

On-line Table 1: Risk-of-bias assessment using the QUIPS tool

Variable	Risk of Bias								
	Fukuda et al ²¹	Phan et al ¹⁴	Payabvash et al ²²	Beare et al ²⁰	Khan et al ¹²	Haranhalli et al ²³	Rangaraju et al ¹⁵	Rosso et al ²⁴	Sheth et al ¹³
Study participation	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Study attrition	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low
Prognostic factor measurement	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Outcome measurement	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Study confounding	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Moderate	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Low
Statistical and reporting	High (limited information provided)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Overall	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

Note:—QUIPS indicates Quality In Prognosis Studies.

On-line Table 2: Bibliographic information, baseline characteristics of patients, and key findings from 9 included studies

	Fukuda et al (2017) ²¹	Phan et al (2013) ¹⁴	Payabvash et al (2018) ²²	Beare et al (2015) ²⁰	Haranhalli et al (2019) ²³	Rangaraju et al (2015) ¹⁵	Rangaraju et al (2015) ¹⁵ (Right Stroke)	Rangaraju et al (2015) ¹⁵ (Left Stroke)	Rosso et al (2019) ²⁴ (Right Stroke)	Rosso et al (2019) ²⁴ (Left Stroke)
Patients (No.)	109	607	198	185	100	213	105	103	215	190
Study period	June 2013 to January 2016	January 1991 to October 1994	January 2011 to December 2014	NA	February 2011 to October 2014	January 2007 to January 2014	January 2007 to January 2014	January 2007 to January 2014	August 2015 to December 2016	August 2015 to December 2016
Imaging technique	CT	CT	DWI	CT	CTP	DWI	DWI	DWI	DWI	DWI
Imaging time	Admission	Admission	Admission 13.4 ± 6.6 hr	Admission	Admission	FU MRI 12-72 hr from treatment	FU MRI 12-72 hr from treatment	FU MRI 12-72 hr from treatment	Day 1 after stroke	Day 1 after stroke
Treatment	EVT	IV tPA and placebo	IV tPA (n=5) IAT/ EVT (n=5)	IV tPA (n=145)	IV tPA IAT/EVT	EVT	EVT	EVT	EVT, IV thrombolysis or both	EVT, IV thrombolysis or both
Outcome, 90-day mRS ≤2 (No.) (%)	38 (40)	NA	151 (76.3)	60 (22.4)	NA	100 (47.0)	NA	NA	109 (50.7)	86 (45.3)
ASPECTS region (No.) (%)										
M1	28 (29.6)	117 (19.3)	15 (7.6)	43 (23.2)	Penumbra: 37 (37) Infarcted: 35 (35)	118 (55.7)	NA	NA	95 (44)	83 (44)
M2	45 (47.6)	165 (27.2)	29 (14.6)	49 (26.5)	Penumbra: 39 (39) Infarcted: 43 (43)	70 (33)	NA	NA	140 (65)	114 (60)
M3	20 (22.2)	56 (9.2)	25 (12.6)	29 (15.7)	Penumbra: 54 (54) Infarcted: 28 (28)	109 (51.4)	NA	NA	79 (37)	72 (38)
M4	23 (24.7)	83 (13.7)	13 (6.6)	17 (9.2)	Penumbra: 34 (34) Infarcted: 37 (37)	118 (55.7)	NA	NA	75 (26)	69 (36)
M5	54 (57.6)	169 (27.9)	73 (36.9)	57 (30.8)	Penumbra: 37 (37) Infarcted: 44 (44)	49 (23.1)	NA	NA	130 (60)	113 (59)
M6	22 (23.4)	64 (10.6)	30 (15.2)	24 (13)	Penumbra: 50 (50) Infarcted: 32 (32)	135 (64)	NA	NA	68 (32)	68 (36)
Caudate	37 (39.5)	119 (19.6)	18 (9.1)	33 (17.8)	Penumbra: 12 (12) Infarcted: 16 (16)	122 (57.5)	NA	NA	98 (46)	74 (39)
Internal capsule	14 (14.8)	4 (0.7)	16 (8.1)	80 (43.2)	Penumbra: 25 (25) Infarcted: 22 (22)	126 (59.4)	NA	NA	64 (30)	43 (23)
Lentiform	46 (49.1)	188 (31)	38 (19.2)	80 (43.2)	Penumbra: 30 (30) Infarcted: 30 (30)	68 (32.1)	NA	NA	161 (75)	121 (64)
Insula	57 (60.3)	197 (32.5)	39 (19.7)	112 (60.5)	Penumbra: 31 (31) Infarcted: 42 (42)	53 (25)	NA	NA	151 (70)	142 (75)
Poor outcome, univariate analysis (OR) (95% CI)										
M1	1.33 (0.53-3.31)	1.31 (0.87-1.97)	11.23 ^d (3.38-37.32)	3.06 ^b (1.34-7.95)	1.76 (0.72-4.26)	1.07 (0.49-2.27)	1.04 (0.34-3.11)	1.88 (0.59-6.08)	3.21 ^e (1.84-5.61)	3.13 ^d (1.73-5.67)
M2	0.87 (0.38-1.98)	1.53 ^b (1.07-2.20)	4.59 ^c (2.01-10.45)	5.98 ^b (2.42-18.09)	9.06 ^c (3.14-26.11)	1.9 (0.83-4.37)	2.57 (0.68-9.49)	1.84 (0.57-6.01)	3.52 ^e (1.96-6.32)	2.21 ^f (1.26-3.90)
M3	0.88 (0.33-2.3)	1.77 ^b (0.99-3.13)	3.64 ^c (1.53-8.67)	3.50 ^b (1.28-12.3)	2.22 (0.77-6.43)	0.86 (0.4-1.81)	1.03 (0.32-3.2)	0.63 (0.2-1.91)	4.99 ^e (2.72-9.16)	2.77 ^f (1.50-5.09)
M4	6.48 ^c (1.77-23.77)	1.72 ^c (1.06-2.77)	5.99 ^c (1.86-19.34)	0.87 (0.31-2.63)	2.07 (0.87-4.97)	2.82 ^c (1.39-5.76)	0.91 (0.29-2.7)	5.63 ^d (1.86-18.55)	2.97 ^d (1.65-5.33)	3.02 ^d (1.62-5.60)
M5	0.67 (0.29-1.56)	1.82 ^c (1.26-2.61)	2.17 ^b (1.12-4.23)	1.51 (0.77-3.10)	2.79 ^b (1.05-7.41)	1.81 (0.83-4.07)	2.02 (0.61-7.39)	2.07 (0.68-6.26)	2.36 ^d (1.36-4.10)	3.54 ^d (1.92-6.34)
M6	1.62 (0.59-4.45)	2.42 ^c (1.38-4.25)	3.01 ^b (1.33-6.80)	6.19 ^c (1.74-39.53)	3.52 ^c (1.22-10.11)	2.45 ^c (1.15-5.30)	6.25 ^d (2.01-22.12)	0.99 (0.29-3.24)	5.14 ^d (2.71-9.75)	3.22 ^d (1.71-6.04)
Caudate	0.32 (0.14-0.77)	1.86 ^c (1.22-2.82)	4.83 ^c (1.8-13.1)	1.27 (0.51-2.65)	1.65 (0.63-4.34)	1.49 (0.7-3.21)	2.37 (0.83-7.14)	0.97 (0.26-3.46)	NS	2.47 ^c (1.36-4.49)
Internal capsule	0.55 (0.24-1.26)	0.79 (0.11-5.69)	2.06 (0.71-6.02)	1.88 (0.83-4.68)	2.15 (0.88-5.26)	1.28 (0.48-2.16)	1.24 (0.44-3.45)	1.2 (0.34-4.24)	1.84 ^b (1.02-3.32)	6.12 ^e (2.57-14.6)
Lentiform	0.57 (0.25-1.36)	1.79 ^c (1.27-2.55)	1.93 (0.89-4.16)	1.22 (0.65-2.29)	2.23 (0.95-5.23)	1.28 (0.56-2.93)	0.81 (0.25-2.46)	2.19 (0.67-7.22)	NS	2.50 ^f (1.41-4.46)
Insula	0.57 (0.25-1.36)	1.69 ^c (1.20-2.39)	3.32 ^c (1.57-7.02)	1.56 (0.83-2.91)	2.64 ^c (1.10-6.33)	1.36 (0.58-3.18)	1.15 (0.3-4.22)	1.68 (0.55-5.22)	3.13 ^d (1.71-5.74)	2.53 ^f (1.36-4.70)
Poor outcome, multivariate analysis (OR) [95%CI]										
M1	M4 (5.6) ^c (1.3-23.9)	Lentiform (1.01) ^c	Insula (2.53) ^f	M2 (PageRank 0.005) (bootstrap 95% CI 0.194-0.367)	M2 (3.37) ^b (1.30-8.74)	M4 (2.82) ^c (1.39-5.76)	M6 (5.77) ^c (1.87-20.3)	M3 (2.89) (1.39-5.98)	M3 (2.89) (1.39-5.98)	Caudate (2.07) (1.06-4.06)
M2	M6 (5.7) ^b (1.2-27.5)	M6 (1.01) ^c		M5 (PageRank 0.125) (bootstrap 95% CI 0.096-0.204)	M5 (2.82) (0.98-8.14) (P = .056)	M6 (2.45) ^b (1.15-5.3)		M6 (2.76) (1.28-5.98)	M6 (2.76) (1.28-5.98)	IC (4.55) (1.82-11.34)
M3										M5 (3.39) (1.77-6.48)

Continued on next page

On-line Table 2: Continued

	Sheth et al ¹³ (2018) (Right Stroke)	Sheth et al (2018) ¹³ (Right Stroke)	Sheth et al (2018) ¹³ (Left Stroke)	Khan et al (2017) ¹²	Khan et al (2017) ¹² (Right Stroke)	Khan et al (2017) ¹² (Left Stroke)	Overall
Patients (No.)	342	178	164	90	NA	NA	3364
Study period	January 2010	January 2010	January 2010	January 2010 to August 2012	January 2010 to August 2012	January 2010 to August 2012	January 1991 to December 2016
Imaging technique	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	
Imaging time	24-hr CT scan	24-hr CT scan	24-hr CT scan	Admission IV thrombolysis or EVT	Admission IV thrombolysis or EVT	Admission IV thrombolysis or EVT	
Treatment	EVT	EVT	EVT	EVT	EVT	EVT	
Outcome, 90-day mRS ≤ 2 (No.) (%)	NA	NA	NA	62 (69)	NA	NA	
ASPECTS region (No.) (%)							
M1	65 (19)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Without Penumbra 599/1946
M2	130 (38)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Penumbra 636/1946
M3	70 (20)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	785/1946
M4	75 (22)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	824/1946
M5	106 (31)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	488/1946
M6	62 (18)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	542/1946
Caudate	178 (54)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	510/1946
Internal capsule	65 (19)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	544/1946
Lentiform	241 (71)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	795/1946
Insula	188 (57)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	832/1946
Poor outcome, univariate analysis (OR) (95% CI)							505/1946
M1	NA	1.14 (0.15–8.95)	1.01 (0.16–6.43)	NA	1.97 (0.36–10.82)	NA	555/1946
M2	NA	0.20 (0.03–1.21)	0.98 (0.20–4.86)	NA	5.54 ^b (1.20–25.68)	NA	695/1946
M3	NA	0.24 (0.01–3.94)	3.14 (23.06)	NA	115 ^c (9.32–148.99)	NA	707/1946
M4	NA	2.27 ^d (0.29–17.56)	1.07 (0.02–51.28)	NA	0.70 (0.12–4.20)	NA	434/1946
M5	NA	0.10 (<0.001–31.90)	2.66 (0.12–58.77)	NA	4.00 (0.85–18.84)	NA	459/1946
M6	NA	0.07 ^e (0.002–2.99)	1.02 (0.02–62.62)	NA	25.7 ^c (2.76–239.81)	NA	973/1946
Caudate	NA	0.42 (0.03–5.07)	0.04 (0.001–1.35)	NA	1.15 (0.09–14.19)	NA	1003/1946
Internal capsule	NA	0.012 (<0.001–0.88)	1.09 (0.03–32.3)	NA	1.15 (0.09–14.19)	NA	981/1946
Lentiform	NA	0.04 (<0.001–2.15)	0.02 (<0.001–8.92)	NA	1.17 (0.18–7.56)	NA	1012/1946
Insula	NA	<0.001 (<0.001–0.03)	0.004 (<0.001–6.82)	NA	1.25 (0.30–5.23)	NA	
Poor outcome, multivariate analysis (OR) [95%CI]	NA	M4 ($\beta = 4.4$) ^b	NA	NA	M2 (5.54) ^b (1.2–25.68)	M3 (14.9) ^c (2.75–80.29)	
		M6 ($\beta = 9.7$) ^c	NA	NA	M3 (115) ^d (9.32–148.99)	M5 (12.63) ^b (1.48–107.53)	
					M6 (25.7) ^c (2.76–239.81)	M6 (10.4) ^c (1.97–54.87)	

Note:—NA indicates not applicable; FU, follow-up; EVT, endovascular treatment; IAT, intra-arterial thrombolysis.

^a Only included patients with isolated M2 occlusion.

^b $P < .05$.

^c $P < .01$.

^d $P < .001$.

^e $P < .001$.

On-line Table 3: Results of pooled analyses from studies measuring region-specific infarct in ASPECTS locations via MR imaging and associated clinical outcome^a

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value	Weight (%)
M1	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	11.230	(3.380–37.316)	$P < .001$	14.2
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.040	(0.364–2.970)	$P = .942$	16.7
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.870	(0.578–6.055)	$P = .296$	14.6
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.210	(1.838–5.605)	$P < .001$	27.7
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.130	(1.729–5.666)	$P < .001$	26.8
	Collective	2.918	(1.643–5.183)	$P < .001$	100
M2	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	4.590	(2.013–10.466)	$P < .001$	16.7
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.560	(0.685–9.564)	$P = .162$	6.5
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.840	(0.567–5.975)	$P = .310$	8.2
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.520	(1.960–6.321)	$P < .001$	33.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.210	(1.256–3.888)	$P = .006$	35.5
	Collective	2.897	(2.069–4.056)	$P < .001$	100
M3	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	3.640	(1.529–8.665)	$P = .004$	19.9
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.030	(0.326–3.257)	$P = .960$	15.9
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.630	(0.204–1.947)	$P = .004$	16.2
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	4.990	(2.719–9.157)	$P = .004$	24.0
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.770	(1.504–5.103)	$P = .004$	23.9
	Collective	2.261	(1.151–4.444)	$P = .004$	100
M4	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	5.990	(1.858–19.315)	$P = .003$	13.5
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.910	(0.299–2.772)	$P = .868$	14.5
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	5.630	(1.783–17.780)	$P = .003$	13.9
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.970	(1.652–5.338)	$P < .001$	29.7
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.020	(1.624–5.615)	$P < .001$	28.4
	Collective	3.019	(1.822–5.004)	$P < .001$	100
M5	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	2.170	(1.117–4.217)	$P = .022$	23.1
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.020	(0.580–7.031)	$P = .269$	6.6
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	2.070	(0.682–6.281)	$P = .199$	8.3
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.360	(1.359–4.098)	$P = .002$	33.5
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.540	(1.948–6.433)	$P < .001$	28.6
	Collective	2.545	(1.849–3.502)	$P < .001$	100
M6	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	3.010	(1.331–6.806)	$P = .008$	20.9
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	6.250	(1.884–20.734)	$P = .003$	12.4
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.980	(0.294–3.271)	$P = .974$	12.4
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	5.140	(2.71–9.749)	$P < .001$	27
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.220	(1.713–6.052)	$P < .001$	27.3
	Collective	3.377	(2.074–5.499)	$P < .001$	100
Caudate	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	4.830	(1.790–13.03)	$P = .002$	21.7
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.808–6.951)	$P = .116$	19.2
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.960	(0.263–3.502)	$P = .951$	14.0
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	NA	NA	NA	0
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.470	(1.359–4.488)	$P = .003$	45.0
	Collective	2.486	(1.483–4.170)	$P = .001$	100
Internal capsule	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	2.060	(0.707–5.998)	$P = .185$	16.7
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.813–6.910)	$P = .114$	16.6
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.20	(0.340–4.238)	$P = .777$	13.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	1.840	(1.020–3.320)	$P = .043$	31.9
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	6.120	(2.568–14.587)	$P < .001$	21.7
	Collective	2.401	(1.419–4.062)	$P = .001$	100
Lentiform	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	1.930	(0.893–4.173)	$P = .095$	27.3
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.810	(0.258–2.541)	$P = .718$	12.4
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	2.190	(0.667–7.189)	$P = .196$	11.5
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	NA	NA	NA	0
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.500	(1.406–4.446)	$P = .002$	48.8
	Collective	1.994	(1.332–2.986)	$P = .001$	100
Insula	Payabvash et al, 2018 ²²	3.320	(1.570–7.020)	$P = .002$	21.0
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.150	(0.307–4.313)	$P = .836$	6.8
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.680	(0.545–5.175)	$P = .366$	9.3
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.130	(1.708–5.734)	$P < .001$	32.2
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.530	(1.361–4.703)	$P = .003$	30.7
	Collective	2.618	(1.857–3.691)	$P < .001$	100

Note:—R indicates right hemisphere measurements; L, left hemisphere measurements; NA, not applicable.

^a Odds ratios represent odds of infarct in a given ASPECTS region versus odds of poor clinical outcome as defined by the mRS. Pooled odds ratios were calculated by random-effects meta-analysis using the DerSimonian and Laird method.

On-line Table 4: Results of pooled analyses from studies measuring region-specific infarct in ASPECTS locations via CT and associated clinical outcome^a

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value	Study Weight (%)
M1	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.800	(0.709–4.572)	<i>P</i> = .216	10.9
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.310	(0.871–1.971)	<i>P</i> = .195	56.8
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	3.060	(1.256–7.453)	<i>P</i> = .014	12.0
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	1.760	(0.724–4.281)	<i>P</i> = .213	12.0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.141	(0.145–8.948)	<i>P</i> = .900	2.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	2.663	(0.158–6.438)	<i>P</i> = .992	2.8
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.970	(0.359–10.800)	<i>P</i> = .435	3.3
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	1.560	(1.147–2.123)	<i>P</i> = .005	100
M2	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.870	(0.381–1.986)	<i>P</i> = .741	15.2
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.530	(1.067–2.194)	<i>P</i> = .021	18.3
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	5.980	(2.187–16.35)	<i>P</i> < .001	13.8
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	9.060	(3.142–26.126)	<i>P</i> < .001	13.4
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.204	(0.034–1.212)	<i>P</i> = .080	8.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.982	(0.198–4.861)	<i>P</i> = .982	9.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	5.540	(1.198–25.628)	<i>P</i> = .028	10.0
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	2.430	(0.619–9.542)	<i>P</i> = .203	11.1
	Collective	2.075	(1.028–4.189)	<i>P</i> = .042	100
M3	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.880	(0.333–2.323)	<i>P</i> = .796	17.3
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.770	(0.995–3.147)	<i>P</i> = .052	20.4
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	3.500	(1.128–10.863)	<i>P</i> = .03	16.0
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.220	(0.768–6.415)	<i>P</i> = .141	16.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.240	(0.015–3.942)	<i>P</i> = .317	6.5
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.068	(0.022–51.279)	<i>P</i> = .974	3.9
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	115.00	(9.320–1418.9)	<i>P</i> < .001	7.5
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	14.900	(2.758–80.51)	<i>P</i> = .002	11.8
	Collective	2.753	(1.186–6.393)	<i>P</i> = .018	100
M4	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	6.480	(1.768–23.747)	<i>P</i> = .005	10.2
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.720	(1.064–2.780)	<i>P</i> = .027	41.0
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	0.870	(0.299–2.534)	<i>P</i> = .798	14.1
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.070	(0.866–4.948)	<i>P</i> = .102	19.5
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	2.268	(0.293–17.556)	<i>P</i> = .433	4.4
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.092	(0.124–5.884)	<i>P</i> = .874	5.0
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	0.700	(0.118–4.141)	<i>P</i> = .694	5.8
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	1.721	(1.104–2.682)	<i>P</i> = .017	100
M5	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.730	(0.317–1.683)	<i>P</i> = .460	17.6
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.820	(1.265–2.619)	<i>P</i> = .001	33.6
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.510	(0.753–3.030)	<i>P</i> = .246	21.2
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.790	(1.050–7.412)	<i>P</i> = .040	14.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.095	(<0.001–31.90)	<i>P</i> = .428	0.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	2.663	(0.121–58.767)	<i>P</i> = .535	2.0
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	4.00	(0.850–18.832)	<i>P</i> = .079	7.1
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	12.630	(1.482–107.66)	<i>P</i> = .020	4.0
	Collective	1.795	(1.144–2.816)	<i>P</i> = .011	100
M6	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.620	(0.590–4.449)	<i>P</i> = .349	19.1
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	2.420	(1.379–4.247)	<i>P</i> = .002	27.1
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	6.190	(1.299–29.504)	<i>P</i> = .022	11.9
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	3.520	(1.223–10.133)	<i>P</i> = .020	18.3
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.073	(0.002–2.992)	<i>P</i> = .167	3.0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.018	(0.017–62.621)	<i>P</i> = .993	2.5
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	25.700	(2.757–239.56)	<i>P</i> = .004	7.2
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	10.400	(1.971–54.887)	<i>P</i> = .006	11.0
	Collective	3.290	(1.678–6.452)	<i>P</i> = .001	100
Caudate	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.430	(0.179–1.034)	<i>P</i> = .059	19.7
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.860	(1.223–2.828)	<i>P</i> = .004	27.9
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.270	(0.557–2.895)	<i>P</i> = .570	20.6
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	1.650	(0.629–4.331)	<i>P</i> = .309	18.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.418	(0.034–5.068)	<i>P</i> = .493	5.3
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.043	(0.001–1.346)	<i>P</i> = .073	3.0
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.150	(0.092–14.44)	<i>P</i> = .914	5.2
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	1.013	(0.540–1.902)	<i>P</i> = .041	100

Continued on next page

On-line Table 4: Continued

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value	Study Weight (%)
Internal capsule	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.410	(0.430–4.622)	<i>P</i> = .571	18.8
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	0.790	(0.110–5.682)	<i>P</i> = .815	7.0
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.880	(0.792–4.464)	<i>P</i> = .153	34.0
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.150	(0.879–5.256)	<i>P</i> = .093	31.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.012	(<0.001–0.877)	<i>P</i> = .043	1.5
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.092	(0.037–32.312)	<i>P</i> = .959	2.4
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.150	(0.092–14.44)	<i>P</i> = .914	4.3
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	1.567	(0.925–2.655)	<i>P</i> = .095	100
Lentiform	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.520	(0.227–1.193)	<i>P</i> = .123	18.1
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.790	(1.263–2.536)	<i>P</i> = .001	27.9
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.220	(0.650–2.290)	<i>P</i> = .536	22.1
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.230	(0.950–5.232)	<i>P</i> = .065	17.7
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.240	(0.001–2.151)	<i>P</i> = .112	1.7
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.017	(<0.001–8.920)	<i>P</i> = .202	0.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.170	(0.181–7.582)	<i>P</i> = .869	6.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	0.380	(0.042–3.478)	<i>P</i> = .392	5.0
	Collective	1.112	(0.647–1.912)	<i>P</i> = .701	100
Insula	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.570	(0.242–1.343)	<i>P</i> = .199	16.8
	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.690	(1.198–2.385)	<i>P</i> = .003	22.8
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.560	(0.833–2.921)	<i>P</i> = .165	19.7
	Haranhalli et al, 2019 ²³	2.640	(1.101–6.333)	<i>P</i> = .030	16.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	<0.001	(<0.001–0.290)	<i>P</i> = .002	1.0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.004	(<0.001–6.820)	<i>P</i> = .147	0.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.250	(0.299–5.219)	<i>P</i> = .760	10.8
	Khan et al, 2017 (L) ¹²	0.600	(0.159–2.260)	<i>P</i> = .450	11.7
	Collective	1.109	(0.593–2.072)	<i>P</i> = .746	100

Note:—R indicates right hemisphere measurements; L, left hemisphere measurements; NA, not applicable.

^aOdds ratios represent odds of infarct in a given ASPECTS region versus odds of poor clinical outcome as defined by the mRS. Pooled odds ratios were calculated by random-effects meta-analysis using the DerSimonian and Laird method.

On-line Table 5: Hemisphere-specific results of pooled analyses from studies measuring region-specific infarct in ASPECTS locations via CT or MR imaging and their associated clinical outcome^a

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value	Weight (%)
M1 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.040	(0.364–2.970)	<i>P</i> = .942	26.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.210	(1.838–5.605)	<i>P</i> < .001	53.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.141	(0.145–8.948)	<i>P</i> = .900	8.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.970	(0.359–10.800)	<i>P</i> = .435	12.1
	Collective	2.063	(1.092–3.897)	<i>P</i> = .026	100
M1 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.870	(0.578–6.055)	<i>P</i> = .296	18.8
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.130	(1.729–5.666)	<i>P</i> < .001	73.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.009	(0.158–6.432)	<i>P</i> = .992	7.56
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	2.608	(1.567–4.340)	<i>P</i> < .001	100
M2 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.560	(0.685–9.564)	<i>P</i> = .162	24.6
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.520	(1.960–6.321)	<i>P</i> < .001	34.3
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.204	(0.034–1.212)	<i>P</i> = .080	19.1
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	5.540	(1.198–25.628)	<i>P</i> = .028	21.9
	Collective	2.087	(0.693–6.292)	<i>P</i> = .191	100
M2 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.840	(0.567–5.975)	<i>P</i> = .310	15.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.210	(1.256–3.888)	<i>P</i> = .006	65.6
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.982	(0.198–4.861)	<i>P</i> = .982	8.2
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	2.430	(0.619–9.542)	<i>P</i> = .203	11.2
	Collective	2.033	(1.287–3.212)	<i>P</i> = .002	100
M3 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.030	(0.326–3.257)	<i>P</i> = .960	29.7
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	4.990	(2.719–9.157)	<i>P</i> < .001	33.0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.240	(0.015–3.942)	<i>P</i> = .317	17.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	115.0	(0.932–1419.0)	<i>P</i> < .001	19.6
	Collective	3.369	(0.621–18.281)	<i>P</i> = .159	100
M3 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.630	(0.204–1.947)	<i>P</i> = .422	30.8
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.770	(1.504–5.103)	<i>P</i> = .001	37.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.068	(0.022–51.279)	<i>P</i> = .974	8.5
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	14.900	(2.758–80.510)	<i>P</i> = .002	23.6
	Collective	2.412	(0.679–8.560)	<i>P</i> = .173	100
M4 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.910	(0.299–2.772)	<i>P</i> = .868	27.4
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.970	(1.652–5.338)	<i>P</i> < .001	46.4
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	2.268	(0.293–17.556)	<i>P</i> = .433	11.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	0.700	(0.118–4.141)	<i>P</i> = .694	14.6
	Collective	1.687	(0.779–3.655)	<i>P</i> = .185	100
M4 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	5.630	(1.783–17.78)	<i>P</i> = .003	28.4
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.020	(1.624–5.615)	<i>P</i> < .001	59.4
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.855	(0.124–5.884)	<i>P</i> = .874	12.2
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	3.091	(1.513–6.318)	<i>P</i> = .002	100
M5 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.020	(0.580–7.031)	<i>P</i> = .269	14.7
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.360	(1.359–4.098)	<i>P</i> = .002	75.1
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.095	(<0.001–31.92)	<i>P</i> = .874	0.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	4.000	(0.850–18.832)	<i>P</i> = .079	9.5
	Collective	2.373	(1.471–3.829)	<i>P</i> < .001	100
M5 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.070	(0.682–6.281)	<i>P</i> = .199	20.6
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.540	(1.948–6.433)	<i>P</i> < .001	71.2
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	2.663	(0.121–58.767)	<i>P</i> = .535	2.7
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	12.630	(1.482–107.66)	<i>P</i> = .020	5.5
	Collective	3.375	(2.039–5.586)	<i>P</i> < .001	100
M6 (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	6.250	(1.884–20.734)	<i>P</i> = .003	32.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	5.140	(2.710–9.749)	<i>P</i> < .001	42.5
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.073	(0.002–2.992)	<i>P</i> = .167	8.1
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	25.700	(2.757–239.56)	<i>P</i> = .004	17.3
	Collective	5.125	(0.39–33.099)	<i>P</i> = .006	100
M6 (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.980	(0.294–3.271)	<i>P</i> = .974	29.5
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.220	(1.713–6.052)	<i>P</i> < .001	45.1
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.018	(0.017–62.621)	<i>P</i> = .993	4.8
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	10.400	(1.971–54.887)	<i>P</i> = .006	20.6
	Collective	2.730	(1.059–7.042)	<i>P</i> = .038	100
Caudate (Right)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.808–6.951)	<i>P</i> = .116	73.2
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	NA	NA	NA	0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.418	(0.034–5.068)	<i>P</i> = .493	13.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.150	(0.092–14.44)	<i>P</i> = .914	13.2

Continued on next page

On-line Table 5: Continued

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value	Weight (%)
Caudate (Left)	Collective	1.701	(0.678–4.270)	$P = .258$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.960	(0.263–3.502)	$P = .951$	37.6
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.470	(1.359–4.488)	$P = .003$	49
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.043	(0.001–1.346)	$P = .073$	13.4
Internal capsule (Right)	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	1.007	(0.235–4.312)	$P = .993$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.813–6.910)	$P = .114$	73.2
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	1.840	(1.02–3.32)	$P = .043$	0
Internal capsule (Left)	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.012	(<0.001–0.877)	$P = .043$	13.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.150	(0.092–14.44)	$P = .914$	13.2
	Collective	1.701	(0.570–3.951)	$P = .411$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.200	(0.340–4.238)	$P < .001$	39.3
Lentiform (Right)	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	6.120	(2.568–14.587)	$P = .077$	48.5
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.092	(0.037–32.312)	$P = .959$	12.2
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	NA	NA	NA	0
	Collective	2.613	(0.696–9.806)	$P = .155$	100
Lentiform (Left)	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.810	(0.258–2.541)	$P = .718$	68.8
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	NA	NA	NA	0
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.038	(0.001–2.541)	$P = .112$	5.5
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.170	(0.181–7.582)	$P = .869$	25.7
Insula (Right)	Collective	0.752	(0.291–1.941)	$P = .556$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.190	(0.667–7.189)	$P = .196$	17.1
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.500	(1.406–4.446)	$P = .002$	71
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.170	(0.181–7.582)	$P = .869$	7
Insula (Left)	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	0.380	(0.042–3.478)	$P = .392$	5
	Collective	2.112	(1.289–3.459)	$P = .003$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.150	(0.307–4.313)	$P = .836$	29.8
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.130	(1.708–5.735)	$P < .001$	35.9
Insula (Left)	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	<0.001	(<0.001–0.029)	$P = .002$	5.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	1.250	(0.299–5.219)	$P = .760$	28.8
	Collective	0.977	(0.205–4.659)	$P = .977$	100
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.680	(0.545–5.176)	$P = .366$	29.9
Insula (Left)	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.530	(1.361–4.703)	$P = .003$	42.9
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.004	(<0.001–6.820)	$P = .147$	1.6
	Khan et al, 2017 (R) ¹²	0.600	(0.159–2.260)	$P = .450$	25.6
	Collective	1.401	(0.550–3.572)	$P = .480$	100

Note:—R indicates right hemisphere measurements; L, left hemisphere measurements; NA, not applicable.

^a Odds ratios represent odds of infarct in a given ASPECTS region versus odds of poor clinical outcome as defined by the mRS. Pooled odds ratios were calculated by random-effects meta-analysis using the DerSimonian and Laird method.

On-line Table 6: MT-specific results of pooled analyses from studies measuring region-specific infarct in ASPECTS locations and their associated clinical outcome^a

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value
M1	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.800	(0.709–4.571)	<i>P</i> = .216
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.040	(0.364–2.971)	<i>P</i> = .942
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.870	(0.578–6.052)	<i>P</i> = .296
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.210	(1.838–5.606)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.130	(1.729–5.666)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	1.141	(0.145–8.963)	<i>P</i> = .900
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.009	(0.158–6.438)	<i>P</i> = .992
	Collective	2.380	(1.705–3.322)	<i>P</i> < .001
M2	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.870	(0.381–1.986)	<i>P</i> = .741
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.560	(0.685–9.566)	<i>P</i> = .162
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.840	(0.567–5.973)	<i>P</i> = .310
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.520	(1.960–6.321)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.210	(1.256–3.888)	<i>P</i> = .006
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.204	(0.034–1.218)	<i>P</i> = .081
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.982	(0.198–4.866)	<i>P</i> = .982
	Collective	1.607	(0.096–2.851)	<i>P</i> = .105
M3	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.880	(0.333–2.324)	<i>P</i> = .741
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.030	(0.326–3.256)	<i>P</i> = .162
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.630	(0.204–1.946)	<i>P</i> = .310
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	4.990	(2.719–9.157)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.770	(1.504–5.102)	<i>P</i> = .006
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.240	(0.015–3.891)	<i>P</i> = .081
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.068	(0.022–51.562)	<i>P</i> = .982
	Collective	1.475	(0.698–3.116)	<i>P</i> = .309
M4	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	6.480	(1.768–23.749)	<i>P</i> = .741
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.910	(0.299–2.771)	<i>P</i> = .162
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	5.630	(1.783–17.779)	<i>P</i> = .310
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.970	(1.652–5.339)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.020	(1.624–5.616)	<i>P</i> = .006
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	2.268	(0.293–17.556)	<i>P</i> = .081
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.855	(0.124–5.890)	<i>P</i> = .982
	Collective	2.778	(1.751–4.407)	<i>P</i> < .001
M5	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.730	(0.317–1.682)	<i>P</i> = .460
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.020	(0.580–7.033)	<i>P</i> = .269
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	2.079	(0.682–6.282)	<i>P</i> = .199
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.360	(1.359–4.098)	<i>P</i> = .002
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.540	(1.948–6.433)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.095	(0.001–53.658)	<i>P</i> = .467
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	2.664	(0.121–58.709)	<i>P</i> = .535
	Collective	1.987	(1.203–3.281)	<i>P</i> = .007
M6	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.620	(0.590–4.449)	<i>P</i> = .349
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	6.250	(1.884–20.734)	<i>P</i> = .003
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.980	(0.294–3.269)	<i>P</i> = .974
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	5.140	(2.710–9.749)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	3.220	(1.713–6.052)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.073	(0.002–2.824)	<i>P</i> = .160
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.018	(0.017–61.785)	<i>P</i> = .993
	Collective	2.593	(1.203–3.281)	<i>P</i> = .003
Caudate	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.430	(0.179–1.033)	<i>P</i> = .059
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.808–6.951)	<i>P</i> = .116
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	0.960	(0.263–3.503)	<i>P</i> = .951
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	2.470	(1.359–4.489)	<i>P</i> = .003
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.418	(0.034–5.103)	<i>P</i> = .494
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.043	(0.001–1.578)	<i>P</i> = .087
	Collective	0.970	(0.396–2.380)	<i>P</i> = .947
Internal capsule	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	1.410	(0.430–1.033)	<i>P</i> = .571
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	2.370	(0.813–6.951)	<i>P</i> = .114
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.200	(0.340–3.503)	<i>P</i> = .777
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	1.840	(1.020–4.489)	<i>P</i> = .043
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	6.120	(2.568–4.489)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.012	(0.001–1.124)	<i>P</i> = .056
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	1.092	(0.037–32.270)	<i>P</i> = .959
	Collective	1.976	(1.023–3.817)	<i>P</i> = .043

Continued on next page

On-line Table 6: Continued

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value
Lentiform	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.520	(0.227–1.192)	<i>P</i> = .122
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	0.810	(0.258–2.542)	<i>P</i> = .718
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	2.190	(0.667–7.190)	<i>P</i> = .196
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.500	(1.406–4.446)	<i>P</i> = .002
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.038	(0.001–1.762)	<i>P</i> = .095
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.017	(<0.001–5.077)	<i>P</i> = .161
	Collective	0.944	(0.372–2.397)	<i>P</i> = .904
Insula	Fukuda et al, 2017 ²¹	0.570	(0.242–1.343)	<i>P</i> = .199
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (R) ¹⁵	1.150	(0.307–4.310)	<i>P</i> = .836
	Rangaraju et al, 2015 (L) ¹⁵	1.680	(0.545–5.177)	<i>P</i> = .366
	Rosso et al, 2019 (R) ²⁴	3.130	(1.708–5.735)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Rosso et al, 2019 (L) ²⁴	2.539	(1.361–4.703)	<i>P</i> = .003
	Sheth et al, 2018 (R) ¹³	0.001	(<0.001–0.017)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Sheth et al, 2018 (L) ¹³	0.004	(<0.001–3.303)	<i>P</i> = .107
	Collective	0.728	(1.023–2.167)	<i>P</i> = .568

Note:—R indicates right hemisphere measurements; L, left hemisphere measurements.

^a Odds ratios represent odds of infarct in a given ASPECTS region versus odds of poor clinical outcome as defined by the mRS. Pooled odds ratios were calculated by random-effects meta-analysis using the DerSominan and Laird method.

On-line Table 7: IV-tPA/conservative management-specific results of pooled analyses from studies measuring region-specific infarct in ASPECTS locations and their associated clinical outcome^a

Region	Study	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value
M1	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.310	(0.871–1.971)	<i>P</i> = .195
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	3.060	(1.256–7.454)	<i>P</i> = .014
	Collective	1.819	(0.809–4.088)	<i>P</i> = .148
M2	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.530	(1.067–2.194)	<i>P</i> = .021
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	5.980	(2.187–16.351)	<i>P</i> < .001
	Collective	2.781	(0.739–10.468)	<i>P</i> = .131
M3	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.770	(0.995–3.148)	<i>P</i> = .052
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	3.500	(1.128–10.861)	<i>P</i> = .030
	Collective	2.076	(1.179–3.654)	<i>P</i> = .011
M4	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.720	(1.064–2.780)	<i>P</i> = .027
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	0.870	(0.299–2.533)	<i>P</i> = .798
	Collective	1.456	(0.820–2.585)	<i>P</i> = .200
M5	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.820	(1.265–2.619)	<i>P</i> = .001
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.510	(0.753–3.029)	<i>P</i> = .246
	Collective	1.749	(1.267–2.414)	<i>P</i> = .001
M6	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	2.420	(1.379–4.247)	<i>P</i> = .002
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	6.190	(1.299–29.500)	<i>P</i> = .022
	Collective	2.884	(1.407–5.911)	<i>P</i> = .004
Caudate	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.860	(1.223–2.828)	<i>P</i> = .004
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.270	(0.557–2.895)	<i>P</i> = .570
	Collective	1.720	(1.184–2.499)	<i>P</i> = .004
Internal capsule	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	0.790	(0.110–5.678)	<i>P</i> = .815
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.880	(0.792–4.463)	<i>P</i> = .152
	Collective	1.635	(0.741–3.609)	<i>P</i> = .224
Lentiform	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.790	(1.263–2.536)	<i>P</i> = .001
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.220	(0.650–2.290)	<i>P</i> = .536
	Collective	1.622	(1.169–2.252)	<i>P</i> = .004
Insula	Phan et al, 2013 ¹⁴	1.690	(1.198–2.385)	<i>P</i> = .003
	Beare et al, 2015 ²⁰	1.560	(0.833–2.921)	<i>P</i> = .165
	Collective	1.659	(1.227–2.243)	<i>P</i> = .001

Note:—R indicates right hemisphere measurements; L, left hemisphere measurements.

^a Odds ratios represent odds of infarct in a given ASPECTS region versus odds of poor clinical outcome as defined by the mRS. Pooled odds ratios were calculated by random effects meta-analysis using the DerSominan-Laird method.

