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Undoubtedly, individuals with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) are at higher risk for developing cerebrovascular disease than counterparts from the general population without SLE. In a metaanalysis of studies from around the world, the likelihood of individuals with SLE developing both ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke (intracerebral and/or subarachnoid hemorrhage) was more than 2 times that of the general population. Risks for stroke appear to be highest soon after SLE diagnosis, and concomitant antiphospholipid syndrome (APS) in these patients does not markedly exacerbate risks for ischemic stroke.

As stroke commonly occurs at a younger age in SLE than in the general population, shorter survival and impaired functionality after stroke will impose a greater burden on a patient with SLE than a patient from the general population. Little is known, however, on poststroke outcomes in SLE from prospective studies. One of the few available studies is an investigation from Sweden in which registers, including a stroke register with universal coverage, were used to identify strokes and their outcomes in individuals with and without SLE. In this study, patients with SLE had a 1.4-fold higher risk for death (from any cause) after the onset of ischemic stroke compared to individuals without SLE. Relative risks for 1-year mortality were even higher for hemorrhagic stroke (2.3-fold higher). In addition, SLE was associated with a 73% higher risk of functional dependence in daily activities 3 months after ischemic stroke onset.

Results from one study may not be generalized to all settings and populations because stroke characteristics and care for these patients may differ among populations. Studies from other SLE populations were therefore warranted. In the article published in this issue of The Journal, Tsoi and colleagues aimed to examine differences in stroke imaging patterns, poststroke survival, functional impairment, and the occurrence of other adverse outcomes among ethnic Chinese individuals with and without SLE.

They conducted a cohort study consisting of 40 individuals with SLE and 120 age- and sex-matched non-SLE comparators with ischemic (including transient ischemic attack) and hemorrhagic stroke. Patients were identified from a Hong Kong hospital database using the International Classification of Disease codes with enrollment from 1997 to 2017. A medical chart review confirmed diagnoses and allowed for the extraction of clinical information and the assessment of stroke imaging patterns on computed tomography or magnetic resonance scans, as well as stroke severity. Participants were followed for all-cause death and their poststroke functional status was assessed using the modified Rankin Scale. Stroke recurrence and other adverse outcomes related to stroke were also reported. It should be noted that the small sample size did not allow for definite conclusions to be drawn from all analyses performed. Nevertheless, descriptive analyses provided useful insights into features of stroke in this SLE population.

The main findings of this study were as follows:
- Ischemic stroke was more common in SLE than in non-SLE comparators (90% vs 63%, respectively) and stroke in the SLE group was more likely to be severe at presentation.
- Ischemic strokes were more likely to be extensive in SLE than non-SLE, and border zone and multiple infarcts were more commonly observed in the SLE group.
- The 30-day mortality was slightly higher in SLE compared to non-SLE, but differences between the 2 groups were more apparent during the long term (of more than 8 years of follow-up), during which 15% versus 3% died in each group, respectively.
- One in 3 individuals with SLE were functionally dependent in their daily activities at 3 months poststroke compared to 8% in comparators, which translated to 5-fold increased odds of functional impairment associated with SLE. Neither SLE activity nor APS appeared to be associated with a worse functional outcome.
• Stroke recurrence and seizures were markedly more frequent in SLE than non-SLE (23% vs 3%), whereas neurosurgical interventions were less commonly performed in SLE.

Similar to the previous study from Sweden, 85–90% of strokes in SLE in the latest study were of ischemic etiology. However, in the study by Tsoi et al, an overrepresentation of ischemic stroke was observed in the SLE population compared to the general population. During the period Tsoi et al enrolled patients (1997–2017), hemorrhagic stroke should have accounted for up to 45% of strokes in this population. Because this observation may affect treatment of stroke in SLE, it is worth looking for the reasons for the difference in stroke type between SLE and non-SLE.

It is possible that the discordance observed by Tsoi et al is a result of the study design. It may be that cerebral hemorrhage was more likely to result in premature death in patients with preclinical (yet undiagnosed) SLE than in comparators without SLE. In studies restricted to survivors of stroke, which is a prerequisite to investigate stroke outcomes in SLE, we cannot exclude the possibility that ischemic stroke is overrepresented because individuals with SLE who would have developed hemorrhagic stroke died before having the chance to enter the study. Another reason is that in the study by Tsoi et al, the average patient with stroke irrespective of SLE status was 45 years old. Matching on age may have led to an overrepresentation of hemorrhagic stroke in the non-SLE group because hemorrhage is generally more common than cerebral ischemia at a younger age in this population.

On the other hand, it is likely that ischemic stroke is truly more predominant in SLE than expected. Although more common in SLE, hypertension, which is a powerful triggering factor of hemorrhage, may be better controlled in the SLE group, resulting in fewer hemorrhagic strokes. Other factors such as accelerated atherosclerosis are then allowed to prevail in SLE. Indeed, Tsoi and colleagues indicate that atherosclerosis was notably more severe in the SLE group, an observation that is in line with several previous studies. Moreover, cerebral vascular disease and secondary APS, which are common features of SLE, are both associated with higher occurrence of cerebral ischemia in this group. Nevertheless, further larger studies are needed to disentangle the differences in stroke type in that population.

In the study by Tsoi et al, not only was ischemic stroke more common than hemorrhagic stroke, it was also more extensive and severe in individuals with SLE than those without. This finding is in contrast to the Swedish study, in which severity of ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke was similar in the SLE and non-SLE groups. A higher proportion of individuals with past strokes in the SLE group (1997–2017), hemorrhagic stroke should have accounted for up to 45% of strokes in this population. Because this observation may affect treatment of stroke in SLE, it is worth looking for the reasons for the difference in stroke type between SLE and non-SLE.

In conclusion, stroke remains an overwhelming complication that disproportionately affects survival and daily life activities of individuals with SLE. Although the study by Tsoi and colleagues furthers our understanding of stroke in SLE, there remains a lot left to learn. Our goal should be to prevent stroke from occurring in patients with SLE and when this is unavoidable, to improve survival and lessen its effect on quality of life. Further epidemiological research is needed to expand the work initiated by Tsoi et al. We should now aim to identify which interventions (e.g., screening, pharmaceutical, or other) that, if administered in a timely manner, are likely to benefit our multifold scope of prevention. To successfully direct interventions on those who are likely to benefit from them, we need to learn more about how stroke affects diverse SLE populations.
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