

ISRCTN SeconDary Stroke PreVEntion ThRough Pathway ManagemenT (**DiVERT**) Stroke Phase I Results

Participant Flow

The study retrospectively collected data on 6,536 patients that met the inclusion criteria across all clinical study sites. All subjects are included in baseline characteristics as well as 6-months follow-up data.

Baseline Characteristics

Table 1: United States Comprehensive Stroke Center vs Non-Comprehensive Stroke Center Baseline Demographics

	Total (N=6347)	Comprehensive (n=2707)	Non- comprehensive (n=3640)	P-Value
Age (years) Mean (SD)	67.5 (13.9)	66.9 (14.0)	68.0 (13.9)	0.003
Gender (Male, n (%))	3183 (50.2)	1407 (52.1) (n=2697)	1776 (48.8)	0.009
Race, n (%)				<0.001
White	4327 (68.2)	1706 (63.0)	2621 (72.0)	
Black	1353 (21.3)	659 (24.3)	694 (19.1)	
Asian	174 (2.7)	70 (2.6)	104 (2.9)	
American Indian	32 (<1.0)	12 (<1.0)	20 (<1.0)	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	52 (<1.0)	16 (<1.0)	36 (1.0)	
Other	409 (6.4)	244 (9.0)	165 (4.5)	
Ethnicity, n (%)				<0.001
Hispanic	309 (4.9)	233 (8.6)	76 (2.1)	
Not Hispanic	6038 (95.1)	2474 (91.4)	3564 (97.9)	
Age group (years), n (%)				0.034
<50	663 (10.4)	307 (11.3)	356 (9.8)	
50-74	3579 (56.4)	1541 (56.9)	2038 (56.0)	
>75	2105 (33.2)	859 (31.7)	1246 (34.2)	

Table 2: United Kingdom Baseline Demographics

	Total (N=189)
Male, n (%)	98 (51.9)
CCF, n (%)	4 (2.1)
Pneumonia Antibiotics 7Days, n (%)	14 (7.4)
Urinary Tract Infection 7Days, n (%)	19 (10.1)
Previous Stroke/TIA, n (%)	51 (27)
Diabetes, n (%)	45 (23.8)
Hypertension, n (%)	91 (48.1)

Table 3: United States Comprehensive Stroke Center vs Non-Comprehensive Stroke Center Ischemic Stroke Subtypes

	Total (N=6347)	Comprehensive (n=2707)	Non-comprehensive (n=3640)	P-Value
				<0.001
Cryptogenic, n (%)	5004 (78.8)	1922 (71.0)	3082 (84.7)	
Large Artery Atherosclerosis	965 (15.2)	516 (19.1)	449 (12.3)	
Small Vessel Occlusion	378 (6.0)	269 (9.9)	109 (3.0)	

Table 4: United Kingdom Ischemic Stroke Subtypes

	Total (N=189)
Cryptogenic	96 (50.8)
Large Artery Atherosclerosis	32 (16.9)
Small Vessel Occlusion	61 (32.3)

Table 5: United States Comprehensive Stroke Center vs Non-Comprehensive Stroke Center Hospital Resource Utilization

	Total (N=6347)	Comprehensive (n=2707)	Non-comprehensive (n=3640)	P-Value
Cardiology consultation during index event, n (%)	762 (12.0)	383 (14.1)	379 (10.4)	<0.001
Length-of-Stay at index (days) Mean (SD)	6.1 (8.4)	7.3 (9.8)	5.2 (7.0)	<0.001

Follow-Up Data

Table 6: United States Comprehensive Stroke Center vs Non-comprehensive Stroke Center Follow-up, 6-Months Post Event

	Total (N=6347)	Comprehensive (n=2707)	Non-comprehensive (n=3640)	P-Value
Any Cardiac Monitoring, n (%)	743 (11.7)	581 (21.5)	162 (4.5)	<0.001
External Monitor	559 (8.8)	486 (18.0)	73 (2.0)	<0.001
ICM	235 (3.7)	144 (5.3)	91 (2.5)	<0.001
Cardiovascular Disease-related Healthcare Encounter, n (%)	1946 (30.7)	847 (31.3)	1099 (30.2)	0.3486
Lost to follow-up, n (%)	2064 (45.2)*	1057 (48.2)*	1007 (42.5)*	<0.001
Recurrent stroke, n (%)	395 (6.2)	182 (6.7)	213 (5.9)	0.1551

*Total n=4564; Comprehensive n=2194; Non-comprehensive n=2370

Table 7: United Kingdom Follow-Up, 6-Months Post-Event

	Total (N=189)
Any Cardiac Monitoring, n (%)	132 (70.2)*
External Monitor	130 (68.8)
ICM	11 (5.9)*

AF after Index, n (%)	2 (1.1)
Readmission for any reason, n (%)	29 (15.3)
Readmission for stroke, n (%)	4 (2.1)

Table 8: United States Atrial Fibrillation after Index Events

			AF		p-value
			No	Yes	
		Total (N=6347)	6002 (94.6%)	345 (5.4%)	
Monitor	No	5604 (88.3%)	5331 (95.1%)	273 (4.9%)	<0.0001
	Yes	743 (11.7%)	671 (90.3%)	72 (9.7%)	

Table 9: United Kingdom Atrial Fibrillation after Index Events

			AF		p-value
			No	Yes	
		Total (N=187)	185 (98.9%)	2 (1.1%)	
Monitor	No	56 (29.9%)	56 (100%)	0 (0%)	<0.001
	Yes	131 (70.1%)	129 (98.5%)	2 (1.5%)	

Adverse Events

There were no adverse events associated with this study.