

**Supplementary Table 4.** Subgroup analysis: logistic regression analysis for the association between weight modality (EBW versus MBW subgroups) and the outcome measures.

Logistic regression analyses		
Outcome	OR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>
sICH	1.09 (0.83–1.46)	1.16 (0.83–1.62)
• EBW vs. MBW		
sICH	1.01 (0.72–1.42)	1.08 (0.74–1.59)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
sICH	1.22 (0.83–1.79)	1.36 (0.87–2.10)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.01 (0.88–1.16)	0.99 (0.82–1.21)
• EBW vs. MBW		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.00 (0.86–1.18)	0.96 (0.75–1.22)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.01 (0.83–1.24)	1.05 (0.81–1.36)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		

EBW: estimated body weight; MBW: measured body weight; OR: odds ratio; aOR: adjusted OR.

<sup>a</sup> aOR, adjusted for: age; atrial fibrillation; diabetes mellitus; hypertension; hyperlipidemia; admission NIHSS, CT in the ER and IVT-volume.

**Supplementary Table 5.** Logistic and linear regression analysis for the association between weight modality (EBW versus MBW subgroups) and the outcome measures with the original dataset (without imputing missing data).

Logistic regression analyses		
Outcome	OR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>
sICH	1.09 (0.83–1.46)	1.13 (0.81–1.59)
• EBW vs. MBW		
sICH	1.01 (0.72–1.42)	1.03 (0.70–1.51)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
sICH	1.22 (0.83–1.79)	1.37 (0.87–2.15)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.16 (0.99–1.63)	0.95 (0.75–1.19)
• EBW vs. MBW		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.13 (0.94–1.35)	0.89 (0.68–1.15)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
mRS 0–2 at 90 days	1.23 (0.99–1.55)	1.09 (0.81–1.49)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		
Linear regression analysis		
Outcome	B (95% CI)	B (95% CI) <sup>b</sup>
DNT in minutes	0.06 (-1.59–1.71)	0.28 (-1.69–2.25)
• EBW vs. MBW		
DNT in minutes	3.99 (1.97– 6.03)	3.74 (1.55–5.93)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
DNT in minutes	-4.57 (-6.72– -2.42)	-4.67 (-7.23– -2.09)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		

EBW: estimated body weight; MBW: measured body weight; OR: odds ratio; aOR: adjusted OR; B: unstandardized regression coefficient.

<sup>a</sup> aOR, adjusted for: age; atrial fibrillation; diabetes mellitus; hypertension; hyperlipidemia; admission NIHSS,

CT in the ER and IVT-volume.

<sup>b</sup> B, adjusted for: blood pressure exceeding threshold for IVT; admission NIHSS, CT in the ER, onset-to-door time and IVT-volume.

**Supplementary Table 6.** *Post hoc* sensitivity analysis: logistic and linear regression analysis for the association between weight modality (EBW versus MBW subgroups) and the outcome measures (excluding patients with unknown clinical outcome).

Logistic regression analyses		
Outcome	OR (95% CI)	aOR (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>
sICH	1.49 (0.84–2.67)	1.58 (0.80–3.12)
• EBW vs. MBW		
sICH	1.13 (0.55–2.30)	1.10 (0.51–2.38)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
sICH	1.95 (0.89–4.26)	2.83 (1.03–7.79)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		
Linear regression analysis		
Outcome	B (95% CI)	B (95% CI) <sup>b</sup>
DNT in minutes	0.06 (-1.59–1.71)	0.28 (-1.69–2.25)
• EBW vs. MBW		
DNT in minutes	7.54 (6.27– 8.82)	7.25 (5.95– 8.55)
• EBW vs. inbuilt weighing bed		
DNT in minutes	-1.98 (-3.12– -0.84)	-2.94 (-4.23– -1.66)
• EBW vs. patient scale sling		

EBW: estimated body weight; MBW: measured body weight; OR: odds ratio; aOR: adjusted OR; B: unstandardized regression coefficient.

<sup>a</sup> aOR, adjusted for: age; atrial fibrillation; diabetes mellitus; hypertension; hyperlipidemia; admission NIHSS, CT in the ER and IVT-volume.

<sup>b</sup> B, adjusted for: blood pressure exceeding threshold for IVT; admission NIHSS, CT in the ER, onset-to-door time and IVT-volume.