

Robotic cochlear implantation in post-meningitis ossified cochlea

Al Saadi, Mohammad; Heuninck, Emilie; De Raeve, Leo; Van de Heyning, Paul; Topsakal, Vedat

Published in:
American journal of otolaryngology

DOI:
[10.1016/j.amjoto.2022.103668](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjoto.2022.103668)

Publication date:
2023

License:
CC BY-NC-ND

Document Version:
Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Al Saadi, M., Heuninck, E., De Raeve, L., Van de Heyning, P., & Topsakal, V. (2023). Robotic cochlear implantation in post-meningitis ossified cochlea. *American journal of otolaryngology*, 44(1), [103668]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjoto.2022.103668>

Copyright

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, without the prior written permission of the author(s) or other rights holders to whom publication rights have been transferred, unless permitted by a license attached to the publication (a Creative Commons license or other), or unless exceptions to copyright law apply.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document infringes your copyright or other rights, please contact openaccess@vub.be, with details of the nature of the infringement. We will investigate the claim and if justified, we will take the appropriate steps.

Robotic Cochlear Implantation in Post-Meningitis ossified Cochlea

Running head: ROBOTIC IMPLANTATION IN OSSIFIED COCHLEA

Mohammad Al Saadi¹, Emilie Heuninck¹, Leo De Raeve², Paul Van de Heyning³, Vedat Topsakal¹

¹ Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Universitair Ziekenhuis Brussel (UZ Brussel), Department of Otolaryngology Head and Neck surgery, Laarbeeklaan 101, Brussels Health Campus, 1090 Brussels, Belgium.

² ONICI, Independent Information Centre on Cochlear Implantation, Waardstraat 9, 3520 Zonhoven, Belgium

³ Antwerp University Hospital, Department of Otolaryngology Head and Neck Surgery, University of Antwerp, 2650 Antwerp, Belgium.

Correspondence author:

Mohammad Al Saadi, **M.D.**

Universitair Ziekenhuis Brussel (UZ Brussel)

Laarbeeklaan 101, 1090 Brussels, Belgium

Email: moalsaadi@msn.com

Orcid: 0000-0003-0285-2349

Tel: +32 2 477 6882

Fax: +32 2 4776880

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding: This study did not receive any specific grant from the public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agencies.

1 Abstract

2 Aim: To report the experience of an image-guided and navigation-based robot arm as an
3 assistive surgical tool for cochlear implantation in a case with a labyrinthitis ossificans.

4

5 Patient: A 55-years-old man with a history of childhood meningitis whose hearing
6 deteriorated progressively to bilateral profound sensorineural hearing loss.

7

8 Intervention: Robotic Assisted Cochlear Implant Surgery (RACIS) with a straight flexible
9 lateral wall electrode.

10

11 Primary outcome measures: Electrode cochlear insertion depth with RACIS with facial recess
12 approach and autonomous inner ear access with full electrode insertion of a flexible straight
13 cochlear implant array.

14 Conclusions: Intra cochlear ossifications pose a challenge for entering the cochlea and full-
15 length insertion of a cochlear implant. RACIS has shown that computations of radiological
16 images combined with navigation-assisted robot arm drilling can provide efficient access to
17 the inner ear.

18

19 Keywords

20 Sensorineural hearing loss, cochlear implantation, Meningitis ossificans, Robotic-assisted
21 cochlear implanted surgery, image-guided surgery.

22

23 Introduction

24

25 Labyrinthitis ossificans (LO) is the formation of fibrous tissue and new bone in the
26 membranous labyrinth. It often occurs after a severe inflammatory process to the inner ear,
27 such as infections, far advanced otosclerosis, and immune-mediated inner ear diseases¹.
28 Meningitis is the most common cause of LO, mainly caused by Streptococcus Pneumonia².
29 Five percent of streptococcus meningitis may be associated with profound sensorineural
30 hearing loss (SNHL). LO may occur as early as 3 to 21 days after meningitis². Therefore, the
31 hearing should be evaluated as soon as possible in meningitis patients, and a long follow-up
32 period is advisory for late-onset SNHL. The ossification is best evaluated in the early stage
33 with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). A loss of liquid density on an MRI may hint toward
34 early fibrosis and already challenging surgical Cochlear implant (CI) placement³. Bony
35 ossification is also visible on CT scans. Some consensus and protocols suggest the best timing
36 of the surgery is during the first month to avoid the risk of incomplete electrode insertion
37 because of fibrosis or ossification, but it remains very challenging³.

38

39 For years, cochlear ossification was considered a contraindication for cochlear implant (CI)
40 surgery, not only because of the difficulty of inserting the electrode through the ossified
41 cochlea but also because it had been thought that surviving spiral ganglion cells would be
42 affected for adequate stimulation¹. Years ago, surgical techniques were developed to insert the
43 array even in patients with totally cochlear ossification. However, it remains challenging for
44 otolaryngologists and audiologists to gain auditory benefits.⁴ In the surgical context,
45 technological innovations have always been of interest to surgeons to overcome challenges of
46 access to the inner ear.

47

48 Here we report an autonomous robotic system for inner ear access of 1.0 mm diameter by a
49 trajectory passing through the facial recess with a keyhole tunnel of 1.8 mm diameter⁵.
50 Pre-operative planning was performed with dedicated software that can segment and
51 reconstruct CT imaging of the temporal bone to obtain an accurate cochlear view, calculate the
52 estimation of cochlear duct length (CDL) to predict the electrode insertion depth, and find the
53 best keyhole trajectory. The most optimal trajectory to access the cochlea simulated for robotic
54 keyhole surgery is the best alignment with the basal turn of the cochlea⁶. We have planned this
55 trajectory with dedicated software (Otoplan® CAsCination, Bern, Switzerland) and have
56 performed a robotic surgical procedure in a challenging case with a post-meningitis partial
57 cochlear ossification⁶. We report intracochlear findings during this Robotic-Assisted Cochlear
58 Implant Surgery (RACIS) that was proven safe and efficient for the surgical placement of a
59 flexible lateral straight electrode.

60

61 Case Presentation

62 An otherwise healthy 55-year-old male with profound bilateral SNHL was referred for cochlear
63 implant candidacy. His medical history involved childhood meningitis. He became hearing aid
64 dependent. Work-up for Cochlear Implantation was performed when his hearing thresholds
65 deteriorated over time. It included audiological tests, imaging, and psychological evaluation.
66 The pure-tone audiometry and speech audiometry in quiet showed profound bilateral deafness.
67 A high-resolution temporal bone CT scan showed a bilateral cochlear ossification in the basal
68 turn. The basal turn ossification on the left side was limited to 4 mm at the level of the round
69 window (Figure 1). MR imaging confirms the lack of T2 signal in the membranous labyrinth
70 on both sides. The patient is consulted for CI surgery with explicit consent for poor speech
71 recognition results and, at best, a signaling function of the CI. The informed consent is

72 obtained for the robotic procedure. A lateral wall flexible electrode of 28 mm length was
73 chosen after calculating the CDL (37.8mm) (Flex 28, Med-EL, Innsbruck, Austria). The patient
74 underwent RACIS with round window access using HEARO robotic system (CASCINATION
75 AG, Switzerland) to perform a drill out in the set direction to basal turn.
76 After successful inner ear access was acquired, a customized endoscope was used to inspect
77 the keyhole trajectory. This recording also demonstrated some more trabecular ossification in
78 the basal turn of the cochlea (Figure 2, supplemental digital video). Trabecular bone was
79 fractured with a pick to allow the complete array insertion up to 609 degrees (Figure 3). Evoked
80 compound action potential response was detectable on all electrodes with intraoperative
81 telemetry. There were no postoperative complications. The audiological tests one and two years
82 after the initial fitting of the processor showed improvement in the hearing on pure-tone
83 audiometry PTA (46 and 53 dB HL, respectively) (Figure 4). After a rehabilitation period of
84 1.5 years (during COVID-19 pandemic restrictions), the patient's speech understanding is only
85 possible with visual support such as lip-reading. Sound detecting is present and sound
86 recognition is still improving. The patient is subjectively satisfied with his CI. Subjective
87 results have been investigated preoperatively and 12 months post-implantation using the
88 SSQ12 and NCIQ questionnaire^{7,8}. The SSQ12 score improved from 1.4 preoperatively to 4.2
89 one year after implantation. The NCIQ scores improved one year after implantation in basic
90 sound perception, advanced sound perception, speech production, and self-esteem.

91

92

93 Discussion

94 The primary goal of CI surgery is a full and atraumatic insertion of the electrode array. Cochlear
95 ossification is a challenge for otologists where atraumatic is less of a focus than full insertion.

96 The insertion of the array is extremely complex due to the ossification and fibrosis, and damage
97 to remaining neurosensory cells should be reduced.

98

99 Several approaches have been reported to increase the insertion part of the electrode: drilling
100 out the ossified part of scala tympani⁹, inserting CI in the scala vestibuli¹⁰, double array CI with
101 two cochleostomies¹¹, and using an image-guided approach⁵. Nevertheless, correct positioning
102 is sometimes impossible, and the audiological results are variable and poor in many cases.
103 These cases are less reported in the literature. In 2013, Wanna and colleagues¹² evaluated the
104 benefit of an image-guided approach for a cochlear implant drill-out procedure. Here we
105 combine image-guided surgery with a robot arm, allowing a precision within a tenth of a
106 millimeter for the keyhole trajectory. Access into the inner ear through the round window to
107 insert the electrode array was robotically drilled. The electrode could be inserted completely,
108 and the audiological outcome of the present case was up to the patient and healthcare workers'
109 expectancies. Furthermore, the reconstructed post-operatively CT images allowed us to
110 correlate the insertion depth to the audiological postoperative thresholds.¹⁰

111 Conclusion

112 Only a very experienced otologist can manage challenges such as cochlear ossification. The
113 robotically assisted surgery applied in the present case provides a novel and efficient approach
114 with high safety and accuracy during the insertion of the array that is much more based on
115 image guidance rather than surgical experience. Cochlear ossification is no longer considered
116 a surgical contraindication for CI. Despite unpredictable audiological outcomes due to the
117 challenge of signal transduction, the indication should be evaluated by a team at a
118 comprehensive cochlear implant center.

119 **References**

120

- 121 1. Green, J. D., Marion, M. S. & Hinojosa, R. Labyrinthitis Ossificans: Histopathologic
122 Consideration for Cochlear Implantation. *Otolaryng Head Neck* **104**, 320–326 (1990).
- 123 2. Tinling, S. P., Colton, J. & Brodie, H. A. Location and Timing of Initial Osteoid
124 Deposition in Postmeningitic Labyrinthitis Ossificans Determined by Multiple Fluorescent
125 Labels. *Laryngoscope* **114**, 675–680 (2004).
- 126 3. Merkus, P. *et al.* Dutch Cochlear Implant Group (CI-ON) Consensus Protocol on
127 Postmeningitis Hearing Evaluation and Treatment. *Otol Neurotol* **31**, 1281–1286 (2010).
- 128 4. Balkany, T. *et al.* Surgical technique for implantation of the totally ossified cochlea.
129 *Laryngoscope* **108**, 988–992 (1998).
- 130 5. Topsakal, V. *et al.* First Study in Men Evaluating a Surgical Robotic Tool Providing
131 Autonomous Inner Ear Access for Cochlear Implantation. *Front Neurol* **13**, 804507 (2022).
- 132 6. Topsakal, V. *et al.* Comparison of the Surgical Techniques and Robotic Techniques for
133 Cochlear Implantation in Terms of the Trajectories Toward the Inner Ear. *J Int Adv Otolaryngology*
134 **16**, 3–7 (2020).
- 135 7. Hinderink, J. B., Krabbe, P. F. M. & Broek, P. V. D. Development and application of a
136 health-related quality-of-life instrument for adults with cochlear implants: The Nijmegen
137 Cochlear Implant Questionnaire. *Otolaryngology- Head Neck Surg* **123**, 756–765 (2000).
- 138 8. Gatehouse, S. & Noble, W. The Speech, Spatial and Qualities of Hearing Scale (SSQ). *Int*
139 *J Audiol* **43**, 85–99 (2009).
- 140 9. Balkany, T., Gantz, B. & Nadol, J. B. Multichannel Cochlear Implants in Partially Ossified
141 Cochleas. *Ann Otolaryngology Rhinology Laryngology* **97**, 3–7 (1988).
- 142 10. Steenerson, R. L., Gary, L. B. & Wynens, M. S. Scala vestibuli cochlear implantation for
143 labyrinthine ossification. *Am J Otolaryngology* **11**, 360–3 (1990).
- 144 11. Lenarz, T. *et al.* The Nucleus Double Array Cochlear Implant: A New Concept for the
145 Obliterated Cochlea. *Otol Neurotol* **22**, 24–32 (2001).
- 146 12. Wanna, G. B. *et al.* Implantation of the Completely Ossified Cochlea. *Otol Neurotol* **34**,
147 522–525 (2013).

148

149 **Figures**

150 **Figure 1:** Reconstructed CT (axial, coronal, and sagittal) shows a basal turn ossification (4
151 mm). The 3D reconstruction shows the trajectory of the RACIS (sky-blue) through the facial
152 recess and next to the facial nerve (yellow), and corda tympani (orange). The green dots
153 refer to the center of the round window and the furthest point in the opposite wall of the
154 cochlea. The blue dots refer to the inferior and superior points of the lateral wall. The red
155 dots refer to the height of the cochlea.

156

157 **Figure 2:** ossification in the basal turn of the cochlea captured by a customized endoscope
158 through the keyhole trajectory (see the full video in the Supplemental Digital Content).

159

160 **Figure 2:** Reconstruction of the postoperative CT shows the full insertion of the electrode
161 (orange).

162

163 **Figure 4:** Postoperative pure-tone audiometry.

164

165 List of Supplemental Digital Content:

166 - trajectory endoscopy.mp4







