1 Title

- 2 Potential of machine learning to predict early ischemic events after carotid endarterectomy or
- 3 stenting: A comparison with surgeon predictions
- 4

5 **Author information**

- 6 Kazuya Matsuo MD, PhD¹, ORCID ID 0000-0001-6721-1353, Atsushi Fujita MD, PhD¹,
- 7 ORCID ID 0000-0003-1294-6584, Kohkichi Hosoda MD, PhD², ORCID-ID
- 8 0000-0002-0419-9497, Jun Tanaka MD, PhD³, Taichiro Imahori MD, PhD⁴, Taiji Ishii MD,
- 9 PhD⁵, Masaaki Kohta MD, PhD¹, Kazuhiro Tanaka MD, PhD¹, Yoichi Uozumi MD, PhD¹,
- ¹⁰ Hidehito Kimura MD, PhD¹, Takashi Sasayama MD, PhD¹, Eiji Kohmura MD, PhD¹

11

12 Affiliations

- ¹³ ¹ Department of Neurosurgery, Kobe University Graduate School of Medicine, Kobe, Hyogo,
- 14 Japan
- ¹⁵ ² Department of Neurosurgery, Kobe City Nishi-Kobe Medical Center, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan
- ³ Department of Neurosurgery, Konan Hospital, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan
- ⁴ Department of Neurosurgery, Hyogo Brain and Heart Center at Himeji, Himeji, Hyogo, Japan

⁵ Department of Neurosurgery, Toyooka Hospital, Toyooka, Hyogo, Japan

- 19
- 20 *Correspondence: Kazuya Matsuo, MD, PhD, Department of Neurosurgery, Kobe University
- 21 Graduate School of Medicine, 7-5-1 Kusunoki-cho, Chuo-ku, Kobe, Hyogo 650-0017, Japan
- 22 Tel: +81-78-382-5966
- 23 Fax: +81-78-382-5979
- 24 E-mail: <u>kkmatsuo@outlook.jp</u>

1 Abstract

2 Background

3 Carotid endarterectomy (CEA) and carotid artery stenting (CAS) are recommended for 4 high stroke-risk patients with carotid artery stenosis to reduce ischemic events. However, we 5 often face difficulty in determining the best treatment strategy.

6 **Objective**

We aimed to develop an accurate post-CEA/CAS outcome prediction model using machine
learning that will serve as a basis for a new decision support tool for patient-specific treatment
planning.

10 Methods

11 Retrospectively collected data from 165 consecutive patients with carotid stenosis 12 underwent CEA or CAS were divided into training and test samples. The following five 13 machine learning algorithms were tuned, and their predictive performance evaluated by 14 comparison with surgeon predictions: an artificial neural network, logistic regression, support 15 vector machine, random forest, and extreme gradient boosting (XGBoost). Seventeen clinical 16 factors were introduced into the models. Outcome was defined as any ischemic stroke within 30 17 days after treatment including asymptomatic diffusion-weighted imaging abnormalities.

18 **Results**

The XGBoost model performed the best in the evaluation; its sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and accuracy were 31.9%, 94.6%, 47.2%, and 86.2%, respectively. These statistical measures were comparable to those of surgeons. Internal carotid artery peak systolic velocity, low density lipoprotein cholesterol, and procedure (CEA or CAS) were the most contributing factors according to the XGBoost algorithm.

24 Conclusion

1	We were able to develop a post-procedural outcome prediction model comparable to
2	surgeons in performance. The accurate outcome prediction model will make it possible to make
3	a more appropriate patient-specific selection of CEA or CAS for the treatment of carotid artery
4	stenosis.
5	
6	Keywords
7	Carotid artery stenting, carotid endarterectomy, carotid stenosis, decision support tool, machine
8	learning.
9	
10	Declarations
11	Funding
12	Matsuo K is supported in part by a research fund from the Alumni Association of the
13	Department of Neurosurgery, Kobe University School of Medicine.
14	
15	Conflicts of interest/Competing interests
16	Not applicable.
17	
18	Availability of data and material (data transparency)
19	The patient data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding
20	author upon reasonable request.
21	
22	Code availability (software application or custom code)
23	A subset of the program code generated for this study is available at GitHub and can be
24	accessed at https://gist.github.com/kkmatsuo/e77e78a0346280d5570829164760132f.

2	Ethics approval (include appropriate approvals or waivers)
3	This retrospective study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Kobe University Graduate
4	School of Medicine (approval no. B200444).
5	
6	Consent to participate (include appropriate statements)
7	Written informed consent was obtained from all patients before treatment.
8	
9	Consent for publication (include appropriate statements)
10	Not applicable.
11	
12	Authors' contributions
13	Kazuya Matsuo conceptualized the experimental design, analyzed the data, developed the
14	machine learning model, and wrote the manuscript. Atsushi Fujita contributed to study design,
15	interpreted the results, and critically revised the manuscript. Kohkichi Hosoda provided the
16	background data for the study, interpreted the results, and reviewed the manuscript. Jun Tanaka
17	carried out the data acquisition, conducted the analyses, and reviewed the manuscript. Taichiro
18	Imahori carried out the data acquisition and reviewed the manuscript. Taiji Ishii carried out the
19	data acquisition and reviewed the manuscript. Masaaki Kohta participated in the study design,
20	interpreted the results, and reviewed the manuscript. Kazuhiro Tanaka carried out the data
21	acquisition, conducted the analyses, and interpreted the results. Yoichi Uozumi conducted the
22	analyses and interpreted the results. Hidehito Kimura carried out the data acquisition and
23	interpreted the results. Takashi Sasayama supervised the whole study and critically revised the
24	manuscript. Eiji Kohmura supervised the whole study, contributed to study design, and critically

1 revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

1 Introduction

2 Carotid artery stenosis is an important cause of ischemic stroke, which remains a major public health problem worldwide [26]. To reduce the risk of ischemic stroke, carotid 3 4 endarterectomy (CEA) and carotid artery stenting (CAS) are recommended for patients at high 5 stroke risk with carotid artery stenosis. Based on the evidence that there are no significant differences in long-term outcomes after CEA and CAS [1,10,23], there are general guidelines 6 7 for patient selection for CEA and CAS [10,13,27]. However, we often face difficulty in 8 determining the best treatment method. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a useful decision 9 support tool for patient-specific treatment planning for carotid artery stenosis. Recently, the use 10 of artificial intelligence (AI) has been increasing in medical field because of advances in technology including robust machine learning (ML) algorithms for successful prediction and 11 12 diagnosis [14]. However, no studies have applied modern ML models in the carotid stenosis cohort. 13

In this study, we aimed to develop an accurate ML model for the prediction of ischemic events within 30 days after CEA or CAS with 17 clinical factors. The usefulness of the ML models was evaluated by comparing their predictions with those of surgeons. Because early periprocedural major and minor stroke is associated with long-term outcomes [18], our model to predict post-procedural ischemic events can serve as the basis for an effective decision support tool for patient-specific adaptation of CEA and CAS. Additionally, the relative importance of the clinical features was measured using an ML method.

21

22 Materials and Methods

23 Study population

24 We enrolled 170 consecutive cases of carotid stenosis treated with CEA or CAS at a single

center in Japan between January 2013 and December 2018. Patient information was 1 2 retrospectively collected from the hospital carotid stenosis database and anonymized before analysis. This retrospective study was approved by the institutional review board. Written 3 4 informed consent was obtained from all patients before treatment. We excluded patients with 5 arterial dissection and those who could not undergo MRI because of pacemaker implantation. The missing values were imputed by the k-nearest-neighbours (kNN) method [30]. We used the 6 7 clinical data of patients until March 2018 as training data to optimize the hyperparameters and 8 train the ML models, and used the data of more recent patients, from April to December 2018, 9 as test data to evaluate the predictive performance of each model. The sample size was 10 determined based on a previous study [8]. We conducted and reported this study in compliance with the transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or 11 12 diagnosis (TRIPOD) statement for multivariate prediction models [19].

13

14 Treatments

15 Therapeutic approach was in accordance with the guidelines [13,27] based on stenosis degree assessed by NASCET criteria [7]. Basically, CAS was performed for CEA high-risk 16 patients according to the inclusion criteria in the SAPPHIRE study [10]. The final treatment 17 strategy was made by a multidisciplinary team. CEA was performed under general anaesthesia 18 19 by three surgeons. Continuous neurophysiological monitoring was performed by neurophysiologists during surgery multimodality 20 with а protocol involving 21 electroencephalogram (EEG), median nerve somatosensory evoked potentials (SSEP), and 22 bilateral regional cerebral oximetry (rSO2). Shunt placement was determined by the onset of 23 alarm criteria for either EEG or SSEP, which was defined as a >50% decrease in amplitude [9]. CAS was performed under local anaesthesia by four surgeons. The rSO2 was monitored during 24

the procedure. Each patient treated with CAS was administered 100 mg aspirin and 75 mg clopidogrel daily for at least 7 days before and 90 days after the CAS. The choice of stent and interventional strategy were determined by the interventional team.

4

5 Clinical parameters

A total of 17 clinical parameters were used for the ML model development based on their 6 7 known or expected influence on the outcome. These parameters consisted of age [28], 8 pretreatment modified Rankin scale (mRS) [21], hypertension [21], diabetes mellitus [11,24,31], 9 medical history of arteriosclerotic disease [5], serum low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol 10 value (mg/dL) [24], internal carotid artery peak systolic velocity (ICA-PSV, cm/sec), symptomatic [24,28], crescendo transient ischemic attack (TIA) or stroke in evolution [11], 11 12 previous neck irradiation [6], type III aorta [24], contralateral carotid occlusion [31], stenosis at a high position, mobile plaque, plaque ulceration [11,24], plaque with hyperintense signal on 13 14 time-of-flight (TOF), and procedure (CEA or CAS) [4,18,20]. History of arteriosclerotic disease 15 was defined as a history of acute coronary syndrome or peripheral artery disease requiring treatment. Crescendo TIA was defined as at least two similar TIAs in one week. Contralateral 16 carotid occlusion, stenosis at a high position, and type III aorta were assessed using MRA, CTA, 17 or angiography. Stenosis at a high position was defined as carotid stenosis that extends distally 18 to the height of the vertebral body of C2. The ICA-PSV, mobile plaque, and plaque ulceration 19 20 were assessed using echocardiogram. A plaque with hyperintense signal on TOF was defined as 21 a plaque that appeared hyperintense on TOF-MRI compared with the signal of the adjacent 22 sternocleidomastoid muscle.

In our preliminary study, we first created a prediction model with 22 clinical parameters which included gender, arterial fibrillation, estimated glomerular filtration rate, stenosis degree

assessed by NASCET criteria, and the side of the lesion. We then find the effective parameters
and narrowed it down to the 17 parameters with the highest predictive performance (data not
shown).

4

5 Outcomes

Outcome was defined as minor or major ischemic stroke including asymptomatic diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) hyperintense lesions within 30 days after CEA or CAS. Minor stroke was defined as a National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale score of less than 3, and major stroke was defined as a score of 3 or higher. Postprocedural MRI was performed the day after the procedure for CAS and less than one week afterwards for CEA. Additional MRI was performed if any neurological deficit was observed.

12

13 Development of machine learning models

14 The following five ML models were applied: artificial neural network (ANN), logistic 15 regression, random forest, support vector machine (SVM), and extreme gradient boosting (XGBoost) [3]. The logistic regression, random forest, and SVM were implemented using 16 scikit-learn, which is a free ML library for Python. The ANN model was implemented using the 17 Keras library with a TensorFlow backend. All the ML models were developed using Python 18 version 3.7.7, Scikit-learn version 0.22.1, and TensorFlow version 2.2.0. First, we performed 19 20 hyperparameter tuning of all models except for ANN using a grid-search algorithm with 21 log-loss as the objective function on the training data. All numerical variables were standardized 22 using centring and scaling. When applying grid-search, the value of the objective function was 23 evaluated by stratified 5-fold cross-validation. The hyperparameters of the ANN model were 24 hand-tuned using the holdout method on the training data with cross-entropy as the objective

function. The base ANN model consisted of three dense layers with two dropout layers and two 1 2 batch normalization layers (Supplemental table 1). After identifying the optimal hyperparameters for every model that minimize the log-loss value, we evaluated the predictive 3 performance of each model using 10 times repeated stratified 5-fold cross-validation on the 4 5 training data. The averages of the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC AUC), sensitivity, specificity, positive prediction value (PPV), and prediction accuracy were 6 7 calculated through the cross-validation, and 95% confidence intervals were estimated. We also 8 created and evaluated an ensemble model which comprises of the three models with the highest 9 ROC AUC on the training data.

10

11 Test of machine learning models

12 The data of 22 consecutive patients treated by CEA or CAS at the same institution from April to December 2018 were used as a test data. Their post-procedural outcomes were 13 14 predicted using the trained ML models with the 17 factors. In this procedure, we used the 15 standard bootstrap method as an additional internal validation technique. In this study, the number of resampling repetitions, which should be as large as possible to ensure the stability of 16 the estimates, was set to 1000 repetitions. The bootstrap averages of sensitivity, specificity, PPV, 17 and prediction accuracy were calculated, and 95% confidence intervals were estimated. Using 18 19 the same 17 factors, four surgeons (board-certified neurosurgeons who had at least 10 years of 20 experience) also predicted the post-procedural outcomes for each patient based on the test data 21 within 10 minutes. When surgeons performed the outcome prediction test, to ensure that other 22 information was never leaked, a paper test with information on only the 17 clinical factors for each patient was used. These surgeons were independent of the CEA and CAS performed during 23 the designated study period. The average sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and prediction accuracy of 24

1 the predictions of the four surgeons were compared with those of the ML models.

2

3 Feature importance measurement

The relative importance of the clinical features was measured by the total gain of the XGBoost algorithm. The gain is the relative contribution of a feature to the model, calculated by taking each feature's contribution to each tree in the gradient boosting decision tree model. Thus, the features with higher gain are more important for generating the prediction of the XGBoost model.

9

10 Statistical Analysis

Descriptive and comparative statistics were used to describe clinical characteristics of the patients. We performed a statistical comparison between training and test groups using Welch's t-test for numerical values, Fisher's exact test for categorical variables, and the Mann–Whitney U test for pretreatment mRS. A 2-tailed probability value of 0.05 or lower was considered statistically significant. Statistical analysis was performed using EZR version 1.38.

16

17 Results

18 Study participants

The flow diagram of model development and validation is presented in Figure 1. Among the 170 patients with carotid stenosis, five (2.9%) were excluded. Thus, the data of a total of l65 patients with carotid stenosis were included for analysis and separated into training and test data. The baseline characteristics before missing value imputation are shown in Table 1. There were 36 (22%) patients over 80 years of age, and 127 (77%) patients in good condition (mRS 0-1). Severe carotid stenosis, which was defined as an ICA-PSV of more than 200 cm/s, was

observed in 115 (70%) patients. CEA and CAS were performed on 95 (58%) and 70 (42%) 1 2 patients, respectively. The outcome was observed in 45 (27%) patients. Major stroke, minor stroke, and asymptomatic DWI hyperintense lesions were diagnosed in 3 (1.8%), 3 (1.8%), and 3 39 (24%) patients, respectively. All missing values were imputed using the kNN method. No 4 significant difference was found in the comparison before and after imputation of the missing 5 values (data not shown). Although age and follow-up duration were significantly older and 6 7 shorter, respectively, in the test data, there was no significant difference between the training 8 and test data for the other factors that were used for analysis after imputation (Table 1). The test 9 data tended to have more CAS and fewer outcomes, but there were no significant differences.

The differences in patient characteristics between the CEA and CAS groups were shown in Supplemental table 1. The patients with hypertension, plaque ulceration, plaque with hyperintense signal on TOF, and symptomatic stenosis were significantly more common in the CEA group. Asymptomatic DWI hyperintense lesion was significantly increased in CAS group. Other variables did not differ between the CEA and CAS groups.

15

16 **Prediction of post-procedural ischemic events on the training dataset**

To evaluate the predictive performance of five ML models for post CEA/CAS outcomes, 17 10 times repeated stratified 5-fold cross-validation was first performed on the 143-patient 18 training data. The prediction results showed that the ROC AUC of XGBoost was highest at 19 20 0.719, sensitivity of SVM was highest at 36.2%, and the specificity, PPV, and accuracy of 21 random forest were highest at 98.3%, 78.9%, and 75.4%, respectively (Table 2). Then, an 22 ensemble model of the logistic regression, XGBoost, and ANN models, which were the three 23 most highest ROC AUC models, was also created and evaluated. It yielded a ROC AUC of 0.739, sensitivity of 15.1%, specificity of 97.4%, PPV of 75.1%, and accuracy of 72.7%. Thus, 24

1 the ensemble model obtained the highest ROC AUC on the training data.

2

3 Prediction of post-procedural ischemic events on the test dataset and comparison with

4 surgeons

5 Next, to confirm the post-CEA/CAS outcome prediction performances of the six ML 6 models including the ensemble model, these models were further evaluated on the 22-patient 7 test data with the bootstrap method. The results are shown in Table 3. XGBoost achieved the 8 highest PPV, and accuracy scores, which were 47.2% and 86.2%, respectively. The highest 9 sensitivity was 34.0%, which was achieved by random forest, SVM, and logistic regression. The 10 highest specificity was 95.4%, which was achieved by ANN. The ensemble model, which 11 obtained the highest ROC AUC on the training data, did not perform so well on the test data.

The average of the outcome predictions made by four surgeons had a sensitivity of 41.7%, specificity of 75.0%, PPV of 20.1%, and accuracy of 70.5%. Therefore, all of the current ML models trained with 143 cases and 17 factors outperformed the surgeons' predictions in terms of specificity and accuracy. However, surgeons showed a higher predictive sensitivity than the current ML models. A statistical analysis was not performed on these results because of the small sample size. The optimized hyperparameters of these models are listed in Supplemental table 2.

19

20 Importance values of the clinical factors

The feature importances were measured using a function of the XGBoost algorithm, which obtained the best predictive performance on the test data. The results reveal that ICA-PSV, serum LDL-cholesterol value, and procedure (CEA or CAS) are the most important in this order (Figure 2).

1

2 Discussion

In this study, we identified two notable findings. First, using an appropriate model construction process with effective clinical factors, we were able to develop a post-CEA/CAS outcome prediction model that is comparable to surgeons in terms of sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and accuracy, although our models were developed with a relatively small number of patients. Second, in our validation process, the XGBoost model had the highest predictive performance, and the factors that contributed most to the accurate model were ICA-PSV, serum LDL-cholesterol value, and procedure (CEA or CAS).

10

11 ML and ICAS

12 We were able to develop a post-CEA/CAS outcome prediction model that is comparable to surgeons, even with a relatively small training sample size. This is the first study to predict the 13 14 outcome after treatment of carotid artery stenosis using ML models. Our model makes it 15 possible to preoperatively calculate the post-CEA/CAS stroke risk as a concrete numeric value; for example, 10% with CEA and 15% with CAS for postprocedural stroke risk. This function 16 can help surgeons to determine whether the patient suitable for CEA or CAS. However, a 17 problem of the current models is that sensitivity is relatively low. To increase the prediction 18 sensitivity, we tuned the models with sensitivity as the objective function during model 19 20 development. However, such sensitivity-oriented models showed a considerable decrease in 21 accuracy, although sensitivity increased slightly (data not shown). Therefore, these 22 sensitivity-oriented models were not adopted this time. In this study, we did not perform statistical analyses on differences of predictive performance between ML models and surgeons 23 24 because of the small test sample size. Therefore, we did not determine the statistical significance

of ML models. However, our prediction models could be a milestone in the development of new decision support tool for treatment choice in carotid stenosis, because as the training data continues to grow in size, we can expect the prediction performance of the models to be higher than the present study. To further improve the predictive performance of ML models, it would be necessary to use big data and more important contributing factors.

In this study, the incidence rate of postprocedural ischemic events was 27%, which was 6 7 similar to the results of previous studies [29]. Most of these postprocedural ischemic events 8 were asymptomatic DWI small lesions. Although such asymptomatic DWI lesions are 9 sometimes underestimated in clinical practice, it was reported that the volume of postoperative 10 DWI lesions could correlate with cognitive deterioration at 6 months after CEA or CAS [36]. Accordingly, even if the lesion is small, we should try to avoid the postoperative DWI lesions. 11 12 In general, MRI DWI can detect ischemic changes for at least 2 weeks after a stroke onset, and the postoperative DWI lesions have been considered to be derived from cerebral microembolism 13 14 during CAS or CEA [25]. Thus, the difference in the timing of postoperative MRI between the 15 CEA and CAS groups should not have a significant impact on our results.

16 The number of studies using ML to explore stroke and neurosurgical diseases has increased 17 rapidly over the past decade. The most frequently applied algorithms are ANN, logistic regression, random forest, and SVM [2,12,32], which suggests that our model selection is 18 appropriate. In our study, the predictive performance of the XGBoost was better than those of 19 the ANN, logistic regression, SVM, and random forest. Although the superior performance of 20 21 the GBDT model has been shown in many data-science contests in recent years [33], there is 22 still very little research on neurosurgery or stroke using the GBDT model [22,33]. The ensemble 23 model, which had the highest ROC AUC on our training data, did not perform so well on the test data, probably because of overfitting to the training data. 24

1

2 Feature Importance

XGBoost, which showed the best predictive performance, identified ICA-PSV, serum 3 LDL-cholesterol value, and procedure (CEA or CAS), as the most effective factors. The 4 procedure type, CEA or CAS, has previously been reported as a potential predictor of 5 periprocedural stroke [4,18,20,21]. Thus, it seems reasonable that the procedure type is the third 6 7 most important factor in this study. However, no studies have suggested that ICA-PSV or serum 8 LDL-cholesterol value are associated to postprocedural outcome. Although ICA-PSV should 9 reflect the degree of stenosis, many studies reported that the degree of stenosis is not associated 10 with postprocedural outcome [24,28]. ICA-PSV might be used in our model as a valid predictor in combination with other clinical factors. In a study investigating the components of emboli 11 12 captured by the filter-protection device during CAS, more postoperative DWI high intensity lesions were observed in patients whose main component of the emboli was cholesterol [17]. It 13 14 may be inferred from such results that serum LDL-cholesterol might be related to 15 post-procedural outcome because it should be possible for a higher serum LDL-cholesterol value to leads to a higher cholesterol content of the plaque, which produces emboli. In this study, 16 the presence and intensity of lipid-lowering therapies, such as statins, were not evaluated. How 17 LDL-cholesterol levels and lipid-lowering therapies are associated with clinical outcome need 18 19 to be further investigated in future studies.

20

21 Comparison of clinician and AI performance

22 Many studies have compared clinicians and AI with image interpretation or diagnostic 23 performance and have shown that ML models are equivalent to or superior to specialists [16,34]. 24 However, there were very few studies that compared the predictive performance of clinicians

1	and AI as in this study [15]. The sensitivity of the surgeons' prediction was higher than our ML
2	models, presumably because the surgeons have experience of more than 143 patients, which
3	comprise the dataset that our ML models learned. Therefore, instead of a difference in predictive
4	ability, the number of experienced and learned cases might have influenced the results. The
5	advantage of an ML model is that if only the question and answer are provided correctly, it can
6	learn an enormous number of cases that one surgeon would not be able to experience. Therefore,
7	in future, as the number of training cases increases, the predictive performance of the ML model
8	would further improve.

9

10 Limitations

One of the main limitations of our study is the small sample size. Although a larger sample 11 12 size would be needed for more accurate ML models, a previous report suggested that 80-560 13 samples are required for ML algorithms excluding deep neural networks, and the required 14 sample size depends on the dataset and sampling method [19]. Furthermore, a systematic review 15 of AI in neurosurgery has shown that the median number of patients in each study was 120 [2]. Thus, the sample size might not be insufficient for our ML models (excepting the ANN model). 16 Second, several potentially important clinical parameters, such as tandem stenotic lesions or 17 other inappropriate anatomical features for the procedure, were not considered in this study. 18 Third, optimizing hyperparameters for neural network models is generally difficult because they 19 20 have many hyperparameters that need to be adjusted. In addition to hyperparameters, the neural 21 network architecture should be optimized for better performance [35]. In this study, because the 22 ANN was hand-tuned by multiple trial-and-error sessions, a more effective hyperparameter set 23 might be found by other, more sophisticated optimization methods. Finally, because the dataset 24 was collected retrospectively from a single institution, it is prone to selection bias, and our ML

models may not be applicable to other institutions where different treatment strategies or patient 1 2 demographics might exist. Although internal validation was applied with repeated cross-validation and bootstrap methods, further external validation is necessary in another 3 setting that differs in time or place to validate the performance of our prognostic models. 4 5 Conclusion 6 7 We developed a post-CEA/CAS outcome prediction model with a performance comparable 8 to that of surgeons. The XGBoost model showed the best predictive performance which 9 achieved more than 85% accuracy, and the most contributing factors were ICA-PSV, serum LDL-cholesterol value, and procedure (CEA or CAS). Our model can help surgeons to 10 determine whether the patient suitable for CEA or CAS based on the calculated probability 11 12 estimates for postprocedural ischemic event. Larger datasets and analysis of potential prognostic factors would be necessary to further improve the predictive performance of the ML models. 13 14 **Conflict of Interest** 15 None. 16 17 18 References 1. Brott TG, Howard G, Roubin GS, Meschia JF, Mackey A, Brooks W, et al (2016) Long-Term 19 20 Results of Stenting versus Endarterectomy for Carotid-Artery Stenosis. N Engl J Med 21 374:1021-1031. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1505215 2. Buchlak QD, Esmaili N, Leveque JC, Farrokhi F, Bennett C, Piccardi M, et al (2019) 22 Machine learning applications to clinical decision support in neurosurgery: an artificial 23

intelligence augmented systematic review. Neurosurg Rev. doi:10.1007/s10143-019-01163-8

1	3. Chen T, Guestrin C (2016) XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. Paper presented at
2	the Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge
3	Discovery and Data Mining,
4	4. Choi JC, Johnston SC, Kim AS (2015) Early outcomes after carotid artery stenting compared
5	with endarterectomy for asymptomatic carotid stenosis. Stroke 46:120-125.
6	doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.006209
7	5. Dua A, Romanelli M, Upchurch GR, Jr., Pan J, Hood D, Hodgson KJ, et al (2016) Predictors
8	of poor outcome after carotid intervention. J Vasc Surg 64:663-670.
9	doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2016.03.428
10	6. Favre JP, Nourissat A, Duprey A, Nourissat G, Albertini JN, Becquemin JP (2008)
11	Endovascular treatment for carotid artery stenosis after neck irradiation. J Vasc Surg
12	48:852-858. doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2008.05.069
13	7. Ferguson GG, Eliasziw M, Barr HW, Clagett GP, Barnes RW, Wallace MC, et al (1999) The
14	North American Symptomatic Carotid Endarterectomy Trial Surgical Results in 1415
15	Patients. Stroke 30:1751-1758. doi: 10.1161/01.str.30.9.1751
16	8. Figueroa RL, Zeng-Treitler Q, Kandula S, Ngo LH (2012) Predicting sample size required for
17	classification performance. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 12:8. doi: 10.1186/1472-6947-12-8
18	9. Friedell ML, Clark JM, Graham DA, Isley MR, Zhang XF (2008) Cerebral oximetry does not
19	correlate with electroencephalography and somatosensory evoked potentials in determining
20	the need for shunting during carotid endarterectomy. J Vasc Surg 48:601-606.
21	doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2008.04.065
22	10. Gurm HS, Yadav JS, Fayad P, Katzen BT, Mishkel GJ, Bajwa TK, et al (2008) Long-term
23	results of carotid stenting versus endarterectomy in high-risk patients. N Engl J Med
24	358:1572-1579.

1	11. Halm EA, Tuhrim S, Wang JJ, Rockman C, Riles TS, Chassin MR (2009) Risk factors for
2	perioperative death and stroke after carotid endarterectomy: results of the new york carotid
3	artery surgery study. Stroke 40:221-229. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.524785
4	12. Heo J, Yoon JG, Park H, Kim YD, Nam HS, Heo JH (2019) Machine Learning-Based Model
5	for Prediction of Outcomes in Acute Stroke. Stroke 50:1263-1265.
6	doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.024293
7	13. Kernan WN, Ovbiagele B, Black HR, Bravata DM, Chimowitz MI, Ezekowitz MD, et al
8	(2014) Guidelines for the prevention of stroke in patients with stroke and transient ischemic
9	attack: a guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart
10	Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke 45:2160-2236.
11	doi:10.1161/STR.000000000000024
12	14. Koch M (2018) Artificial Intelligence Is Becoming Natural. Cell 173:531-533.
13	doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.04.007
14	15. Lammers RL, Hudson DL, Seaman ME (2003) Prediction of traumatic wound infection with
15	a neural network-derived decision model. Am J Emerg Med 21:1-7.
16	doi:10.1053/ajem.2003.50026
17	16. Li L, Chen Y, Shen Z, Zhang X, Sang J, Ding Y, et al (2020) Convolutional neural network
18	for the diagnosis of early gastric cancer based on magnifying narrow band imaging. Gastric
19	Cancer 23:126-132. doi:10.1007/s10120-019-00992-2
20	17. Maekawa K, Shibata M, Nakajima H, Kitano Y, Seguchi M, Kobayashi K, et al (2018)
21	Cholesterol Crystals in Embolic Debris are Associated with Postoperative Cerebral
22	Embolism after Carotid Artery Stenting. Cerebrovasc Dis 46:242-248.
23	doi:10.1159/000495795
24	18. Mantese VA, Timaran CH, Chiu D, Begg RJ, Brott TG, Investigators C (2010) The Carotid

1	Revascularization Endarterectomy versus Stenting Trial (CREST): stenting versus carotid
2	endarterectomy for carotid disease. Stroke 41:S31-34.
3	doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.595330
4	19. Moons KG, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, Ioannidis JP, Macaskill P, Steyerberg EW, et al (2015)
5	Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or
6	Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. Ann Intern Med 162:W1-73.
7	doi:10.7326/M14-0698
8	20. Moresoli P, Habib B, Reynier P, Secrest MH, Eisenberg MJ, Filion KB (2017) Carotid
9	Stenting Versus Endarterectomy for Asymptomatic Carotid Artery Stenosis: A Systematic
10	Review and Meta-Analysis. Stroke 48:2150-2157. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.016824
11	21. Muller MD, von Felten S, Algra A, Becquemin JP, Brown M, Bulbulia R, et al (2018)
12	Immediate and Delayed Procedural Stroke or Death in Stenting Versus Endarterectomy for
13	SymptomaticCarotidStenosis.Stroke49:2715-2722.
14	doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.118.020684
15	22. Oermann EK, Rubinsteyn A, Ding D, Mascitelli J, Starke RM, Bederson JB, et al (2016)
16	Using a Machine Learning Approach to Predict Outcomes after Radiosurgery for Cerebral
17	Arteriovenous Malformations. Sci Rep 6:21161. doi:10.1038/srep21161
18	23. Rosenfield K, Matsumura JS, Chaturvedi S, Riles T, Ansel GM, Metzger DC, et al (2016)
19	Randomized Trial of Stent versus Surgery for Asymptomatic Carotid Stenosis. N Engl J Med
20	374:1011-1020. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1515706
21	24. Setacci C, Chisci E, Setacci F, Iacoponi F, de Donato G, Rossi A (2010) Siena carotid artery
22	stenting score: a risk modelling study for individual patients. Stroke 41:1259-1265.
23	doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.110.578583

1 Cerebral microemboli and brain injury during carotid artery endarterectomy and stenting.

2	Stroke 40:230-234. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.107.513341							
3	26. Taussky P, Hanel RA, Meyer FB (2011) Clinical considerations in the management of							
4	asymptomatic carotid artery stenosis. Neurosurg Focus 31:E7.							
5	doi:10.3171/2011.9.FOCUS11222							
6	27. The Japan Stroke Society SGC (2015) Japanese guidelines for the management of stroke							
7	2015. Kyowa Kikaku, Tokyo							
8	28. Theiss W, Hermanek P, Mathias K, Bruckmann H, Dembski J, Hoffmann FJ, et al (2008)							
9	Predictors of death and stroke after carotid angioplasty and stenting: a subgroup analysis of							
10	the Pro-CAS data. Stroke 39:2325-2330. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.108.514356							
11	29. Traenka C, Engelter ST, Brown MM, Dobson J, Frost C, Bonati LH (2019) Silent brain							
12	infarcts on diffusion-weighted imaging after carotid revascularisation: A surrogate outcome							
13	measure for procedural stroke? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur Stroke J							
14	4:127-143. doi:10.1177/2396987318824491							
15	30. Troyanskaya O, Cantor M, Sherlock G, Brown P, Hastie T, Tibshirani R, et al (2001)							
16	Missing value estimation methods for DNA microarrays. Bioinformatics 17:520-525							
17	31. Tu JV, Wang H, Bowyer B, Green L, Fang J, Kucey D (2003) Risk factors for death or							
18	stroke after carotid endarterectomy: observations from the Ontario Carotid Endarterectomy							
19	Registry. Stroke 34:2568-2573. doi:10.1161/01.STR.0000092491.45227.0F							
20	32. van Os HJA, Ramos LA, Hilbert A, van Leeuwen M, van Walderveen MAA, Kruyt ND, et							
21	al (2018) Predicting Outcome of Endovascular Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke:							
22	Potential Value of Machine Learning Algorithms. Front Neurol 9:784.							
23	doi:10.3389/fneur.2018.00784							

24 33. Xie Y, Jiang B, Gong E, Li Y, Zhu G, Michel P, et al (2019) Use of Gradient Boosting

1	Machine Learning to Predict Patient Outcome in Acute Ischemic Stroke on the Basis of
2	Imaging, Demographic, and Clinical Information. AJR Am J Roentgenol 212:44-51.
3	doi:10.2214/AJR.18.20260
4	34. Ye H, Gao F, Yin Y, Guo D, Zhao P, Lu Y, et al (2019) Precise diagnosis of intracranial
5	hemorrhage and subtypes using a three-dimensional joint convolutional and recurrent neural
6	network. Eur Radiol 29:6191-6201. doi:10.1007/s00330-019-06163-2
7	35. Yoo Y (2019) Hyperparameter optimization of deep neural network using univariate
8	dynamic encoding algorithm for searches. Knowledge-Based Systems 178:74-83.
9	doi:10.1016/j.knosys.2019.04.019
10	36. Zhou W, Baughman BD, Soman S, Wintermark M, Lazzeroni LC, Hitchner E, et al (2017)
11	Volume of subclinical embolic infarct correlates to long-term cognitive changes after carotid
12	revascularization. J Vasc Surg 65:686-694. doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2016.09.057
13	
14	Figure Captions
15	Fig. 1 Flow diagram describing the general framework of the study. Models were built using the
16	training dataset. The test dataset was used for measuring the predictive performance and
17	comparison with the surgeons. CAS, carotid artery stenting; CEA, carotid endarterectomy;
18	ICA-PSV, internal carotid artery peak systolic velocity; kNN, k-nearest-neighbours; LDL, low
19	density lipoprotein; PPV, positive predictive value
20	
21	Fig. 2 Importance values of the clinical factors measured using the total gain of the XGBoost
22	algorithm CAS carotid artery stanting: CEA carotid andarteractomy: DM dispetes mallitus:
	argorithm. CAS, carotid aftery stenting, CEA carotid endarterectomy, DW, diabetes memitus,
23	ICA-PSV, internal carotid artery peak systolic velocity; LDL, low density lipoprotein; mRS,

1

- 2 Supplementary Information
- 3 Supplemental Table 1 Patient characteristics of CEA group and CAS group.
- 4 **Supplemental Table 2** Optimized hyperparameters of five machine learning models.

1 Table 1. Patient characteristics

	Before imputation	After imputation		
Variable	Total (n=165)	Training data (n=143)	Test data (n=22)	p value
Age, year, mean (SD)	74.2 (7.61)	73.8 (7.82)	76.7 (5.62)	0.04
Male sex, n (%)	141 (85)	122 (85)	19 (86)	1
pre-treatment mRS, median [IQR]	0 [0-1]	0 [0-1]	0.5 [0-1.75]	0.55
LDL-cholesterol, mg/dL, mean (SD)	90.0 (29.5)	90.4 (30.1)	87.1 (23.3)	0.56
Prior medical histories, n (%)				
Hypertension	136 (82)	118 (83)	18 (82)	1
Diabetes mellitus	58 (35)	50 (35)	8 (36)	1
Acute coronary syndrome	53 (32)	42 (29)	11 (50)	0.08
Peripheral artery disease	28 (17)	24 (17)	4 (18)	0.77
Anatomical and pathophysiological features				
Contralateral occlusion, n (%)	14 (8.5)	11 (7.7)	3 (14)	0.40
Stenosis at a high position, n (%)	13 (7.9)	12 (8.4)	1 (4.5)	1
Type III Aorta, n (%)	64 (39)	56 (39)	8 (36)	1
ICA-PSV, cm/sec, mean (SD)	276 (130)	272 (126)	291 (147)	0.56
Mobile plaque, n (%)	19 (12)	15 (10)	4 (18)	0.29
Plaque ulceration, n (%)	39 (24)	36 (25)	3 (14)	0.29
plaque with hyperintense signal on TOF, n (%)	61 (37)	54 (38)	7 (32)	0.64
Previous neck irradiation, n (%)	15 (9.1)	13 (9.1)	2 (9.1)	1
Symptomatic, n (%)	64 (39)	56 (39)	8 (36)	1
Crescendo TIA or stroke in evolution, n (%)	10 (6.1)	8 (5.6)	2 (9.1)	0.62
Treatment, CEA, n (%)	95 (58)	85 (59)	10 (45)	0.25
Outcome, n (%)				
Ischemic stroke within 30 days	45 (27)	42 (29)	3 (14)	0.13
Major ischemic stroke	3 (1.8)	2 (1.4)	1 (4.5)	0.36
Minor ischemic stroke	3 (1.8)	3 (2.1)	0 (0)	1
Asymptomatic DWI hyperintense lesions	39 (24)	37 (26)	2 (9.1)	0.11

Follow-up duration, days, mean (SD)	833 (565)	921 (555)	259 (259)	<.0001
-------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------

1 CEA = carotid endarterectomy; DWI = diffusion weighted imaging; IQR = interquartile range;

2 LDL = low density lipoprotein; mRS = modified Rankin scale; ICA-PSV = internal carotid

3 artery-peak systolic velocity; TIA = transient ischemic attack; TOF = time-of-flight.

1 Table 2. Prediction results on the training dataset evaluated by repeated 5-fold cross validation

Madal	ROC AUC	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
Model	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)
Encomble model *	0.739	15.1	97.4	75.1	72.7
	(0.714 - 0.764)	(11.3 – 18.8)	(96.2 - 98.6)	(65.6 - 84.7)	(71.3 – 74.0)
VCDoost	0.719	14.6	94.9	54.5	70.8
AUDOOSI	(0.692 - 0.746)	(10.3 – 19.0)	(93.1 – 96.7)	(44.6 - 64.3)	(69.1 – 72.4)
Logistic regression	0.702	26.5	95.5	71.2	74.8
Logistic regression	(0.671 - 0.732)	(22.4 – 30.5)	(94.2 - 96.8)	(62.7 – 79.7)	(73.1 – 76.4)
Noural nativorit	0.692	29.0	91.2	61.3	72.5
Neural network	(0.659 - 0.726)	(23.8 – 34.1)	(89.1 – 93.3)	(54.3 - 68.3)	(70.8 – 74.3)
Dondom forest	0.683	22.0	98.3	78.9	75.4
Kandonii lõiest	(0.653 - 0.712)	(18.0 – 26.0)	(97.4 – 99.2)	(69.2 - 88.7)	(74.0 – 76.8)
SVM	0.680	36.2	85.3	51.7	70.6
S V 1VI	(0.650 - 0.711)	(32.2 – 40.3)	(83.5 – 87.1)	(46.6 - 56.8)	(68.8 – 72.4)

2 and sorted by ROC AUC

3

4 * Ensemble model is created by using XGBoost, neural network, and logistic regression, which

5 are the three most highest ROC AUC models.

6 ROC AUC = area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; PPV = positive predictive

7 value; SVM = support vector machine.

1 Table 3. Prediction results on the test dataset evaluated using the bootstrap technique and sorted

2 by accuracy.

Model	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)	mean (95%CI)
XGBoost	31.9	94.6	47.2	86.2
	(30.0 – 33.8)	(94.2 - 94.9)	(44.9 – 49.6)	(85.7 – 86.6)
Neural network	4.1	95.4	12.4	83.3
	(3.3 – 4.8)	(95.3 – 95.5)	(10.4 – 14.4)	(82.9 - 83.8)
Ensemble model *	31.8	89.6	32.0	82.0
	(29.9 – 33.7)	(89.2 - 90.0)	(30.0 - 33.9)	(81.5 - 82.5)
Random forest	34.0	84.3	25.1	77.7
	(32.1 – 35.9)	(83.8 - 84.8)	(23.6 – 26.6)	(77.1 – 78.2)
SVM	34.0	79.1	19.9	73.2
	(32.1 – 35.9)	(78.6 – 79.7)	(18.7 – 21.1)	(72.6 – 73.7)
Logistic regression	34.0	79.0	20.2	73.0
	(32.1 – 35.9]	(78.4 – 79.6)	(18.9 – 21.5)	(72.4 – 73.6)
C **	41.7	75.0	20.1	70.5
Surgeons **	(0-92.4)	(60.7 – 89.3)	(0-42.8)	(57.9 - 83.0)

3 4

* Ensemble model is created by using XGBoost, neural network, and logistic regression, which

5 are the three most highest ROC AUC models on the training dataset.

⁶ ** The average of 4 surgeon's prediction results with 95% confidence interval.

7 PPV = positive predictive value; SVM = support vector machine.





Total gain of the XGBoost model