Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Jie Jia, Fudan University, China

REVIEWED BY Junfen Fan, Capital Medical University, China Wen Wu, Southern Medical University, China Yue Lan, Guangzhou First People's Hospital, China

\*CORRESPONDENCE Xiao Lu

🖂 luxiao1972@163.com

 $^{\dagger}\mbox{These}$  authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

RECEIVED 07 February 2023 ACCEPTED 03 July 2023 PUBLISHED 14 July 2023

#### CITATION

Yan C, Zheng Y, Zhang X, Gong C, Wen S, Zhu Y, Jiang Y, Li X, Fu G, Pan H, Teng M, Xia L, Li J, Qian K and Lu X (2023) Development and validation of a nomogram model for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes in ischemic stroke patients after acute phase. *Front. Aging Neurosci.* 15:1161016. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2023.1161016

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Yan, Zheng, Zhang, Gong, Wen, Zhu, Jiang, Li, Fu, Pan, Teng, Xia, Li, Qian and Lu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Development and validation of a nomogram model for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes in ischemic stroke patients after acute phase

Chengjie Yan<sup>1†</sup>, Yu Zheng<sup>1†</sup>, Xintong Zhang<sup>1†</sup>, Chen Gong<sup>1†</sup>, Shibin Wen<sup>2</sup>, Yonggang Zhu<sup>3</sup>, Yujuan Jiang<sup>4</sup>, Xipeng Li<sup>5</sup>, Gaoyong Fu<sup>6</sup>, Huaping Pan<sup>7</sup>, Meiling Teng<sup>1</sup>, Lingfeng Xia<sup>1</sup>, Jian Li<sup>1</sup>, Kun Qian<sup>1</sup> and Xiao Lu<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China, <sup>2</sup>Department of Neurology, Jiuquan City People's Hospital, Jiuquan, China, <sup>3</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The First People's Hospital of Lianyungang, Lianyungang, China, <sup>4</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Cangzhou Central Hospital, Cangzhou, China, <sup>5</sup>Department of Neurology, Xingtai People's Hospital, Xingtai, China, <sup>6</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The First People's Hospital of Yibin, Yibin, China, <sup>7</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, The Affiliated Jiangning Hospital of Nanjing Medical University, Nanjing, China

**Introduction:** Prediction of post-stroke functional outcome is important for personalized rehabilitation treatment, we aimed to develop an effective nomogram for predicting long-term unfavorable functional outcomes in ischemic stroke patients after acute phase.

**Methods:** We retrospectively analyzed clinical data, rehabilitation data, and longitudinal follow-up data from ischemic stroke patients who underwent early rehabilitation at multiple centers in China. An unfavorable functional outcome was defined as a modified Rankin Scale (mRS) score of 3–6 at 90 days after onset. Patients were randomly allocated to either a training or test cohort in a ratio of 4:1. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to identify the predictors for the development of a predictive nomogram. The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) was used to evaluate predictive ability in both the training and test cohorts.

**Results:** A total of 856 patients (training cohort: n = 684; test cohort: n = 172) were included in this study. Among them, 518 patients experienced unfavorable outcomes 90 days after ischemic stroke. Trial of ORG 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment classification (p = 0.024), antihypertensive agents use [odds ratio (OR) = 1.86; p = 0.041], 15-day Barthel Index score (OR = 0.930; p < 0.001) and 15-day mRS score (OR = 13.494; p < 0.001) were selected as predictors for the unfavorable outcome nomogram. The nomogram model showed good predictive performance in both the training (AUC = 0.950) and test cohorts (AUC = 0.942).

**Conclusion:** The constructed nomogram model could be a practical tool for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes in ischemic stroke patients underwent early rehabilitation after acute phase.

#### KEYWORDS

nomogram, ischemic stroke, modified Rankin Scale, rehabilitation, predictive factor

## 1. Introduction

Annual data has shown that of the 16 million people who suffer from stroke worldwide, 87% had an ischemic stroke. More than 6 million deaths or disabilities are attributable to stroke, resulting in heavy social, family, and economic burdens. Reduction of disabilities and improvement of the independence of stroke survivors have been the primary goals of rehabilitation (Langhorne et al., 2011). Early identification of individuals at risk of an unfavorable outcome is important for decision-making in clinical practice and could help improve the disease outcome (Ali-Ahmed et al., 2019; Diener and Hankey, 2020). Predictive factors are not only used to predict prognosis but also stratify patients for individualized treatment (Gravanis and Tsirka, 2008; Diener and Hankey, 2020; Lopatkiewicz et al., 2020).

Previous research on risk prediction of outcome in ischemic stroke patients relied mostly on demographic variables, physical examination variables, disease-related variables, and laboratory and imaging variables (Fahey et al., 2018). The most commonly used risk factors in the prediction of functional outcomes included age, baseline National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score, stroke subtypes, and lesion size (Lucke-Wold et al., 2012; Yu et al., 2015), whereas mortality, recurrence rate, and complication rate were the target outcomes (Lin et al., 2019; You et al., 2019; Montellano et al., 2021; Noubiap et al., 2021). The majority of the available data used for prediction focused mostly on the acute phase of the disease, with few extended longitudinal follow-ups (Faura et al., 2021). Early rehabilitation efforts have been shown to have a positive effect on functional outcomes at 3 months, in acute stroke patients (Winstein et al., 2016; Ahmed et al., 2020). However, studies on diagnostics, rehabilitation, and prognostics of stroke recovery have not kept pace (Moradi et al., 2021; Preston et al., 2021). During this prolonged rehabilitation process, although there were intermittent functional assessments, prognosis judgment was mainly based on the experience of the physician.

Different nomograms have been developed to predict mortality, stroke-associated infections, malignant cerebral edema, post-stroke depression, hemorrhagic transformation, or unfavorable outcomes in stroke populations with different characteristics (Du et al., 2020; Lan et al., 2020, 2022; Szlachetka et al., 2022; Zhang C. et al., 2022; Zhang K. et al., 2022). Zhang C. et al. (2022) innovatively developed a dynamic nomogram to predict the 3-month unfavorable outcome of patients with acute ischemic stroke based on glycosylated hemoglobin, the Alberta Stroke Program Early Computed Tomography Score (ASPECTS), and NIHSS score at day 14, with C-index of 0.891 (95% CI, 0.854–0.928). However, this model still has some limitations, such as being limited by the sample size (n = 93), this model lacks external validation, and requires invasive blood draw and early Computed Tomography (CT) scan (Zhang C. et al., 2022).

We developed an effective and practical nomogram for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes following the acute phase using multidimensional data such as rehabilitation intervention-related features and longitudinally collected data from several Chinese institutions.



# 2. Materials and methods

## 2.1. Study design

This multicenter retrospective observational study was based on baseline data and longitudinally collected rehabilitation features extracted from various institutions in China. This retrospective study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Review Board, which waived the requirement for informed consent.

## 2.2. Patient selection

Ischemic stroke patients who underwent rehabilitation between August 2018 and November 2020 at these institutions were screened, and randomly allocated to either the training cohort or the test cohort in a ratio of 4:1. Patients diagnosed as acute ischemic stroke (within 24 h of onset) based on clinical and computed tomography findings, aged 18 years or older, and underwent early rehabilitation were included in this study. Patients with hemorrhagic stroke, transient ischemic attack, baseline NIHSS score <2, without modified Rankin Scale (mRS) score 90 days after stroke, and those with severe cognitive and mental dysfunction were excluded from this study.

### 2.3. Data collection

We collected baseline demographic data (such as age, gender, occupation, or education), laboratory and clinical examination data (such as hemoglobin A1c, triglycerides, or total cholesterol), pharmaceutical and invasive therapy-related data (such as the use of intravenous thrombolysis, endovascular therapy or antiplatelet

### $\mathsf{TABLE1}\ \ \mathsf{Clinical\ characteristics\ of\ ischemic\ stroke\ patients\ who\ underwent\ early\ rehabilitation.$

	Overall ( <i>n</i> = 856)	Training cohort ( <i>n</i> = 684)	Test cohort (n = 172)	<i>p</i> -Value
Male, <i>n</i> (%)	585 (68.3)	467 (68.3)	118 (68.6)	0.934
Age, years, mean (SD)	63.73 (12.02)	63.67 (11.79)	63.97 (12.91)	0.778
Occupation, <i>n</i> (%)				0.342
Full-time or part-time paid work	167 (19.5)	127 (18.6)	40 (23.3)	
Layoffs	53 (6.2)	39 (5.7)	14 (8.1)	
Retired	369 (43.1)	299 (43.7)	70 (40.7)	
Self-employed	142 (16.6)	119 (17.4)	23 (13.4)	
Home duties	125 (14.6)	100 (14.6)	25 (14.5)	
Education, <i>n</i> (%)				0.698
Primary school or less	334 (39.0)	271 (14.5)	23 (13.4)	
Secondary school	221 (25.8)	169 (24.7)	52 (30.2)	
High school	133 (15.5)	108 (15.8)	25 (14.5)	
College/university	46 (5.4)	37 (5.4)	9 (5.2)	
Smoking index, cigarettes per day × year, mean (SD)	176.59 (346.67)	184.35 (363.39)	145.76 (268.83)	0.192
Alcohol intake, n (%)				0.903
No drinking	575 (67.2)	457 (66.8)	118 (68.6)	
Light drinking	178 (20.8)	144 (21.1)	34 (19.8)	
Heavy drinking	103 (12.0)	83 (12.1)	20 (11.6)	
Regular physical activities, <i>n</i> (%)				0.078
Yes	203 (23.7)	171 (25.0)	32 (18.6)	
No	653 (76.3)	513 (75.0)	140 (81.4)	
Medical history, <i>n</i> (%)				
Hypertension	564 (65.9)	442 (64.6)	122 (70.9)	0.119
Diabetes mellitus	229 (26.8)	118 (26.5)	48 (27.9)	0.702
Dyslipidemia	35 (4.1)	30 (4.4)	5 (2.9)	0.381
Atrial fibrillation	47 (5.5)	38 (5.6)	9 (5.2)	0.868
Coronary heart disease	68 (7.9)	53 (7.7)	15 (8.7)	0.673
Myocardial infarction	11 (1.3)	9 (1.3)	2 (1.2)	1.000
Congenital heart disease	3 (0.4)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	1.000
Valvular heart disease	10 (1.2)	9 (1.3)	1 (0.6)	0.686
Body mass index, kg/m <sup>2</sup> , mean (SD)	24.46 (3.58)	24.46 (3.48)	24.47 (3.95)	0.974
Systolic blood pressure, mmHg, mean (SD)	151.75 (20.37)	151.80 (20.53)	151.56 (19.78)	0.893
Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg, mean (SD)	89.54 (14.23)	89.47 (14.09)	89.86 (14.80)	0.746
Heart rate, mean (SD)	77.54 (11.59)	77.62 (11.07)	77.25 (13.47)	0.740
Baseline NIHSS score, n (%)				0.803
NIHSS 2–7, mild	424 (49.5)	341 (49.9)	83 (48.3)	
NIHSS 8–16, moderate	390 (45.6)	311 (45.5)	79 (45.9)	
NIHSS > 16, severe	42 (4.9)	32 (4.7)	10 (5.8)	
TOAST classification, <i>n</i> (%)				0.168
Large artery atherosclerosis	409 (47.8)	323 (47.2)	86 (50.0)	
Cardio embolism	48 (5.6)	38 (5.6)	10 (5.8)	
Small artery occlusion	332 (38.8)	276 (40.4)	56 (32.6)	

(Continued)

#### TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Overall (n = 856)	Training cohort (n = 684)	Test cohort (n = 172)	<i>p</i> -Value
Stroke of other determined cause	42 (4.9)	29 (4.2)	13 (7.6)	
Stroke of undermined cause	25 (2.9)	18 (2.6)	7 (4.1)	
90-day mRS, <i>n</i> (%)				0.590
mRS 0-2	338 (39.5)	267 (39.0)	71 (41.3)	
mRS 3-6	518 (60.5)	417 (61.0)	101 (58.7)	

Frequencies and percentages are reported for categorical variables, while mean ± SD are reported for continuous variables. SD, standard deviation; NIHSS, National Institute of Health Stroke Scale; mRS, modified Rankin Scale.

therapy within 48 h) within 48 h after onset, and rehabilitation featured data (such as time from onset to first rehabilitation intervention, time from onset to first effective mobilization or total length of effective mobilization within first 14 days) on the 15th day after onset. In addition, longitudinal follow-up data such as the NIHSS score, Barthel Index (BI), and mRS score were collected 24 h and 15 days following ischemic stroke. The target outcome was functional status, which was assessed 90 days following onset using the mRS questionnaire. The favorable functional outcome was defined as an mRS score of 0–2, while the unfavorable outcome was an mRS score of 3–6 (Zheng et al., 2021).

### 2.4. Statistical analysis

All statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 19.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). The missing data at baseline were managed with mean imputation, whereas missing data at follow-up were imputed using the last observation carried forward method (Kim et al., 2019). Baseline demographics were presented as a mean (standard deviation) or a number (percentage). Student's T-test or Mann-Whitney U test was used to compare baseline data between the training cohort and the test cohort for continuous variables, while Chi-square or Fisher's exact test was used for categorical variables. Variables with statistical significance (p < 0.05) in the univariate logistic regression were included in the multivariate logistic regression to identify predictors of unfavorable functional outcomes. The nomogram was developed using predictors in the training cohort identified by multivariate logistic regression. The nomogram was constructed using the regression modeling strategies package in R version 3.0.2 (R Project for Statistical Computing).<sup>1</sup> After establishing the predictive nomogram, the C-statistic and the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve were used to validate the accuracy and discriminative ability of the nomogram both internally (training cohort) and externally (test cohort). The C-statistic was calculated as the area under the ROC curve (AUC) and was used to evaluate the predictive performance of the model. The optimal cut-off value for clinical use was determined by maximizing the Youden index (sensitivity + specificity-1). Statistical significance was defined by a two-tailed *p*-value of less than 0.05. Figure 1 shows a flowchart displaying the process of building the nomogram.

# 3. Results

## 3.1. Patient characteristics

A total of 856 ischemic stroke patients (684 in the training cohort and 172 in the test cohort) were included in our analysis. Our data revealed that the mean age of the participants was 63.73 years, and 585 of them were males (**Table 1**). A total of 518 participants experienced unfavorable outcomes 90 days following an ischemic stroke (**Supplementary Table 1**). There were no statistically significant differences between the training cohort and the test cohort in terms of demographic variables, Trial of ORG 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment (TOAST) classification, or 90-day mRS proportion. The rate of missing data was less than 3.7% for all variables except education, which had a missing data rate of 9.1%. The overall missing data rate was approximately 0.7%.

# 3.2. Predictors of unfavorable functional outcomes

Overall, 45 variables were subjected to univariate analyses (Table 2). Among them, 17 variables with p < 0.05, including 5 demographic and anthropometric variables (age, occupation, atrial fibrillation history, coronary heart disease history, and myocardial infarction history), 2 laboratory and clinical examination variables (TOAST classification and hemoglobin A1c), 1 pharmaceutical and invasive therapy-related variable (antihypertensive agents), 3 rehabilitation variables (time from onset to first effective mobilization, effective mobilization in first rehabilitation intervention, a total length of effective mobilization within first 14 days in minutes), and 6 longitudinal follow-up data (NIHSS, BI, and mRS scores assessed at both baseline and 15-day) were selected as possible predictors.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis revealed that TOAST classification (p = 0.024), antihypertensive agents use [odds ratio (OR) = 1.86; 95% CI: 1.026, 3.373; p = 0.041], 15-day BI score (OR = 0.930; 95% CI: 0.902, 0.960; p < 0.001), and 15-day mRS score (OR = 13.494; 95% CI: 6.871, 26.501; p < 0.001) were significant predictors. Using large artery atherosclerosis (LAA) subtype as reference, stroke of other determined cause (OR = 0.105; 95% CI: 0.015, 0.720; p = 0.022) and stroke of undermined cause (OR = 0.038; 95% CI: 0.003, 0.483; p = 0.012) subtypes exhibited a lower risk (Table 3).

According to the ROC curve analyses, the TOAST classification and antihypertensive agents use did not perform significantly well

<sup>1</sup> www.r-project.org

TABLE 2 Correlation coefficients and odds ratios in the univariate logistic regression analysis of the training cohort.

Demographic and anthropeetric varietsGender//Gender//Fenale//Male-0.0250.8140.020Age0.0231.0230.001Occupation///Pall-time or part-time paid work///Iayoffs0.2341.2640.0151Retired0.2551.7420.0015Self-employed0.4661.5930.001Home duties0.9272.5280.001Gendary school or less//0.023Primary school or less//0.021Secondary school0.0691.0010.074High school0.0091.0010.0151Smoking index0.0091.0010.0151Alcohol intake-0.0280.0210.031No drinking//0.021No drinking//0.021Hayy drinking0.0211.0200.021No///1.021No///1.021No////No////No////No////Secondary school or loss///No drinking////No drinking////No/////No <th></th> <th>β</th> <th>OR</th> <th>p</th>		β	OR	p	
GenderImageImageImageImagePenale///Male-0.0250.8140.220Age0.0231.0230.001Occupation///Iayoffs0.2341.2640.0151Retired0.5551.7420.0151Self-employed0.4661.5930.001Education0.9272.5280.001Primary school or less///Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school0.0691.0710.774Secondary school0.0691.0910.424College/university0.0901.0910.4391Machoin intake//0.4391No drinking///Hary drinking0.1041.1090.593Hary drinking0.1041.1090.593No drinking///Yes///No1.1011.5011.501No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No///No/ <td colspan="5">Demographic and anthropometric variables</td>	Demographic and anthropometric variables				
Female//Male-0.2050.8140.220Age0.0231.0230.001Occupation//0.018Full-time or part-time paid work//.Layoffs0.2341.2440.051Retired0.5551.7420.001Self-employed0.4661.5930.007Home duties0.0272.5280.001Education0.02972.5280.001Scondary school or less//.Scondary school0.0691.0710.774Galleg/university0.0901.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0040.391Alcohol intakeNo drinking//.YesNoNoNoNoNoYesNoNoNoNoNoNoNoYesNoNoNoNo <t< td=""><td>Gender</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Gender				
Male0.2050.8140.220Age0.0231.0230.001Ccupation1/11/10.018Full-time or part-time paid wold111Layoffs0.2341.2440.051Retired0.5551.7420.007Self-employed0.4661.5930.007Home duties0.0272.5280.001Futardon0.0272.5280.001Scondary school or less110.742Scondary school0.0691.0710.742Gollege/university0.0001.0040.751Shoking index0.0001.0040.391Alcohol intake110.497No drinking1/11.1010.593Heavy drinking0.1011.1010.593Hypertension history111No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/1 <td< td=""><td>Female</td><td>/</td><td>/</td><td></td></td<>	Female	/	/		
Age0.0231.0230.001Occupation///0.018Full-time or part-time paid work///Layoffs0.2341.2640.051Retired0.5551.7420.015Self-employed0.4661.5930.087Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education1///0.880Primary school or less///0.812Secondary school0.0691.0140.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0001.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0040.391Alcohol intake1///0.497No drinking1/10.5930.391Heavy drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking-0.2350.7910.350No1/1////1No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No1/11/11No<	Male	-0.205	0.814	0.220	
OccupationInterpretation of the set of th	Age	0.023	1.023	0.001	
Full-time or part-time paid work//Layoffs0.23441.26440.5151Retired0.5551.7420.0151Self-employed0.4641.5930.087Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education1/11.0120.080Primary school or less//0.021Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0001.0940.391Alcohol intake0.0001.0040.497No drinking//0.497Haryy drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking0.1041.1090.593Yes.1.1.1Yes.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1Yes.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1.1.1No.1 <td>Occupation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.018</td>	Occupation			0.018	
Layoffs0.2341.2640.551Retired0.5551.7420.015Self-employed0.4661.5930.087Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education110.774Secondary school or less//0.812Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake110.497No drinking//1Heavy drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking0.0320.7910.350No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////	Full-time or part-time paid work	/	/		
Retired0.5551.7420.015Self-employed0.4661.5930.087Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education110.880Primary school or less//1Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake100.497No drinking///1Ight drinking0.1041.1090.593Regular physical activities0.7910.350Yes//1No1.1090.078No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1Yes0.6970.0900.038No//////No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No//	Layoffs	0.234	1.264	0.551	
Self-employed0.4661.5930.087Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education//0.880Primary school or less//0.774Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0040.391Alcohol intake//0.497No drinking//0.497Heavy drinking0.1041.1090.593Regular physical activities//0.593Yes///1.014No0.3271.3860.078No////Yes-0.2280.7960.162No//////No/////No/////Yes0.2921.3380.097Dyslipidemia history///No/////Yes0.6972.0090.786Atrial fibrillation history////No//////No//////No//////No//////No//////No//////No//////<	Retired	0.555	1.742	0.015	
Home duties0.9272.5280.001Education//0.080Primary school or less///Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school0.0691.0210.424College/university0.0901.0940.751Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake//0.497No drinking//0.497Light drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking-0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activities///Yes////No0.3271.3860.078No//////Yes-0.2280.7960.162Diabetes mellitus history///No//////No//////No//////Yes0.2921.3380.097No//////No//////No//////Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease history///No//////No//////No//////No//////No//0.076 <td>Self-employed</td> <td>0.466</td> <td>1.593</td> <td>0.087</td>	Self-employed	0.466	1.593	0.087	
EducationInterpretationInterpretationInterpretationPrimary school or less//InterpretationSecondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.75Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intakeInterpretation0.0001.000No drinking//InterpretationIdght drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking-0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activities//InterpretationYes//InterpretationNo0.3271.3860.078No////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo////InterpretationNo//InterpretationInterpretationNo//InterpretationInterpretationNo//InterpretationInterpretationNo//InterpretationInterpretationNo/	Home duties	0.927	2.528	0.001	
Primary school or less//Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school-0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.75Smoking index0.0001.0040.391Alcohol intake10.4970.497No drinking1/1/0.497Itight drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking-0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activities111No1.1380.0781.3860.078No1111No1/111No1/1.3860.0781No1/1111No1/1/11No1/1/11No1/1/111No1/11.3860.0971No1/11/111No1/11/11Yes0.2921.3380.097No1/1111No1/11/11No1/111No1/111No1/111No1/111No1/111No1/111No1/111No1/111No <td>Education</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.080</td>	Education			0.080	
Secondary school0.0691.0710.774High school0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.75Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake100.497No drinking///Light drinking0.1041.1090.593Regular physical activities-0.2350.7910.350Yes////No0.3271.3860.078Hypertension history///Yes-0.2380.7960.162Diabetes mellitus history///Yes0.2921.3380.097No///Yes-0.1050.9000.786Atrial fibrillation history///No////Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease history///No/////No/////Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease history///No/////No/////No/////No/////No/////No/////No/////	Primary school or less	/	/		
High school0.2080.8120.424College/university0.0901.0940.75Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake//0.497No drinking//0.191Light drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activities//1Yes//1No0.3271.3860.078Hypertension history//1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1Yes-0.1050.9000.786Atrial fibrillation history////1No////1Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease history////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////1No////0.007	Secondary school	0.069	1.071	0.774	
College/university0.0901.0940.75Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake//0.497No drinking///Light drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking-0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activities///Yes///No0.3271.3860.078Hypertension history///No///Yes-0.2280.7960.162Diabetes mellitus history///No///Yes0.2921.3380.097Dyslipidemia history//////No//////Yes-0.1050.9000.786Atrial fibrillation history//////No//////Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease history//////No////////Yes0.7742.1680.007Myocardial infarction history//////No////////Yes0.7742.1680.007Myocardial infarction history//////No////////No////////No///////	High school	-0.208	0.812	0.424	
Smoking index0.0001.0000.391Alcohol intake0.497No drinking//Light drinking0.1041.1090.593Heavy drinking0.2350.7910.350Regular physical activitiesYes//No0.3271.3860.078Hypertension historyNo//Yes-0.2280.7960.162Diabetes mellitus historyNo//Yes0.2921.3380.097Dyslipidemia historyNo//Yes-0.1050.9000.786Atrial fibrillation historyNo//Yes0.6972.0090.038Coronary heart disease historyNo//Yes0.7742.1680.007Myocardial infarction historyNo//Yes0.7742.1680.007Myoardial infarction historyNo// </td <td>College/university</td> <td>0.090</td> <td>1.094</td> <td>0.75</td>	College/university	0.090	1.094	0.75	
Alcohol intake   /   /     No drinking   /   /     Light drinking   0.104   1.109   0.593     Heavy drinking   -0.235   0.791   0.350     Regular physical activities   /   /   /     Yes   /   /   /     No   0.327   1.386   0.078     Hypertension history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   -0.228   0.796   0.162     Diabetes mellitus history   /   /   ////////////////////////////////////	Smoking index	0.000	1.000	0.391	
No drinking     /     /       Light drinking     0.104     1.109     0.593       Heavy drinking     -0.235     0.791     0.350       Regular physical activities     /     /     /       Yes     /     /     /       No     0.327     1.386     0.078       Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     //     /     /       No     /     /     /     //       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     //     //     //       No     //     //     //       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     //     //     //       No     //     //     //     //       No     //     //     //     // <t< td=""><td>Alcohol intake</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.497</td></t<>	Alcohol intake			0.497	
Light drinking     0.104     1.109     0.593       Heavy drinking     -0.235     0.791     0.350       Regular physical activities     /     /     /       Yes     /     /     /       No     0.327     1.386     0.078       Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     ./     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     //     //     ////////////////////////////////////	No drinking	/	/		
Heavy drinking    0.235     0.791     0.350       Regular physical activities     /     /     /       Yes     /     /     /       No     0.327     1.386     0.078       Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     //     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     //     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     //     /     /       No     //     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     //     /     /       No     //     /     /     /<	Light drinking	0.104	1.109	0.593	
Regular physical activities     /     /       Yes     /     /       No     0.327     1.386     0.078       Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     //     //     //       No     /     /     //       No     /     /     //     //       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     //     //     //       No     //     //     //       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     //     //     //       No     //     //     //       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     //     //     //	Heavy drinking	-0.235	0.791	0.350	
Yes   /   /     No   0.327   1.386   0.078     Hypertension history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   -0.228   0.796   0.162     Diabetes mellitus history   -   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   0.292   1.338   0.097     Dyslipidemia history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   //     No   /   /   //   //     No   /   /   //   //     Yes   -0.105   0.900   0.786     Atrial fibrillation history   //   //   //     No   /   /   //   //     Yes   0.697   2.009   0.038     Coronary heart disease history   //   //   //     No   //   //   //   //     Yes   0.774   2.168   0.007 <td>Regular physical activities</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Regular physical activities				
No     0.327     1.386     0.078       Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     //     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     //     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     //     /     /       No     //     /     /     /	Yes	/	/		
Hypertension history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     -     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007<	No	0.327	1.386	0.078	
No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.228     0.796     0.162       Diabetes mellitus history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     -     -     -       No     /     /     /     -       No     /     /     -     -       No     /     /     -     -       No     /     /     -     -       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     -     -     -       No     /     /     -     -       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038     -       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     -     -       No     /     /      -     -       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007<	Hypertension history				
Yes   -0.228   0.796   0.162     Diabetes mellitus history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   0.292   1.338   0.097     Dyslipidemia history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   -0.105   0.900   0.786     Atrial fibrillation history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   ////////////////////////////////////	No	/	/		
Diabetes mellitus history     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history      /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history      /     /       No     /     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     2.553     12.	Yes	-0.228	0.796	0.162	
No     /     /       Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     -     -     -       No     /     /     /     -       No     /     /     -     -       Myocardial infarction history     -     -     -     -       No     /     /     -	Diabetes mellitus history				
Yes     0.292     1.338     0.097       Dyslipidemia history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	No	/	/		
Dyslipidemia history     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history          No     /     /         No     /     /          No     /     /           No     /     /   <	Yes	0.292	1.338	0.097	
No     /     /       Yes     -0.105     0.900     0.786       Atrial fibrillation history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /     /       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	Dyslipidemia history				
Yes   -0.105   0.900   0.786     Atrial fibrillation history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   0.697   2.009   0.038     Coronary heart disease history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   /     Yes   0.774   2.168   0.007     Myocardial infarction history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   ////////////////////////////////////	No	/	/		
Atrial fibrillation history   /   /     No   /   /   /     Yes   0.697   2.009   0.038     Coronary heart disease history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   /     Yes   0.774   2.168   0.007     Myocardial infarction history   /   /   /     No   /   /   /   /     Yes   2.553   12.849   0.016     Body mass index   0.021   1.022   0.338	Yes	-0.105	0.900	0.786	
No     /     /     /       Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     //       No     /     /     /     //       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     //     //     //       No     /     /     //       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	Atrial fibrillation history				
Yes     0.697     2.009     0.038       Coronary heart disease history     /     /     ////////////////////////////////////	No	/	/		
Coronary heart disease history//No///Yes0.7742.1680.007Myocardial infarction history///No////Yes2.55312.8490.016Body mass index0.0211.0220.338	Yes	0.697	2.009	0.038	
No     /     /       Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     /     /     /       No     /     /     /       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	Coronary heart disease history				
Yes     0.774     2.168     0.007       Myocardial infarction history     //     //     //       No     //     //     //       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	No	/	/		
Myocardial infarction history//No//Yes2.55312.8490.016Body mass index0.0211.0220.338	Yes	0.774	2.168	0.007	
No     /     /       Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	Myocardial infarction history				
Yes     2.553     12.849     0.016       Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	No	/	/		
Body mass index     0.021     1.022     0.338	Yes	2.553	12.849	0.016	
	Body mass index	0.021	1.022	0.338	

#### TABLE 2 (Continued)

	β	OR	р	
Systolic blood pressure	0.005	1.005	0.197	
Diastolic blood pressure	-0.009	0.991	0.107	
Heart rate	-0.001	0.999	0.860	
Laboratory and clinical examination variables				
TOAST classification			< 0.001	
Large artery atherosclerosis	/	/		
Cardio embolism	0.13	1.139	0.704	
Small artery occlusion	-0.579	0.560	0.001	
Stroke of other determined cause	-1.702	0.182	0.002	
Stroke of undermined cause	-1.949	0.142	0.010	
OCSP classification			0.088	
Total anterior circulation infarction	/	/		
Partial anterior circulation infarction	-0.402	0.669	0.101	
Posterior circulation infarction	-0.497	0.608	0.106	
Lacunar infarction	-0.766	0.465	0.012	
Hemoglobin A1c	0.106	1.112	0.016	
Triglycerides	0.014	1.015	0.322	
Total cholesterol	0.039	1.040	0.203	
Low-density lipoprotein cholesterol	0.088	1.092	0.229	
High-density lipoprotein cholesterol	-0.206	0.814	0.261	
Homocysteine	0.001	1.001	0.862	
Prothrombin time-international normalized ratio	-0.145	0.865	0.125	
Activated partial thromboplastin time	0.005	1.005	0.669	
Pharmaceutical and invasive	e therapy re	lated variab	les	
Intravenous thrombolysis				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.125	1.134	0.487	
Endovascular therapy				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.074	1.077	0.820	
Antiplatelet therapy within 48 h				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.333	1.395	0.199	
Anticoagulant therapy within 48 h				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.225	1.252	0.257	
Antihypertensive agents				
Yes	/	/		

(Continued)

(Continued)

#### TABLE 2 (Continued)

	β	OR	p	
No	0.443	1.558	0.006	
Lipid regulators				
Yes	/	/		
No	-0.383	0.682	0.115	
Hypoglycemic agents				
Yes	/	/		
No	-0.114	0.892	0.524	
Rehabilitation featured v	variables			
Time from onset to first rehabilitation intervention	0.000	1.000	0.957	
Time from onset to first effective mobilization	0.006	1.006	< 0.001	
Effective mobilization in first rehabilitation intervention				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.665	1.945	< 0.001	
Length of effective mobilization in first rehabilitation intervention (minutes)	-0.014	0.986	0.062	
Total length of effective mobilization within first 14 days (minutes)	-0.001	0.999	0.001	
Longitudinal follow-up variables				
NIHSS score at baseline	0.149	1.161	< 0.001	
15-day NIHSS	0.274	1.315	< 0.001	
Barthel Index score at baseline	-0.073	0.930	< 0.001	
15-day Barthel Index	-0.089	0.915	< 0.001	
mRS score at baseline	2.035	7.655	< 0.001	
15-day mRS	3.278	26.520	< 0.001	

β, correlation coefficient; OR, odds ratio; TOAST, Trial of ORG 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment; OCSP, Oxfordshire Community Stroke Project; NIHSS, National Institute of Health Stroke Scale; mRS, modified Rankin Scale.

when used for individual prediction. The AUC value of TOAST classification in the test cohort was 0.589 (95% CI: 0.503, 0.674), while the AUC value of antihypertensive agents use was 0.536 (95% CI: 0.447, 0.625). In contrast, the 15-day BI score had an AUC value of 0.868 (95% CI: 0.815, 0.921), and the 15-day mRS score had an even better AUC value of 0.903 (95% CI: 0.858, 0.948) in the test cohort, indicating their good predictive performance (Supplementary Figure 1).

# 3.3. Development and validation of the nomogram

Based on the predictors, a nomogram was developed to predict unfavorable functional outcomes (Figure 2). In the nomogram, each patient received a total score based on baseline characteristics (TOAST classification and antihypertensive agents) and 15-day follow-up characteristics (15-day BI score and 15-day mRS score) to predict the occurrence of unfavorable functional outcomes with risk percentages. According to the maximized Youden index, the optimal cut-off value for an unfavorable functional outcome risk was 0.45.

The AUC of the model in the training cohort was 0.950 (95% CI, 0.935–0.965; Figure 3A), while that of the test cohort was 0.942 (95% CI, 0.910–0.974; Figure 3B).

## 4. Discussion

Early rehabilitation is considered an important treatment after an ischemic stroke and has been widely accepted in stroke units. Previous studies have demonstrated that early rehabilitation has positive effects on poststroke disability and health-related quality of life after ischemic stroke (Askew et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020), however, there are no practical tool predicting the long-term functional outcomes during the rehabilitation phase. Previous predictive tools have focused on predicting outcomes before intervention, which has aided in the development of early treatment decision-making, such as thrombolysis, mechanical thrombectomy or rehabilitation treatment plans (Ang et al., 2003; Cho et al., 2008; Lan et al., 2020; Zhang C. et al., 2022). However, it is important to note that the recovery process after ischemic stroke is a long-term and continuous process. As such, the rehabilitation treatment plan may require continuous adjustments, and evaluation and new predictions serve as the basis for adjusting the plan. Our nomogram predicts long-term functional outcomes for patients 15 days after onset, providing more accurate predictions for physicians and patients during this period and helping to adjust subsequent treatment plans. Unlike previous tools, our tool is designed for patients who have undergone treatment for a period of time, rather than those with recent onset of ischemic stroke. A significant advantage of our tool is that the variables required for prediction are easily obtainable. Only BI and mRS scale assessments are required 15 days after onset, combined with retrospective collection of antihypertensive drug use and TOAST classification results. Our tool does not require invasive examinations or strong dependence on magnetic resonance imaging results, making it easier to promote and use compared to previous tools.

Previous research suggests that stroke severity (NIHSS score), age, gender, and other factors all influence stroke prognosis (Clua-Espuny et al., 2019). However, few studies have focused on features of rehabilitation therapy and prediction aiding in the design and adjustment of rehabilitation programs. As patients' health conditions improve, a growing number of them receive early rehabilitation and continuous follow-up, which has made it possible to use rehabilitation characteristics to predict the risk of unfavorable functional outcomes in this population.

Similar to previous studies (Zhang et al., 2019), this study discovered that LAA (47.8%) and small artery occlusion (SAO) (38.8%) were the predominant subtypes in ischemic stroke. Studies have shown that the severity and prognosis of stroke patients are correlated with the TOAST classification (Leira et al., 2008). Cardio embolism (CE) subtype had the highest risk, whereas SAO and

#### TABLE 3 Multivariate logistic regression for unfavorable functional outcomes in the training cohort.

	β	p	OR (95% CI)	
Age	0.014	0.400	1.014 (0.982, 1.047)	
Occupation		0.237		
Full-time or part-time paid work	1	/		
Layoffs	0.094	0.902	1.098 (0.245, 4.932)	
Retired	-0.004	0.994	0.996 (0.361, 2.749)	
Self-employed	0.091	0.859	1.095 (0.402, 2.984)	
Home duties	1.069	0.072	2.913 (0.910, 9.324)	
Atrial fibrillation history				
No	1	/		
Yes	0.681	0.483	1.977 (0.294, 13.291)	
Coronary heart disease history				
No	/	/		
Yes	0.863	0.156	2.371 (0.719, 7.811)	
Myocardial infarction history				
No	/	/		
Yes	6.000	0.100	403.35 (0.317, 512636.336)	
TOAST classification		0.024		
Large artery atherosclerosis	/	/		
Cardio embolism	0.158	0.852	1.171 (0.223, 6.148)	
Small artery occlusion	-0.090	0.781	0.914 (0.483, 1.726)	
Stroke of other determined cause	-2.258	0.022	0.105 (0.015, 0.720)	
Stroke of undermined cause	-3.273	0.012	0.038 (0.003, 0.483)	
Hemoglobin A1c	0.140	0.082	1.150 (0.982, 1.347)	
Antihypertensive agents				
Yes	/	/		
No	0.621	0.041	1.86 (1.026, 3.373)	
Time from onset to first effective mobilization	0.002	0.351	1.002 (0.998, 1.006)	
Effective mobilization in first rehabilitation intervention				
Yes	/	/		
No	-0.636	0.098	0.529 (0.249, 1.124)	
Total length of effective mobilization within first 14 days (minutes)	0.000	0.835	1.000 (0.998, 1.001)	
NIHSS score at baseline	0.027	0.675	1.028 (0.905, 1.167)	
15-day NIHSS	-0.035	0.668	0.965 (0.822, 1.134)	
Barthel Index score at baseline	0.011	0.419	1.011 (0.984, 1.039)	
15-day Barthel Index	-0.072	<0.001	0.930 (0.902, 0.960)	
Baseline mRS score	0.598	0.051	1.819 (0.996, 3.320)	
15-day mRS	2.602	<0.001	13.494 (6.871, 26.501)	
Intercept	-10.670	<0.001		
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	0.773			

β, correlation coefficient; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; TOAST, Trial of ORG 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment; NIHSS, National Institute of Health Stroke Scale; mRS, modified Rankin Scale.

LAA subtypes had a higher risk than a stroke caused by other specified causes and stroke of undermined cause subtypes. This may be because the severity of the CE subtype is relatively severe, and its prognosis is worse, which is likely due to underlying cardiac pathologies such as arrhythmias and heart failure. A study by Bjerkreim et al. (2019) revealed that the 5-year risk of mortality and



readmission for all causes was significantly higher in patients with CE compared with other subtypes. Chen et al. (2022) performed an outcome prediction of 10,967 patients with transient ischemic attack and minor stroke, and found that the TOAST classification was the influencing factor, the risk of LAA subtype was the highest, and the risk of SAO subtype was the lowest. A few studies have been conducted on people undergoing rehabilitation, disparate outcomes are likely attributable to distinct populations. However, in general, early assessment of TOAST classification in patients with ischemic stroke is of great significance for secondary prevention and prediction of poor prognosis.

In this retrospective study, the use of antihypertensive agents within 48 h after ischemic stroke was associated with a higher risk of unfavorable outcomes (OR = 1.86). However, neither systolic nor diastolic blood pressure (BP) levels were significant predictors. The management of hypertension in the acute stage of an ischemic stroke remains controversial, as observational studies are unable to determine whether elevated BP level is a poor prognostic factor following acute ischemic stroke (Ntaios et al., 2010, 2011). Following an acute ischemic stroke, prospective trials are necessary to validate the timing of BP lowering and choice of agent. As reported, acute and aggressive BP lowering within 24 h of stroke onset could jeopardize the outcome (Georgianou et al., 2018) and the benefit of starting antihypertensive therapy within 48 or 72 h after onset remains unclear (He et al., 2014). For patients not receiving intravenous recombinant tissue-type plasminogen activator (rt-PA), endovascular treatment and with no compelling medical condition to dictate acute BP lowering therapy, BPs up to 220/120 mmHg may be observed without BP lowering therapy in the first several days according to the latest American Heart Association/American Stroke Association [AHA/ASA] (2022) guidelines. At the same time, the AHA/ASA guidelines recommended that BP should be controlled to a level <185/110 mmHg before intervention and maintained at levels <180/105 mmHg in patients who require administration of rt-PA, intra-arterial fibrinolysis or mechanical thrombectomy (Powers et al., 2018). The Enhanced Control of Hypertension and Thrombolysis Stroke Study, on the other hand, found that achieving early and persistently low levels of SBP <140 mmHg within 24 h, even as low as 110-120 mmHg, was associated with better outcomes in thrombolytic-eligible acute ischemic stroke patients (Wang et al., 2022). Our findings suggest a potential benefit of antihypertensive agent use, but because this was an observational study, we cannot conclude that there is a direct causal relationship between antihypertensive agent use and outcomes. The deep relationship requires additional investigation. This study included patients who received thrombolysis, thrombectomy, and conservative treatment, limiting further interpretation of the results.

The NIHSS score is the world's most widely used acute ischemic stroke scale (Saber and Saver, 2020). A previous study reported that discharged patients with high NIHSS scores were generally more severely ill and had larger brain infarct volumes, which were associated with 90-day outcomes in ischemic stroke patients (Wouters et al., 2018). In this study, the NIHSS score was also a potential influencing factor, although it was not included in the final model. The mRS score is widely used to assess disability; the higher the score, the higher the risk of unfavorable outcomes. The BI is widely used to assess daily activities of living, and the higher the score, the lower the risk of poor outcomes. The NIHSS, mRS, and BI are all associated with more severe disease, a larger infarct volume in brain tissue, and a 90-day prognosis in ischemic stroke patients (Govan et al., 2009). Unlike the results of Zhang C. et al. (2022), the NIHSS score was not included in our final model, which could be attributed to the increased contribution of mRS and BI scores. Furthermore, the NIHSS is an 11-item scale that assesses consciousness, vision, language, sensory, and motor function. The lack of strong correlation between NIHSS and outcomes may be due to the existence of multiple subscales. This could be the reason why NIHSS does not perform as well as BI and mRS in predicting 90-day mRS score (Schmid et al., 2011). At the same time, the mRS and BI scores at 15 days were more valuable in predicting outcome than the mRS and BI scores at baseline. Similarly, Chen et al. (2022) found that discharge mRS and discharge NIHSS score were associated with a poor 90day prognosis, with discharge mRS having a greater predictive contribution than admission mRS. These findings indicated the importance of follow-up data in outcome prediction. Therefore, we emphasize the importance of reassessment after the acute phase, such as 15 days after onset.

There are some advantages and limits to this study. The first strength is that this study provides a basis for predicting the prognosis of patients in the rehabilitation stage. Second, although our study only used four predictors for modeling, the model and



model in the training and test cohort. Harrell's C-statistic was calculated as the AUC (area under the curve) value. (A) The AUC was 0.950~(95%~Cl,~0.935-0.965) in the training cohort for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes. (B) The AUC was 0.942~(95%~Cl,~0.910-0.974) in the test cohort for predicting unfavorable functional outcomes.

nomogram built by logistic regression achieved great prediction performance and were more convenient for external validation and nomogram use due to the small number and easy to obtain of features. The following are the limitations. First, this is a retrospective study and it is subject to the selection and followup bias. Second, we included the variables selected by univariate logistic regression in the multivariate logistic regression, which may lead to underestimation of interactions between variables. Third, the data included in this study is from patients who received early rehabilitation, limiting the generalizability of our findings to countries with lower rates of patients receiving early rehabilitation. As stated previously, however, an increasing number of stroke patients can receive early rehabilitation following the acute phase, and this population is growing. Fourth, our nomogram uses 15day follow-up data, therefore patients lacking follow-up data will be limited to use this nomogram. Finally, the model can also incorporate machine learning methods to increase the accuracy of future predictions.

Future studies will use rehabilitation-related features to make more precise predictions of long-term functions such as swallowing function, walking ability, and aphasia. The unresolved question is how to identify individuals who can transition from higher mRS levels to lower mRS levels.

## 5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the nomogram can accurately predict the risk of unfavorable functional outcomes in the early rehabilitation population 90 days after ischemic stroke, with longitudinally collected data and rehabilitation-specific characteristics such as the 15-day mRS score and the 15-day BI score, serving as the predominant predictors. Patients at high risk (>0.45) should receive additional care to prevent unfavorable outcomes.

# Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

## Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University. Written informed consent for participation was not required for this study in accordance with the national legislation and the institutional requirements.

# Author contributions

CY, YZhe, XZ, CG, and XLu contributed to the conception and design of the study. SW, YZhu, YJ, XLi, GF, HP, MT, JL, and KQ collected the data. CY and LX performed the statistical analysis. CY drafted the manuscript. YZhe and XLu revised the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

# Funding

This study was supported by grants from the Stroke Prevention and Treatment Project of the National Health Commission – Research and Popularization of Appropriate Intervention Technology for the Stroke High Risk Group in China (Task No. GN-2018R0010).

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank each of the participants in this study for their effort.

# **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

## References

Ahmed, N., Mauad, V. A. Q., Gomez-Rojas, O., Sushea, A., Castro-Tejada, G., Michel, J., et al. (2020). The impact of rehabilitation-oriented virtual reality device in patients with ischemic stroke in the early subacute recovery phase: study protocol for a phase iii, single-blinded, randomized, controlled clinical trial. *J. Cent. Nerv. Syst. Dis.* 12:1179573519899471. doi: 10.1177/1179573519899471

Ali-Ahmed, F., Federspiel, J. J., Liang, L., Xu, H., Sevilis, T., Hernandez, A. F., et al. (2019). Intravenous tissue plasminogen activator in stroke mimics. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Qual. Outcomes* 12:e005609. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.005609

American Heart Association/American Stroke Association [AHA/ASA] (2022). *Types of Stroke*. Washington, DC: American Heart & Stroke Association.

Ang, Y. H., Chan, D. K., Heng, D. M., and Shen, Q. (2003). Patient outcomes and length of stay in a stroke unit offering both acute and rehabilitation services. *Med. J. Aust.* 178, 333–336. doi: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.2003.tb05225.x

Askew, R. L., Capo-Lugo, C. E., Naidech, A., and Prabhakaran, S. (2020). Differential effects of time to initiation of therapy on disability and quality of life in patients with mild and moderate to severe ischemic stroke. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 151:e1511. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2020.05.005

Bjerkreim, A. T., Khanevski, A. N., Thomassen, L., Selvik, H. A., Waje-Andreassen, U., Naess, H., et al. (2019). Five-year readmission and mortality differ by ischemic stroke subtype. *J. Neurol. Sci.* 403, 31-37. doi: 10.1016/j.jns.2019.06.007

Chen, S. D., You, J., Yang, X. M., Gu, H. Q., Huang, X. Y., Liu, H., et al. (2022). Machine learning is an effective method to predict the 90-day prognosis of patients with transient ischemic attack and minor stroke. *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.* 22:195. doi: 10.1186/s12874-022-01672-z

Cho, Y. M., Choi, I. S., Bian, R. X., Kim, J. H., Han, J. Y., and Lee, S. G. (2008). Serum albumin at admission for prediction of functional outcome in ischaemic stroke patients. *Neurol. Sci.* 29, 445–449. doi: 10.1007/s10072-008-1024-0

Clua-Espuny, J. L., Abilleira, S., Queralt-Tomas, L., Gonzalez-Henares, A., Gil-Guillen, V., Muria-Subirats, E., et al. (2019). Long-term survival after stroke according to reperfusion therapy. cardiovascular therapy and gender. *Cardiol. Res.* 10, 89–97. doi: 10.14740/cr839

Diener, H. C., and Hankey, G. J. (2020). Primary and secondary prevention of ischemic stroke and cerebral hemorrhage: JACC Focus Seminar. J. Am. Coll. Cardiol. 75, 1804–1818. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.12.072

Du, M., Huang, X., Li, S., Xu, L., Yan, B., Zhang, Y., et al. (2020). a nomogram model to predict malignant cerebral edema in ischemic stroke patients treated with endovascular thrombectomy: an observational study. *Neuropsychiatr. Dis. Treat.* 16, 2913–2920. doi: 10.2147/NDT.S279303

Fahey, M., Crayton, E., Wolfe, C., and Douiri, A. (2018). Clinical prediction models for mortality and functional outcome following ischemic stroke: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 13:e0185402. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185402

Faura, J., Bustamante, A., Reverte, S., Garcia-Berrocoso, T., Millan, M., Castellanos, M., et al. (2021). Blood biomarker panels for the early prediction of stroke-associated complications. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* 10:e018946. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.120.018946

Georgianou, E., Georgianos, P. I., Petidis, K., Athyros, V. G., Sarafidis, P. A., and Karagiannis, A. (2018). Antihypertensive therapy in acute ischemic stroke: where do we stand? *J. Hum. Hypertens.* 32, 799–807. doi: 10.1038/s41371-018-0105-7

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

## Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2023. 1161016/full#supplementary-material

Govan, L., Langhorne, P., and Weir, C. J. (2009). Categorizing stroke prognosis using different stroke scales. *Stroke* 40, 3396–3399. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.109.557645

Gravanis, I., and Tsirka, S. E. (2008). Tissue-type plasminogen activator as a therapeutic target in stroke. *Expert. Opin. Ther. Targets* 12, 159–170. doi: 10.1517/14728222.12.2.159

He, J., Zhang, Y., Xu, T., Zhao, Q., Wang, D., Chen, C. S., et al. (2014). Effects of immediate blood pressure reduction on death and major disability in patients with acute ischemic stroke: the CATIS randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 311, 479–489. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.282543

Huang, J. B., Chen, N. C., Chen, C. L., Fu, M. H., Pan, H. Y., Hsu, C. Y., et al. (2020). Serum levels of soluble triggering receptor expressed on myeloid cells-1 associated with the severity and outcome of acute ischemic stroke. *J. Clin. Med.* 10:10061. doi: 10.3390/jcm10010061

Kim, M., Merrill, J. T., Wang, C., Viswanathan, S., Kalunian, K., Hanrahan, L., et al. (2019). SLE clinical trials: impact of missing data on estimating treatment effects. *Lupus Sci. Med.* 6:e000348. doi: 10.1136/lupus-2019-000348

Lan, Y., Pan, C., Qiu, X., Miao, J., Sun, W., Li, G., et al. (2022). Nomogram for persistent post-stroke depression and decision curve analysis. *Clin. Interv. Aging* 17, 393–403. doi: 10.2147/CIA.S357639

Lan, Y., Sun, W., Chen, Y., Miao, J., Li, G., Qiu, X., et al. (2020). Nomogram including neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio for the prediction of stroke-associated infections. *Front. Neurol.* 11:574280. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2020.574280

Langhorne, P., Bernhardt, J., and Kwakkel, G. (2011). Stroke rehabilitation. Lancet 377, 1693–1702. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60325-5

Leira, E. C., Adams, H. P. Jr., Rosenthal, G. E., and Torner, J. C. (2008). Baseline NIH stroke scale responses estimate the probability of each particular stroke subtype. *Cerebrovasc. Dis.* 26, 573–577. doi: 10.1159/000165109

Lin, C. H., Yen, C. C., Hsu, Y. T., Chen, H. H., Cheng, P. W., Tseng, C. J., et al. (2019). Baroreceptor sensitivity predicts functional outcome and complications after acute ischemic stroke. *J. Clin. Med.* 8, 300. doi: 10.3390/jcm8030300

Lopatkiewicz, A. M., Gradek-Kwinta, E., Czyzycki, M., Pera, J., Slowik, A., and Dziedzic, T. (2020). Glucocorticoid resistance is associated with poor functional outcome after stroke. *Cell Mol. Neurobiol.* 40, 1321–1326. doi: 10.1007/s10571-020-00818-1

Lucke-Wold, B. P., Turner, R., Lucke-Wold, A., Rosen, C., and Huber, J. D. (2012). Age and the metabolic syndrome as risk factors for ischemic stroke: Improving preclinical models of ischemic stroke. *Yale J. Biol. Med.* 85, 523–539.

Montellano, F. A., Ungethum, K., Ramiro, L., Nacu, A., Hellwig, S., Fluri, F., et al. (2021). Role of blood-based biomarkers in ischemic stroke prognosis: A systematic review. *Stroke* 52, 543–551. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.029232

Moradi, V., Mafi, H., Shariat, A., Cleland, J. A., Nakhostin Ansari, N., and Savari, S. (2021). Neurorehabilitation, the practical method of returning to work after stroke. *Iran J. Public Health* 50, 209–210. doi: 10.18502/ijph.v50i1.5092

Noubiap, J. J., Fitzgerald, J. L., Gallagher, C., Thomas, G., Middeldorp, M. E., and Sanders, P. (2021). Rates, predictors, and impact of smoking cessation after stroke or transient ischemic attack: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J. Stroke Cerebrovasc. Dis. 30, 106012. doi: 10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2021.106012 Ntaios, G., Bath, P., and Michel, P. (2010). Blood pressure treatment in acute ischemic stroke: a review of studies and recommendations. *Curr. Opin. Neurol.* 23, 46–52. doi: 10.1097/WCO.0b013e328334e9d9

Ntaios, G., Lambrou, D., and Michel, P. (2011). Blood pressure change and outcome in acute ischemic stroke: the impact of baseline values, previous hypertensive disease and previous antihypertensive treatment. *J. Hypertens.* 29, 1583–1589. doi: 10.1097/HJH.0b013e328348c957

Powers, W. J., Rabinstein, A. A., Ackerson, T., Adeoye, O. M., Bambakidis, N. C., Becker, K., et al. (2018). 2018 Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke* 49, e46–e110. doi: 10.1161/ STR.000000000000158

Preston, E., Ada, L., Stanton, R., Mahendran, N., and Dean, C. M. (2021). Prediction of independent walking in people who are nonambulatory early after stroke: A systematic review. *Stroke* 52, 3217–3224. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.120.032345

Saber, H., and Saver, J. L. (2020). Distributional validity and prognostic power of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale in US Administrative Claims Data. *JAMA Neurol.* 77, 606–612. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.5061

Schmid, A. A., Kroenke, K., Hendrie, H. C., Bakas, T., Sutherland, J. M., and Williams, L. S. (2011). Poststroke depression and treatment effects on functional outcomes. *Neurology* 76, 1000–1005. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0b013e318210435e

Szlachetka, W. A., Pana, T. A., Mamas, M. A., Bettencourt-Silva, J. H., Metcalf, A. K., Potter, J. F., et al. (2022). Predicting 10-year stroke mortality: Development and validation of a nomogram. *Acta Neurol. Belg.* 122, 685–693. doi: 10.1007/s13760-021-01752-9

Wang, X., Minhas, J. S., Moullaali, T. J., Di Tanna, G. L., Lindley, R. I., Chen, X., et al. (2022). Associations of early systolic blood pressure control and outcome after thrombolysis-eligible acute ischemic stroke: Results from the ENCHANTED Study. *Stroke* 53, 779–787. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.121.034580

Winstein, C. J., Stein, J., Arena, R., Bates, B., Cherney, L. R., Cramer, S. C., et al. (2016). Guidelines for adult stroke rehabilitation and recovery: A guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke* 47, e98–e169. doi: 10.1161/STR.000000000000098

Wouters, A., Nysten, C., Thijs, V., and Lemmens, R. (2018). Prediction of outcome in patients with acute ischemic stroke based on initial severity and improvement in the first 24 h. *Front. Neurol.* 9:308. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2018.00308

You, S., Ou, Z., Zhang, W., Zheng, D., Zhong, C., Dong, X., et al. (2019). Combined utility of white blood cell count and blood glucose for predicting in-hospital outcomes in acute ischemic stroke. *J. Neuroinflammation* 16:37. doi: 10.1186/s12974-019-1 422-7

Yu, C., An, Z., Zhao, W., Wang, W., Gao, C., Liu, S., et al. (2015). Sex differences in stroke subtypes, severity, risk factors, and outcomes among elderly patients with acute ischemic stroke. *Front. Aging Neurosci.* 7:174. doi: 10.3389/fnagi.2015.0 0174

Zhang, C., Zhang, W., Huang, Y., Qiu, J., and Huang, Z. X. (2022). A dynamic nomogram to predict the 3-month unfavorable outcome of patients with acute ischemic stroke. *Risk Manag. Healthc. Policy* 15, 923–934. doi: 10.2147/RMHP. S361073

Zhang, K., Luan, J., Li, C., and Chen, M. (2022). Nomogram to predict hemorrhagic transformation for acute ischemic stroke in Western China: A retrospective analysis. *BMC Neurol.* 22:156. doi: 10.1186/s12883-022-02678-2

Zhang, H., Li, Z., Dai, Y., Guo, E., Zhang, C., and Wang, Y. (2019). Ischaemic stroke etiological classification system: the agreement analysis of CISS, SPARKLE and TOAST. *Stroke Vasc. Neurol.* 4, 123–128. doi: 10.1136/svn-2018-000226

Zheng, Y., Yan, C., Shi, H., Niu, Q., Liu, Q., Lu, S., et al. (2021). Time window for ischemic stroke first mobilization effectiveness: Protocol for an investigator-initiated prospective multicenter randomized 3-arm clinical trial. *Phys. Ther.* 101:zab038. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzab038