.97)	8999 (40.44)	<0.001	27197 (37.91)	1156 (41.94)	0.049
Smoking	589646 (16.59)	36044 (17.90)	<0.001	44143 (10.25)	2216 (9.96)	0.526	5237 (7.30)	219 (7.95)	0.556
Dyslipidaemia	1730383 (48.68)	104613 (51.94)	<0.001	236190 (54.86)	13000 (58.42)	<0.001	28513 (39.74)	1134 (41.16)	0.516
Outcomes, N (%)[‡]									
In-hospital mortality	159265 (4.48)	16160 (8.02)	<0.001	22843 (5.31)	2361 (10.61)	<0.001	5899 (8.22)	365 (13.23)	<0.001
Length-of-stay >4 days	1331502 (37.46)	99953 (49.63)	<0.001	193216 (44.88)	12482 (56.09)	<0.001	41104 (57.29)	1924 (69.81)	<0.001
Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	2047841 (60.86)	119378 (65.01)	<0.001	291493 (71.91)	15134 (76.52)	<0.001	46417 (71.37)	1788 (75.41)	0.049

1
2

1 CKD – Chronic Kidney Disease; ESRD – End Stage Renal Disease; IVT – intravenous thrombolysis, SD – Standard Deviation; IQR –
2 Interquartile Range; Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **bold**.

3
4 † The Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare differences between patients receiving thrombolysis and those who did not amongst each
5 group of renal dysfunction for this variable.

6
7 ‡ The Pearson χ^2 test was used to compare differences between patients receiving thrombolysis and those who did not amongst each group of
8 renal dysfunction for this variable.

1 **Table 2.** Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the association between levels of renal dysfunction and adverse acute ischaemic
 2 stroke in-hospital outcomes.
 3

	In-hospital mortality		Prolonged hospitalisation		Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	
	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value
No CKD (n= 3,755,784)	Reference	-	Reference	-	Reference	-
CKD/No ESRD (n= 452,802)	1.04 (1.0003-1.09)	0.009	1.03 (1.02-1.06)	<0.001	1.13 (1.10-1.15)	<0.001
ESRD (n= 74,499)	2.06 (1.90-2.25)	<0.001	1.44 (1.37-1.51)	<0.001	1.34 (1.26-1.41)	<0.001

4
 5 Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of comorbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol
 6 abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease,
 7 coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders,
 8 metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid
 9 tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease,
 10 smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).

11
 12 OR – Odds Ratio; CI – Confidence Interval;

13
 14 Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **bold**.
 15

1 **Table 3.** Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the association between levels of renal dysfunction and adverse acute ischaemic
 2 stroke in-hospital outcomes including interaction terms with use of thrombolysis.
 3

	In-hospital mortality		Prolonged hospitalisation		Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	
	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value
No CKD (n= 3,755,784)	Reference	-	Reference	-	Reference	-
CKD/No ESRD (n= 452,802)	1.04 (0.99-1.09)	0.020	1.04 (1.02-1.07)	<0.001	1.13 (1.10-1.16)	<0.001
<i>Interaction term: Thrombolysis use</i>	1.02 (0.88-1.19)	0.701	0.91 (0.82-1.00)	0.010	0.91 (0.81-1.02)	0.028
ESRD (n= 74,499)	2.09 (1.91-2.28)	<0.001	1.43 (1.36-1.51)	<0.001	1.34 (1.26-1.42)	<0.001
<i>Interaction term: Thrombolysis use</i>	0.84 (0.59-1.21)	0.223	1.12 (0.84-1.47)	0.328	0.95 (0.69-1.30)	0.647

4
 5 Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of comorbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol
 6 abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease,
 7 coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders,
 8 metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid
 9 tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease,
 10 smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).

11
 12 OR – Odds Ratio; CI – Confidence Interval;
 13

1 Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **Table 4**. Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the
 2 association between levels of renal dysfunction and intracranial haemorrhage amongst acute ischaemic stroke patients undergoing thrombolysis.
 3
 4

AIS admissions undergoing thrombolysis			
	ICH* events N (%)	OR (99% CI)	P value
No CKD (n=201,417)	18,028 (8.95)	Reference	-
CKD/No ESRD (n=22,254)	22,254 (9.97)	0.93 (0.80-1.08)	0.215
ESRD (n=2757)	233 (8.47)	0.88 (0.57-1.35)	0.430

16
 17 *defined using ICD-9 comorbidity codes 430; 431; 432.0; 432.1; 432.9. While the ICD-9 comorbidity codes used in the National Inpatient
 18 Sample do not allow differentiation between comorbidity diagnoses and in-hospital complications, this model assumes that ICH diagnoses
 19 recorded in patients undergoing thrombolysis occurred during the index admission as a complication of thrombolysis given that previous
 20 intracranial haemorrhage (ICH) is an absolute contraindication to thrombolytic therapy.
 21

22 Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of comorbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol
 23 abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease,
 24 coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders,
 25 metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid
 26 tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease,
 27 smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).
 28

29 ICH – intracranial haemorrhage; OR – Odds Ratio; CI – Confidence Interval;

1 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

2

3 **Figure 1.** Patient population flowchart.

4

5 **Figure 2.** Yearly trends in thrombolysis use in acute ischaemic stroke patients included in the
6 National Inpatient Sample between 2005-2015 over time, stratified by renal function.

7

8 CKD – Chronic Kidney Disease; ESRD – End Stage Renal Disease;

9

10

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. International Classification of Disease – ninth edition (ICD9) codes used to extract co-morbidities, procedures and in-hospital outcomes.

Comorbidities	ICD 9 codes (Diagnosis)
Atrial Fibrillation	427.31; 427.32
Previous cerebrovascular disease	V125.4
Coronary Heart Disease	411.1; 411.81; 411.89; 412; 413.1; 413.9; 414.00; 414.01; 414.02; 414.04; 414.05; 414.8; 414.9
Smoking	305.1; V158.2
Dyslipidaemia	272.0; 272.1; 272.2; 272.4
Dementia	290.0; 290.10; 290.40; 290.41; 290.42; 290.43; 290.9; 294.10; 294.11; 294.20; 294.21; 331.0; 331.19; 331.2; 331.82
Outcomes	
Intracranial haemorrhage	430; 431; 432.0; 432.1; 432.9;
Procedures	ICD 9 codes (Procedural)
Thrombolysis	99.10

ICD 9 - International Classification of Disease – ninth edition

Supplementary Table 2. Baseline characteristics and outcomes of AIS patients receiving/not receiving thrombolysis, stratified by level of renal dysfunction.

	No CKD			CKD/No ESRD			ESRD		
	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value	No IVT	IVT	<i>P</i> value
N	3554367	201417		430548	22254		71743	2757	
Age, median (IQR)	70.00 (58.00-81.00)	72.00 (60.00-82.00)	<0.001	78.00 (69.00-86.00)	77.00 (67.00-85.00)	<0.001	69.00 (59.00-78.00)	68.00 (58.00-77.00)	0.078
Length-of-stay, median (IQR)	4.00 (3.00-7.00)	4.00 (2.00-6.00)	<0.001	5.00 (3.00-8.00)	4.00 (3.00-7.00)	<0.001	7.00 (4.00-11.00)	5.00 (3.00-9.00)	<0.001
Sex Female, N (%)	1902492 (53.53)	101601 (50.44)	<0.001	201573 (46.82)	10217 (45.91)	0.233	39124 (54.53)	1442 (52.30)	0.307
Ethnicity			<0.001			<0.001			0.005
White	2171771 (61.10)	130770 (64.93)		254440 (59.10)	14073 (63.24)		28278 (39.42)	1245 (45.15)	
Black	476284 (13.40)	24653 (12.24)		82799 (19.23)	3566 (16.02)		21769 (30.34)	820 (29.74)	
Hispanic	228607 (6.43)	13532 (6.72)		26227 (6.09)	1224 (5.50)		8799 (12.26)	366 (13.26)	
Asian or Pacific Islander	79531 (2.24)	5070 (2.52)		11207 (2.60)	744 (3.34)		2422 (3.38)	79 (2.88)	
Native American	14565 (0.41)	602 (0.30)		1603 (0.37)	84 (0.38)		619 (0.86)	<11	
Other	77518 (2.18)	5529 (2.75)		8585 (1.99)	580 (2.60)		1468 (2.05)	55 (2.01)	
Elixhauser Comorbidities									
HIV/AIDS	6332 (0.18)	273 (0.14)	0.044	897 (0.21)	65 (0.29)	0.239	370 (0.52)	<11	0.273
Alcohol abuse	149622 (4.21)	9179 (4.56)	<0.001	10677 (2.48)	526 (2.37)	0.624	768 (1.07)	45 (1.62)	0.222
Deficiency anaemia	330090 (9.29)	19326 (9.60)	0.059	107698 (25.01)	5492 (24.68)	0.615	35324 (49.24)	1480 (53.68)	0.042
Rheumatoid arthritis/ Collagen vascular disease	85050 (2.39)	4883 (2.42)	0.695	11968 (2.78)	661 (2.97)	0.447	1648 (2.30)	81 (2.94)	0.321

Chronic blood loss anaemia	14120 (0.40)	726 (0.36)	.246	2864 (0.67)	139 (0.62)	.743	419 (0.58)	11 (0.39)	.56400 000000 00001
Congestive heart failure	429186 (12.07)	28305 (14.05)	<0.001	120089 (27.89)	7639 (34.32)	<0.001	21127 (29.45)	933 (33.83)	0.028
Chronic Pulmonary Disease	515690 (14.51)	28983 (14.39)	0.523	78057 (18.13)	4129 (18.55)	0.472	11593 (16.16)	488 (17.69)	0.346
Coagulopathy	91964 (2.59)	6467 (3.21)	<0.001	19068 (4.43)	1289 (5.79)	<0.001	4554 (6.35)	161 (5.82)	0.615
Depression	340220 (9.57)	18145 (9.01)	<0.001	42476 (9.87)	2000 (8.99)	0.053	6475 (9.02)	208 (7.55)	0.229
Diabetes Mellitus, Uncomplicated	1004763 (28.27)	47538 (23.60)	<0.001	139424 (32.38)	6819 (30.64)	0.015	23582 (32.87)	850 (30.85)	0.306
Diabetes Mellitus, Chronic Complications	155582 (4.38)	5451 (2.71)	<0.001	68198 (15.84)	2749 (12.35)	<0.001	22456 (31.30)	782 (28.36)	0.138
Hypertension	2785066 (78.36)	155103 (77.01)	<0.001	395230 (91.80)	20742 (93.21)	<0.001	68466 (95.43)	2678 (97.17)	0.050
Hypothyroidism	439093 (12.35)	25588 (12.70)	0.046	68568 (15.93)	3946 (17.73)	0.001	9357 (13.04)	385 (13.95)	0.526
Liver Disease	36920 (1.04)	1882 (0.93)	0.044	6310 (1.47)	293 (1.31)	0.414	1854 (2.58)	64 (2.33)	0.702
Lymphoma	17286 (0.49)	955 (0.47)	0.732	3043 (0.71)	161 (0.72)	0.898	692 (0.96)	15 (0.54)	0.317
Fluid and electrolyte disorders	675617 (19.01)	39471 (19.60)	0.010	126870 (29.47)	6553 (29.45)	0.976	20724 (28.89)	970 (35.20)	0.001
Metastatic Cancer	53273 (1.50)	1507 (0.75)	<0.001	5075 (1.18)	201 (0.90)	0.095	571 (0.80)	28 (1.02)	0.555
Other neurological disorders	16135 (0.45)	2133 (1.06)	<0.001	2150 (0.50)	291 (1.31)	<0.001	892 (1.24)	43 (1.57)	0.491
Obesity	286120 (8.05)	19875 (9.87)	<0.001	46375 (10.77)	2595 (11.66)	0.067	6484 (9.04)	247 (8.97)	0.957
Paralysis	51156 (1.44)	109465 (54.35)	<0.001	5945 (1.38)	12764 (57.35)	<0.001	1677 (2.34)	1331 (48.28)	<0.001
Peripheral Vascular Disease	289670 (8.15)	16011 (7.95)	0.166	62305 (14.47)	3164 (14.22)	0.648	12637 (17.61)	437 (15.84)	0.269
Psychosis	110638 (3.11)	5252 (2.61)	<0.001	14678 (3.41)	637 (2.86)	0.057	2366 (3.30)	108 (3.91)	0.424

Pulmonary circulation disorders	94094 (2.65)	7368 (3.66)	<0.001	22564 (5.24)	1494 (6.72)	<0.001	3845 (5.36)	161 (5.85)	0.621
Solid Tumour (without metastasis)	60175 (1.69)	2739 (1.36)	<0.001	8438 (1.96)	322 (1.45)	0.017	877 (1.22)	20 (0.74)	0.310
Peptic ulcer disease (excluding bleeding)	1009 (0.03)	23 (0.01)	0.041	163 (0.04)	<11	0.204	46 (0.06)	<11	0.534
Valvular Disease	346070 (9.74)	21152 (10.50)	<0.001	56180 (13.05)	3216 (14.45)	0.007	7969 (11.11)	307 (11.15)	0.975
Weight loss	102205 (2.88)	6496 (3.23)	0.002	19994 (4.64)	1181 (5.31)	0.048	5257 (7.33)	264 (9.57)	0.050
Other Comorbidities									
Atrial Fibrillation	786723 (22.13)	64062 (31.81)	<0.001	126988 (29.49)	9447 (42.45)	<0.001	15572 (21.71)	934 (33.89)	<0.001
Previous stroke	316791 (8.91)	19227 (9.55)	<0.001	55461 (12.88)	2630 (11.82)	0.042	6722 (9.37)	253 (9.19)	0.890
Coronary Heart Disease	864809 (24.33)	51025 (25.33)	<0.001	163496 (37.97)	8999 (40.44)	<0.001	27197 (37.91)	1156 (41.94)	0.049
Smoking	589646 (16.59)	36044 (17.90)	<0.001	44143 (10.25)	2216 (9.96)	0.526	5237 (7.30)	219 (7.95)	0.556
Dyslipidaemia	1730383 (48.68)	104613 (51.94)	<0.001	236190 (54.86)	13000 (58.42)	<0.001	28513 (39.74)	1134 (41.16)	0.516
Dementia	285920 (8.04)	11064 (5.49)	<0.001	51474 (11.96)	2372 (10.66)	0.008	4376 (6.10)	115 (4.16)	0.070
Outcomes, N (%)									
In-hospital mortality	159265 (4.48)	16160 (8.02)	<0.001	22843 (5.31)	2361 (10.61)	<0.001	5899 (8.22)	365 (13.23)	<0.001
Length-of-stay >4 days	1331502 (37.46)	99953 (49.63)	<0.001	193216 (44.88)	12482 (56.09)	<0.001	41104 (57.29)	1924 (69.81)	<0.001
Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	2047841 (60.86)	119378 (65.01)	<0.001	291493 (71.91)	15134 (76.52)	<0.001	46417 (71.37)	1788 (75.41)	0.049
Location/teaching status of hospital, N (%)									
Rural	435648 (12.26)	7658 (3.80)		46894 (10.89)	878 (3.95)		5197 (7.24)	71 (2.59)	

Urban non-teaching	1439645 (40.50)	66916 (33.22)		170612 (39.63)	7249 (32.57)		28834 (40.19)	781 (28.32)	
Urban teaching	1679073 (47.24)	126843 (62.98)		213042 (49.48)	14127 (63.48)		37711 (52.56)	1904 (69.09)	
Hospital Region, N (%)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
Northwest	664735 (18.70)	40348 (20.03)		71166 (16.53)	3898 (17.51)		12255 (17.08)	595 (21.57)	
Midwest	788129 (22.17)	42008 (20.86)		99652 (23.15)	5439 (24.44)		14818 (20.65)	521 (18.90)	
South	1450886 (40.82)	75198 (37.33)		171883 (39.92)	7602 (34.16)		30811 (42.95)	946 (34.33)	
West	650616 (18.30)	43863 (21.78)		87847 (20.40)	5315 (23.88)		13859 (19.32)	695 (25.20)	
Disposition of the patient at discharge, N (%)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
Routine	1317134 (37.06)	64243 (31.90)		113869 (26.45)	4643 (20.87)		18619 (25.95)	583 (21.16)	
Transfer to Short-term Hospital	105709 (2.97)	8244 (4.09)		10619 (2.47)	817 (3.67)		2280 (3.18)	120 (4.34)	
Transfer Other: Includes Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF), Intermediate Care Facility (ICF), Another Type of Facility	1495848 (42.08)	91866 (45.61)		214149 (49.74)	11677 (52.47)		32347 (45.09)	1297 (47.05)	
Home Health Care	446284 (12.56)	19268 (9.57)		66725 (15.50)	2641 (11.87)		11789 (16.43)	372 (13.48)	
Against Medical Advice (Ama)	26504 (0.75)	1493 (0.74)		1940 (0.45)	95 (0.43)		615 (0.86)	20 (0.73)	
Died	159265 (4.48)	16160 (8.02)		22843 (5.31)	2361 (10.61)		5899 (8.22)	365 (13.23)	
Discharged alive, destination unknown	3622 (0.10)	143 (0.07)		403 (0.09)	20 (0.09)		193 (0.27)	<11	

Supplementary Table 3. Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the associations between level of renal dysfunction and the odds of receiving thrombolytic therapy for acute ischaemic stroke.

	Odds Ratio (99% Confidence Interval)	<i>P</i> value
No CKD	Reference	-
CKD/No ESRD	1.01 (0.95-1.06)	0.720
ESRD	0.81 (0.70-0.94)	<0.001

Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of co-morbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease, coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders, metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease, smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).

Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **bold**.

Supplementary Table 4. Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the association between levels of renal dysfunction and adverse acute ischaemic stroke in-hospital outcomes including interaction terms with year of admission.

	In-hospital mortality		Prolonged hospitalisation		Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	
	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value
No CKD (n= 3,755,784)	Reference		Reference		Reference	
CKD/No ESRD (n= 452,802)	1.07 (1.00-1.13)	0.010	1.08 (1.04-1.12)		1.13 (1.09-1.18)	<0.001
<i>Interaction term:</i> Admission year (2011 onwards vs. before 2011)	1.00 (0.92-1.09)	0.976	1.02 (0.97-1.07)	0.266	1.00 (0.95-1.05)	0.975
ESRD (n= 74,499)	2.17 (1.94-2.42)	<0.001	1.49 (1.40-1.60)	<0.001	1.33 (1.23-1.44)	<0.001
<i>Interaction term:</i> Admission year (2011 onwards vs. before 2011)	0.90 (0.77-1.06)	0.089	0.95 (0.86-1.05)	0.171	1.01 (0.90-1.13)	0.851

Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of co-morbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease, coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders, metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease, smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).

OR – Odds Ratio; CI – Confidence Interval;

Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **bold**.

Supplementary Table 5. Results of multivariable logistic regressions evaluating the association between levels of renal dysfunction and adverse acute ischaemic stroke in-hospital outcomes including interaction terms with hospital location and teaching status.

	In-hospital mortality		Prolonged hospitalisation		Moderate-to-severe disability on discharge	
	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value	OR (99% CI)	<i>P</i> value
No CKD (n= 3,755,784)	Reference		Reference		Reference	
CKD/No ESRD (n= 452,802)	1.06 (0.94-1.20)	0.188	1.00 (0.94-1.07)	0.907	1.07 (1.00-1.15)	0.010
<i>Interaction term:</i> Urban nonteaching vs. Rural	1.02 (0.89-1.17)	0.724	1.03 (0.96-1.11)	0.278	1.04 (0.96-1.13)	0.161
<i>Interaction term:</i> Urban teaching vs. Rural	0.95 (0.83-1.09)	0.341	1.05 (0.97-1.12)	0.112	1.07 (0.99-1.15)	0.032
ESRD (n= 74,499)	2.08 (1.57-2.76)	<0.001	1.43 (1.19-1.71)	<0.001	1.41 (1.16-1.73)	<0.001
<i>Interaction term:</i> Urban nonteaching vs. Rural	1.03 (0.75-1.40)	0.821	1.07 (0.87-1.30)	0.409	0.93 (0.75-1.16)	0.405
<i>Interaction term:</i> Urban teaching vs. Rural	0.97 (0.72-1.31)	0.813	0.96 (0.79-1.16)	0.589	0.94 (0.76-1.17)	0.476

Models adjusted for age, sex, ethnicity, hospital region, location and teaching status and a wide range of co-morbidities (HIV/AIDS, alcohol abuse, deficiency anaemia, collagen vascular disease, chronic blood loss anaemia, congestive heart failure, chronic pulmonary disease, coagulopathy, depression, diabetes mellitus, drug abuse, hypertension, hypothyroidism, liver disease, lymphoma, fluid and electrolyte disorders, metastatic cancer, other neurological disorders, obesity, paralysis, peripheral vascular disease, psychosis, pulmonary circulation disorders, solid

tumour without metastasis, peptic ulcer disease, valvular disease, weight loss, atrial fibrillation, previous stroke, coronary heart disease, smoking, dyslipidaemia and dementia).

OR – Odds Ratio; CI – Confidence Interval;

Statistically significant differences ($P < 0.01$) highlighted in **bold**.

Ischaemic Stroke admissions from
National Inpatient Sample
2005 – 2015

N = 934,638

Acute Ischaemic Stroke cases
included

N = 885,537

Discharge weights applied

Study population

N = 4,283,086

Excluded cases

N = 49,101

- Age <18: N = 1521
- Age missing: N = 88
- Sex missing: N = 169
- In-hospital vital status: N = 575
- Length-of-stay missing: N = 45
- Hospital location/teaching status missing: N = 4159
- Elective admissions = 42,644

Yearly Thrombolysis Rates

