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Introduction

• Almost 800,000 people in US have a stroke each year
• 5th leading cause of death in US
• A leading cause of long-term disability
• 87% are ischemic

Source: CDC, 2015
Large Vessel Occlusions

- Clot in the internal carotid, middle cerebral, basilar arteries
- 33% of ischemic strokes
- Responsible for 60% of dependency and 90% of mortality in ischemic stroke

Malhotra, et al., *Front Neurol*, 2017

National Stroke Association
Mechanical Reperfusion (MR)

**FIGURE 3.** Three sizes of the Penumbra MAX system of aspiration catheters with separator devices. Reproduced with permission.


Serrone JC, et al., Neurosurgery, 2013
# Field Assessment Stroke Triage for Emergency Destination

**A Simple and Accurate Prehospital Scale to Detect Large Vessel Occlusion Strokes**

Fabricio O. Lima, MD, MPH, PhD; Gisele S. Silva, MD, MPH, PhD; Karen L. Furie, MD, MPH; Michael R. Frankel, MD; Michael H. Lev, MD; Érica C.S. Camargo, MD, PhD, MSc; Diogo C. Haussen, MD; Aneesh B. Singhal, MD; Walter J. Koroshetz, MD; Wade S. Smith, MD; Raul G. Nogueira, MD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm Weakness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denial/Neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No drift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift or some effort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extinction to bilateral simultaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against gravity</td>
<td></td>
<td>stimulation in one sensory modality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort against</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does not recognize own hand or orients</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gravity or no movement</td>
<td></td>
<td>only to one side of the body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild to moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe global aphasia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forced deviation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or mute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Palsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal or minor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Partial or complete paralysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paralysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FAST-ED**

*Figure 2.* Proportion of patients with large vessel occlusion strokes according to the Field Assessment Stroke Triage for Emergency Destination (FAST-ED) scale. Hosmer and Lemeshow test: 0.62.
FAST-ED

• FAST-ED score 1-3
  – Transport to closest primary or comprehensive center

• FAST-ED score ≥ 4
  – Transport to closest comprehensive center

• FAST-ED score ≥ 6, off-hours
  – Comprehensive Stroke Center will activate the Cath Lab and Stroke Team upon notification

Baptist Health
Neuroscience Center
BAPTIST HEALTH SOUTH FLORIDA
To determine whether use of the FAST-ED increased the distance patients traveled to our medical facility.
Methods

• 1153 cases brought to Baptist Hospital by EMS were analyzed from March 2016 to February 2018
Methods

• Miles traveled from scene to our CSC was obtained from EMS incident reports
• Data also were broken down by age
  – <80 vs. ≥80 years
Methods

• Descriptive statistics
  – Initial characteristics
  – Hospital treatment
  – Discharge disposition

• Two factor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
  – Age (<80 vs. ≥80 years) and time (before vs. after FAST-ED implementation)
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### Initial Patient Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Characteristics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroke Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischemic</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Ischemic Attack</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracerebral hemorrhage</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarachnoid hemorrhage</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke Mimic</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hispanic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hospital Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital Treatment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV t-PA only</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA t-PA or MR only</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV t-PA &amp; IA/MR</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Turnaround Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnaround Times</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door to Needle (IV t-PA)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Groin (IA/MR)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34-239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TICI score 2B-3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before FAST-ED</th>
<th>After FAST-ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>312 (56%)</td>
<td>255 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab</td>
<td>72 (13%)</td>
<td>58 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNF</td>
<td>64 (12%)</td>
<td>77 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice</td>
<td>33 (6%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expired</td>
<td>49 (9%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24 (4%)</td>
<td>21 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results not statistically significant
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INTRODUCTION

The Field Assessment Stroke Triage for Emergency Destination (FAST-ED) is a pre-hospital screening algorithm developed to detect large vessel occlusion (LVO) strokes (Table below). FAST-ED was implemented by Miami-Dade Fire Rescue (MDFR) in March 2017 with a goal to bring potential LVOs directly to a Comprehensive Stroke Center (CSC) by bypassing Primary Stroke Centers and Acute Stroke Ready Hospitals. We assessed whether use of the FAST-ED increased the distance patients traveled to a medical facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm Weakness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denial/Neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No drift</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drift or some effort against gravity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extinction to bilateral simultaneous stimulation in one sensory modality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort against gravity or no movement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does not recognize own limb or orients only to one side of the body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eye Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild to moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe global aphasia or mute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forced deviation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Palsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal or minor paralysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Partial or complete paralysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

- 825 acute stroke alerts were reviewed
- 279 cases in Period A, 259 in Period B, 287 in Period C

**Figure 1.** Three comparison time periods: B, C, A

- A two-factor ANOVA with time period (A, B, C) and age group (<80, ≥80) as independent variables determined if FAST-ED implementation and age affected how far patients traveled via ambulance
- Patients ≥80 years traveled shorter distances than those <80 years regardless of time period [F(1,5)=16.124, p<0.001] (Fig. 2)

**Figure 3.** Effect of Time Period on Distance Traveled

- Using three months of data in each period, there was a marginally significant age *x* time interaction, but it was non-significant with six months of data in each period
- No clear pattern for effect of sex was found using a three-factor ANOVA

CONCLUSIONS

- The FAST-ED EMS initiative to bypass to a CSC did not lead to an increase in distance traveled by patients
- This finding suggests that few patients actually are bypassing other centers
- People ≥80 years traveled shorter distances overall compared to people <80
- Older populations in the county tend to live in developed regions near medical facilities, whereas younger populations tend to live in newer, more affordable regions further from these centers
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Conclusions

• Main effect of **age** on distance traveled
  – People 80 years and above traveled shorter distances than those less than 80

• No main effect of **time** period on distance traveled
  – FAST-ED implementation made **no difference** on how far patients travel via EMS

• No **age x time** interaction
Conclusions

• Effect of age likely the result of where people tend to live in SW Miami-Dade
• People who have lived near Baptist Hospital are likely to have lived in that location for decades
• Younger generations move out to more affordable areas further from the hospital
Next Steps

- Jackson Memorial/University of Miami and other Comprehensive Stroke Centers are sharing data and collaborating on a county-wide analysis of FAST-ED implementation
  - Turnaround times
  - 90-day outcomes
• Neuro Research Department
  – Maygret Ramirez, ARNP
  – Virginia Ramos, ARNP
  – Ivis Gonzalez, RN
  – Felix Ruiz
  – Rosa Rodriguez

• Students
  – Camila Tocre Carrion
  – Joseph Souchak
  – Jake Levine
  – Jesse Miller