References

1. Mathur S, Karimi A, Mafee MF. **Acute optic nerve infarction demonstrated by diffusion-weighted imaging in a case of rhinocerebral mucormycosis.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2007;28:489–90
2. Ferry AP, Abedi S. **Diagnosis and management of rhino-orbitocerebral mucormycosis (phycomycosis). A report of 16 personally observed cases.** *Ophthalmology* 1983;90:1096–104
3. Downie JA, Francis IC, Arnold JJ, et al. **Sudden blindness and total ophthalmoplegia in mucormycosis. A clinicopathological correlation.** *J Clin Neuroophthalmol* 1993;13:27–34
4. Blunt MJ, Steele EJ. **The blood supply of the optic nerve and chiasma in man.** *J Anat* 1956;90:486–93
5. Al-Shafai LS, Mikulis DJ. **Diffusion MR imaging in a case of acute ischemic optic neuropathy.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2006;27:255–57
6. Hayreh SS. **Ischaemic optic neuropathy**[published erratum appears in *Indian J Ophthalmol* 2000;48:317]. *Indian J Ophthalmol* 2000;48:171–94

Ashish Verma

Krishan K. Jain

Suvash Mohan

Rajendra V. Phadke

Department of Radiodiagnosis

Sanjay Gandhi Post Graduate Institute of Medical Sciences

Lucknow, India

DOI 10.3174/ajnr.A0710

Cerebral Aneurysms in a Patient with Osteogenesis Imperfecta and Exon 28 Polymorphism of *COL1A2*

Petruzzellis et al¹ present an interesting case of a patient with osteogenesis imperfecta and a ruptured aneurysm at the fenestrated basilar artery. However, they misidentify the fenestration as a vertebral fenestration and, as such, do not seem to relate the fenestration to the basilar aneurysm. Figures 1A and 2A beautifully show well-known features of the basilar fenestration just above the vertebral junction^{2,3}: the joining of both vertebral arteries, subsequent division of the basilar artery into 2 arms, effective widening of the distance between the lateral walls of both arms compared with the basilar diameter beyond, and rejoining of the fenestrated arms into 1 artery.

The relationship of aneurysms of the proximal basilar trunk and basilar fenestrations is well known.^{2,3} A substantial series by Campos et al² of 59 aneurysms of the basilar trunk found 35.5% in association with definite fenestrations, all but 1 at the proximal end of the fenestration. It is possible that other fenestrations were there but were not discerned because the aneurysms were superimposed over the basilar fenestrations, with the result of a higher incidence. With easy-to-do maximum intensity projections or multiplanar reformations with high resolution on CTA or MRA,⁴ viewed with a high index of suspicion, we can now readily show fenestrations. With sectioning of image datasets, aneurysms will less likely superimpose fenestrations.

In the case report by Petruzzellis et al,¹ the discussion of osteogenesis imperfecta is interesting and educational for that entity. However, by not paying attention to the details of their own images, they missed the real point of this case. The important entity of aneurysm at the basilar fenestration is considered to develop as a result of hemodynamic forces on the “crotch” of the fenestration, leading to aneurysms in patients without osteogenesis imperfecta. In this patient with osteogenesis imperfecta and a fenestration aneurysm, the question raised is whether osteogenesis imperfecta is an innocent coincidental bystander.

The authors claim that the aneurysm seen 4 months after coiling is new, with angiograms showing a difference between the right posterior oblique views in Fig 1 and left posterior oblique, lateral, and Towne views in Fig 2. Again, the lack of attention to detail of these

images leads the authors to claim that a new aneurysm developed in 4 months. This conveniently shows the neck of the so-called “new aneurysm” in the same spot as the treated aneurysm, just at the left side of the proximal split of the basilar fenestration. We can compare Fig 1A with Fig 2C for the closest possible orientation, and this comparison gives strong suggestion of the same aneurysm with a refilled neck after coiling, a common enough finding. It seems, then, that this aneurysm is not a rare, newly developed one but another occurrence of lack of attention to the details of the case.

Many reports describing coiling of aneurysms at the basilar fenestration are in the literature.⁵ Perhaps this is the first reported case in a patient with osteogenesis imperfecta, but the discussion in this case avoids this main theme through oversight of important findings and claims others that are dubious. The *American Journal of Neuroradiology* has an educational responsibility to show readers exemplary neuroimaging cases and interpretations, in addition to rigorous scientific reports and interesting musings of authors in discussion.

References

1. Petruzzellis M, De Blasi R, Lucivero V, et al. **Cerebral aneurysms in a patient with osteogenesis imperfecta and exon 28 polymorphism of *COL1A2*.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 2007;28:397–98
2. Campos J, Fox AJ, Viñuela F, et al. **Saccular aneurysms in basilar artery fenestration.** *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol* 1987;8:233–36
3. Uda K, Murayama Y, Gobin YP, et al. **Endovascular treatment of basilar artery trunk aneurysms with Guglielmi detachable coils: clinical experience with 41 aneurysms in 39 patients.** *J Neurosurg* 2001;95:624–32
4. Bharatha A, Fox AJ, Aviv RI, et al. **CT angiographic depiction of a supraclinoid ICA fenestration mimicking aneurysm, confirmed with catheter angiography.** *Surg Radiol Anat* 2007;29:317–21
5. Saatci I, Cekirge HS, Karcaaltincaba M, et al. **Endovascular treatment of kissing aneurysms at the fenestrated basilar artery. Case report with literature review.** *Surg Neurol* 2002;58:54–58; discussion 58

Allan Fox

Sean Symons

Richard Aviv

Department of Neuroradiology

Sunnybrook Sciences Center

Toronto, Ontario

Canada

DOI 10.3174/ajnr.A0727

Reply:

We thank Dr. Fox for his comments concerning our previously published letter to the editor entitled, “Cerebral Aneurysms in a Patient with Osteogenesis Imperfecta and Exon 28 Polymorphism Of *COL1A2*.”¹ He strongly informs us of a misunderstanding regarding the de novo aneurysm that developed after 4 months. Dr. Fox points out some potential errors in our diagnosis, claiming that the de novo aneurysm is actually a refilling of the previously treated one. We believe that indeed at 4 months, our images revealed that a new aneurysm had developed in front of the previous one (Fig 2B). Further evidence of this was found in the posttreatment un-subtracted images (not published due to space constraints), in which it was possible to appreciate the stent crossing the vertebrobasilar junction and the coils occluding 2 different and clearly separable aneurysms.

Finally, we are grateful to Dr. Fox for bringing to our attention some bibliographic references that may help us achieve a better understanding of the anatomic features of this particular case.