ISSN: 0975-1556

Available online on www.ijpcr.com

International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research 2021; 13(6);407-411
Original Research Article

A Prospective Research to Assess Postoperative Mastoid Cavity Complications Following Modified Radical Mastoidectomy

Ratnesh Kumar[1], Preeti Sharma[2], Vineet Sinha[3]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of ENT, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna, Bihar, India

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of ENT, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna, Bihar, India

[3]Associate Professor, Department of ENT, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna, Bihar, India

Received: 02-07-2021 / Revised: 22-07-2021 / Accepted: 20-08-2021
Corresponding author: Dr Preeti Sharma
Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract

Aim: The aim of the present study to evaluate postoperative factors involved in the causation of cavity problems.

Methods: This prospective observational study conducted in the Department of ENT, Patna medical college & hospital Patna, Bihar, India, for 1 year. Total 250 patients who came for open cavity mastoidectomy were included in this study and all those patients had undergone open cavity mastoidectomy.

Results: The incidence of postoperative cavity problems in our set up is 40%. Of the 250 cases, 155 (62%) had sclerotic mastoid and 35 (14%) had cellular mastoid and 60 (24%) had diploeic mastoid. Of the 155 sclerotic mastoids, 65(41.94%) had post mastoidectomy cavity problems. Of the 60 diploeic mastoid, 29(48.33%) had postoperative cavity problems and of the 35 cellular mastoids, 6 (17.14%) had postoperative cavity problems. i.e., Of the 100 patients with cavity problems, 65% were of sclerotic mastoid and 6% were of cellular mastoid and 29% were of diploeic mastoid. Of the 100 problem cavities, 90 had prolonged discharge from mastoid cavity as the main problem (90%). Accumulation of wax in the cavity was present in 37 cases (37%). Vertigo persisting beyond the immediate postoperative period was present in 21 cases (21%). Perichondritis of pinna was found in 7 case (7%). Persistence or/development of facial palsy in post- operative period was found in 15 cases (25%) and recurrent cholesteatoma was seen only in 15 cases (15%). 7 Cases had postoperative wound infection (7%).

Conclusion: The incidence of post mastoidectomy cavity problems in this study was found to be 40%. Increased incidence of cavity problems was found predominantly in 30-40 age groups. There was no significant difference in the incidence of cavity problems according to the type of anaesthesia Cavity problems were seen slightly more in sclerotic mastoids.

Keywords: Cavity, Meatoplasty, Mastoid.

Introduction

A mastoidectomy is a widely used surgical procedure, usually performed with a tympanoplasty, to eradicate disease in the middle ear cavity and mastoid[1] It is considered to be an effective method of

treatment in cases of chronic ear infections resistant to antibiotic therapy.[2] The use of a mastoidectomy as a means to establish drainage of a complicated infection of the ear has little controversy[3] however, the use of a mastoidectomy to treat chronic drainage or suppuration from otitis media remains an issue of debate[4] The rationale for a mastoidectomy combined with a tympanoplasty is that it can allow the surgical debridement of infected and devitalized tissues that can lead to persistent middle ear disease[5] as well as reconstruction of the aerated mastoid cavity. The mastoid air cell system acts primarily as a buffer to pressure changes in the middle ea[6] and the presence of an aerated mastoid greatly increases the volume of the middle ear system, which can moderate pressure changes in the middle ear cavity. Thus, in a well-aerated mastoid, significant changes in the middle ear pressure will likely have little effect on the middle ear and tympanic membrane.[6] Therefore, if surgery could increase the air volume in a poorly aerated mastoid cavity, the sequelae of chronic negative pressure, including atelectasis and cholesteatoma, could be reduced.

Unfortunately, the re-aeration of the mastoid cavity after a canal wall up mastoidectomy is not universally achieved. For example, Vrabec, et al[7]reported that only 46% of 35 patients with prior unilateral canal wall up mastoidectomies showed good mastoid aeration. They concluded from a review of several previous reports that the prevalence of mastoid aeration following a canal wall up mastoidectomy was no greater than 50%.

It is very rare for any surgeon to treat cholestetoma medically, making surgery the principle management of cholesteatoma. MRM is indicated in cases with unresectable disease, unreconstructable posterior canal wall, inadequate patient follow up and poor Eustachian tube function[8] The purpose of every open cavity procedure is to exteriorize the mastoid cavity for future monitoring of recurrent cholesteatoma, provide drainage for unresectable temporal bone infection and occasionally, provide exposure for difficult to access areas of temporal bone. Supporters of open cavity techniques stress upon the fact that even if some disease is left behind, it can be removed in subsequent visits and also, there is better ventilation of cavity which has a drying effect[9]Normally, the open cavity heals by secondary intention. Failure of healing and complete epithelisation leads to various cavity problems such as vertigo, otorrhoea, hearing impairment, wax/debris collection, dependency on doctor for repeated cleaning of cavity, difficulty in wearing hearing aids and residual/ recurrent disease[10] The aimed of the study to find incidence and causes for postoperative mastoid cavity problems after MRM.

Material and methods

This prospective observational study conducted in the Department of ENT, Patna medical college & hospital Patna, Bihar, India, for 1 years, after taking the approval of the protocol review committee and institutional ethics committee. After taking informed consent detailed history was taken from the patient or the relatives. Total 250 patients who came for open cavity mastoidectomy were included in this study and all those patients had undergone open cavity mastoidectomy. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling technique and all the patients who were included in this study had given written informed consent.

After getting the informed consent, each patient was included in the study according to the inclusion criteria. Each patient was evaluated according to the proforma of the study. They were assessed primarily by their complaints and then by cavity examination. Each patient had a follow-up up to three months at twice weekly intervals. In this study a borderline healing period of 3-4 months was given for the complete epithelialisation of an open mastoid cavity. So, any patient presenting

with symptoms beyond this period was taken as a cavity problem case. The cases were studied according to the clinical symptoms. Basic clinical examinations were done. For each case, any of the proven predisposing factors, was determined by cavity examination. When required, investigations like culture and sensitivity of pus was done. Measurement of parameters like facial ridge height, size of cavity and size of meatoplasty were adopted from standard studies conducted by other authors. In this study 5 cc is taken as the volume of a large mastoid cavity, 3-5 cc, small less than 3 cc, appropriate medical treatments like topical/systemic antibiotics, aural toilet, steroids and cauterisation were given. Chemical cauterisations of granulations were attempted as an outpatient basis. Patients were followed up at intervals of 2-3 weeks after the treatment to assess the progress. Some cases were admitted in the ward for protracted symptoms and they were given parenteral medication. Rarely cases required surgical management.

Results

250 patients had undergone open cavity mastoidectomy were included in this study. 100 patients had postoperative cavity problems. Hence according to this study, the incidence of postoperative cavity problems in our set up is 40 %

Table 1: Distribution of patients on the basis of demographic profile

Gender	**No. of cases**	**%**
Male	60	60
Female	40	40
Age groups (years)		
Below 10	3	3
10-20	21	21
20-30	11	11
30-40	27	27
40-50	25	25
Above 50	13	13

Youngest patient to undergo mastoidectomy was 10-year-old boy. The youngest patient who presented with cavity problem was of 12 years. The oldest patient who presented with cavity problems was a 60-year-old female. Of the 250 cases, 150 patients were males, and 100 patients were female. Of the 100 patients who presented with cavity problems, 60 patients were males (60%) and 40 patients were females (40%). Maximum incidence of cavity problem was found between 30–40 years 27% followed by 10-20 years 21% and 40-50 years was 25%.

Table 2: Pneumatisation of mastoid, type of surgery and type of anesthesia during the procedure

Mastoid Pneumatisation	**No. of Cases=250**	**Cases with cavity problem=100**	**%**
Sclerotic	155	65	41.94
Cellular	35	6	17.14
Diploeic	60	29	48.33

Of the 250 cases, 155 (62%) had sclerotic mastoid and 35 (14%) had cellular mastoid and 60 (24%) had diploeic mastoid. Of the 155 sclerotic mastoids, 65(41.94%) had post mastoidectomy cavity problems. Of the 60 diploeic mastoid, 29(48.33%) had postoperative cavity problems and of the 35 cellular mastoids, 6 (17.14%) had postoperative cavity problems. i.e., Of the 100 patients with cavity problems, 65% were of sclerotic mastoid and 6% were of

cellular mastoid and 29% were of diploeic mastoid. 90 surgeries were done under general anaesthesia. All the 250 patients underwent modified radical mastoidectomy.

Of the 100 problem cavities, 90 had prolonged discharge from mastoid cavity as the main problem (90%). Accumulation of wax in the cavity was present in 37 cases (37%). Vertigo persisting beyond the immediate postoperative period was present in 21 cases (21%). Perichondritis of pinna was found in 7 case (7%). Persistence or/development of facial palsy in post-operative period was found in 15 cases (25%) and recurrent cholesteatoma was seen only in 15 cases (15%). 7 Cases had postoperative wound infection (7%).

Table 3: Post-operative problems

Cavity problems	Number	%
Discharge	90	90
Wax	37	37
Vertigo	21	21
Perichondritis	7	7
Facial palsy	25	25
Recurrent cholesteatoma	15	15
Post-operative wound infection	7	7

Table 4: Post-operative analysis

Post-operative analysis	Number
Larger cavity	10
High facial ridge	36
Meatoplasty sterosis	7
Exposed middle ear and eustachian tube	30
Post-operative granuloma	30

According to Table 4, of the 250 cases, 25 cases had a large post-operative cavity. Hence out of the 100 postoperative mastoid cavity problems, 10 cases had large postoperative cavity, 36 cases had high facial ridge, 7 case had stenosis of meatoplasty, 30 cases had exposed middle ear and eustachian tube and 30 had postoperative granulations.

Discussion

The key to success in otological surgery is not whose technique one uses, but how well one uses it and one's own ability and judgement. A perfectly performed primary canal wall down mastoidectomy with tympanoplasty not only results in a trouble free and water tolerant ear, but also good hearing results. In the present study 100 patients had post-operative mastoid cavity problems. Hence 40% of the total had cavity problems, according to this study. Sade et al had 28% post mastoidectomy cavity problems and Kos et al had 30% cavity problems.[11,12] Khan et al had 26.6% problem mastoid cavities.[13] Hence, this study has almost comparable incidence of cavity problems to previous studies.[13] Maximum incidence of cavity problem was found between 30–40 years 27% followed by 10-20 years 21% and 40-50 years was 25% according to this study. Vaid et al got the same findings in their study[14] But Vartianen had different observations. Vartianen had maximum incidence between 20 and 30 years[15] In the study 36% of patients with high facial ridge had cavity problems. A study conducted by Sade et al this was 80%.[10] Almost same value was obtained by Vaid et.al also[14] This finding points to the need of lowering the facial ridge upto the level of floor of external auditory canal. On doing so adequate care should be taken to avoid injury to facial nerve, especially in cellular

mastoids, where one can expect extensive pneumatisation onto the peri facial and retro facial cell tracts with a deep mastoid tip. Exposed middle ear and eustachian tube areas were found to be a significant factor causing postoperative discharge from the cavity. This was proven by all the previous studies conducted by Sade et al and Castrellion et al, only 18.18% grafted cases had cavity problems whereas 30.35% cases had cavity problems when grafting was not done.[11,16,] Meatoplasty stenosis was found only in 7% cases. According to Sade et al, only 30% of their patients with meatoplasty stenosis attained dry cavity.[11] Vartianen et al had 27.8% cases of meatoplasty stenosis.[15]

Conclusion

The incidence of post mastoidectomy cavity problems in this study were found to be 40%. Increased incidence of cavity problems was found predominantly in 30-40 age groups. There was no significant difference in the incidence of cavity problems according to the type of anaesthesia Cavity problems were seen slightly more in sclerotic mastoids.

Reference

1. Brackmann DE. Tympanoplasty with mastoidectomy: canal wall up procedures. Am J Otol 1993; 14:380-2.
2. Kenna MA. Treatment of chronic suppurative otitis media. Otolaryngol Clin North Am 1994; 27:457-72.
3. McGrew BM, Jackson CG, Glasscock ME 3rd. Impact of mastoidectomy on simple tympanic membrane perforation repair. Laryngoscope 2004; 114:506-11.
4. Ramakrishnan A, Panda NK, Mohindra S, Munjal S. Cortical mastoidectomy in surgery of tubotympanic disease. Are we overdoingit? Surgeon 2011; 9:22-6.
5. Eliades SJ, Limb CJ. The role of mastoidectomy in outcomes following tympanic membrane repair: a review. Laryngoscope 2013; 123:1787-802.
6. Ruhl CM, Pensak ML. Role of aerating mastoidectomy in noncholesteatomatous chronic otitis media. Laryngoscope 1999; 109:1924-7.
7. Vrabec JT, Champion SW, Johnson RF Jr, Chaljub G. Aeration following intact canal wall mastoidectomy. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol2003;112(9 Pt 1):801-6
8. Kveton JF. Open cavity mastoid operations. In: Gulya AJ, Minor LB, Poe DS, editors. Glasscock Shambaugh Surgery of the Ear. 6th ed. PMPH publishers; 2010: 515-528.
9. Matsuda Y, Kurita T, Ueda Y. Effects of tympanic membrane perforation on middle ear sound transmission. J Laryngol Otol. 2014; 123:81-9.
10. Smith JA, Danner CJ. Complications of chronic otitis media and cholesteatoma. Otolarygol Clin North Am. 2010; 39:1237-55
11. Sade J. Treatment of retraction pockets and cholesteatoma. J Laryngol Otol. 1982; 96:685-704.
12. Kos MI, Castrillon R, Montandon P, Guyot JP. Anatomic and functional long-term results of canal wall –down mastoidectomy. Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol. 2004; 113:872-6.
13. Khan AA, Manzoor T, Shah AA, Ayub Z. Evaluation of mastoid cavities after canal wall down mastoidectomy. Pak Armed Forces Med J. 2009; 59:295-7.
14. Vaid L, Gupta M, Singh PP. Mastoid obliteration in management of chronically discharging ear. Indian J Otol. 2002; 8:47–56.
15. Vartianen E. Ten-year results of canal wall down mastoidectomy for acquired choesteatoma. Auris Nasus Larynx. 2001; 27:227-9.
16. Castrillion R, Kos I, Montandon P, Guyot JP. Long- term results of canal wall down mastoidectomy. Schweiz Med Wochenschr. 2000;125 (Suppl): 58S- 65S.