Retrievable versus Nonretrievable Coils

I have read with great attention the article written by Chaloupka et al (1) in the August 1996 issue of AJNR. They treated two patients with nonretrievable coils. Although they did not have any complication, I wonder whether it is reasonable to offer a treatment that bears substantial risk of having one coil migrate into the parent vessel without the option of retrieving the coil, or only with great risk if a snare device is used. There are actually different types of retrievable coils on the market and I think that we should not take the risk of treating an aneurysm with nonretrievable coils. I have personally always refused to treat any aneurysm with nonretrievable coils. I waited until I had the opportunity to use the Guglielmi detachable coils (GDCs) (Target Therapeutics, Fremont, Calif), initially as one of the investigators, before these coils became approved by the Food and Drug Administration recently. I am surprised that this article did not address the advantages of using retrievable versus nonretrievable coils.

Gerard Debrun
Departments of Radiology and Neurosurgery
University of Illinois at Chicago
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Reply

We would like respectfully to point out that the objective of therapy in the two cases presented in our recent article was specifically to achieve parent artery occlusion near the site of the aneurysm. In both cases, endosaccular coil embolization with parent artery preservation was not possible because of the relatively large ostia of these aneurysms. Following this line of argument, one could simply dismiss such criticism on the basis of a misunderstanding of the objectives of therapy. However, Dr Debrun’s emphasis on the use of a retrievable coil for endovascular therapy of aneurysms raises some important global issues of technique and technology. There is no question that, in general, retrievable coils increase the level of precision and safety in deployment during microcatheter embolotherapy. This is particularly crucial for performing safe and effective endosaccular coil embolization with parent artery preservation. However, use of retrievable coils is not without its disadvantages and risks, contrary to what Dr Debrun seems to imply. There have been several reports of significant technical failures of the various types of available retrievable coils worldwide, consisting of either inability to retrieve a coil already extruded from a microcatheter or inability to detach the coil once it is deployed. These technical failures occasionally can be remedied by retrieval maneuvers with a snare, although in some situations there have been significant clinical complications because of either inability to retrieve the coil or the attempt itself.

There are also other specific technical limitations in using the commercially available retrievable coil systems in the United States, where, to our knowledge, the only such system commercially available is the GDC. To use such a device, one is obligated to use a two marker band microcatheter (either 2.3F or 2.0F), which occasionally results in technical limitations in achieving very distal superselective catheterization (as is needed for treatment of peripheral aneurysms of the superior cerebellar artery) because of kinking of the catheter at the site of the proximal marker band. Furthermore, the smallest available size coils from the GDC system are 2 mm in helical diameter by 2 cm in length, and can be used only with a 2.0F double marker band microcatheter. Such a system poses the following additional technical limitations: (a) possible increased difficulty in achieving satisfactory superselective catheterization in tortuous vasculature because of the small size of the microcatheter, (b) inability to deposit an appropriate size coil within the parent artery, if this vessel is smaller than 2 mm in diameter, and (c) inability to occlude a short segment of the targeted parent artery because of excessive length of the coil. These last two difficulties can be overcome with the use of the new soft GDC coil (permitting more compact placement of the coils) and intentional overcoiling of the aneurysm sac to include the parent artery. However, in some situations only a short (2 mm), straight coil, which currently comes in only a nonretrievable variety, can be used to occlude selectively a segment of the superior cerebellar artery.

The major intention of our paper was to point out the ability to perform endovascular parent artery occlusion for the treatment of peripheral aneurysms of the superior cerebellar artery, since this is essentially what is accomplished most times when open microneurosurgical clipping is attempted. It should probably be left to the best judgment of the operator to assess ability to perform successful endovascular therapeutic occlusion of the vessel with the variety of devices available. There is no question that nonretrievable coil systems such as the GDC have several advantages, which in most cases should translate to improved efficacy and safety of therapy. However, these systems have their disadvantages and limitations as well. Therefore, judicious consideration of all available endovascular therapeutic technology for a particular problem would seem most clinically sound.

John C. Chaloupka
Departments of Radiology and Neurosurgery
Editor's note.—Dr Debrun’s letter was forwarded to Randall Higashida for comment.

Comment

Chaloupka et al should be congratulated on their report of two patients who were successfully treated with minimally invasive endovascular techniques using coil occlusion for ruptured superior cerebellar artery aneurysms. This resulted in total occlusion of the aneurysms, alleviated the risk of recurrent bleeding, and allowed both patients, who suffered from acute subarachnoid hemorrhage, to avoid the more invasive procedure of surgical craniotomy with clipping or trapping of the aneurysm. Dr Debrun’s comments bring to light the differing opinions, techniques, clinical approaches, and therapeutic options that the interventional neuroradiologist now has in treating patients with complex cerebrovascular disorders.

Fibered microcoils, the electrolytic platinum GDC, mechanical platinum detachable coils, mechanical tungsten detachable coils, detachable balloons, nondetachable balloons, liquid tissue adhesives including cyanoacrylates and cellulose acetate polymer, and intravascular stents have all been reported in successfully treating patients with both symptomatic intracranial and extracranial aneurysms either by primary occlusion of the aneurysm or with parent artery occlusion. In addition, experimental work involving endovascular lasers for tissue repair, endovascular polymers, and nonporous stent grafts for intracranial aneurysms have also recently been described. Each of these devices and techniques have certain advantages and disadvantages (1–4).

The interventional physician uses personal clinical judgment regarding approach, existing technical capabilities, and currently available techniques and devices individualized for each therapeutic case. The technique of using fibered, nonretrievable microcoils for occlusion of small vessels in both the extracranial and intracranial circulation is well documented as effective and is approved by the Food and Drug Administration as an indication for vessel occlusion because they often require placement of many more coils than the more stable and thrombogenic fibered coils, thereby potentially increasing the risk of occlusion of longer segments of the proximal parent artery, which could result in larger areas of ischemia or infarction. However, an alternative approach might have been to pack the ruptured aneurysms with GDCs directly, until the aneurysm no longer fills. However, in the second case, it might not have been feasible to reach the more distal superior cerebellar artery aneurysm with a microcatheter, and attempting to do so could have resulted in vessel or aneurysm perforation.

In summary, there are different reasonable approaches to consider for effectively treating patients with life-threatening disorders by endovascular techniques. Good clinical judgment, technical expertise in all areas of endovascular intervention, and a knowledge of one’s own capabilities and limitations are therefore the most important factors in determining good patient outcome.
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The Intravascular Mobile Structure Detected with Duplex Carotid Ultrasound in Patients with Cardioembolic Carotid Artery Occlusion

Duplex carotid ultrasound is useful for diagnosing internal carotid artery (ICA) occlusion (1–3). Using duplex carotid ultrasonography, we identified mobile intravascular structures in five patients (4 men and 1 woman; mean age, 84 years) with acute cardioembolic carotid artery occlusion.

The diagnosis was established based on clinical and angiographic findings (4). Four patients had atrial fibrillation and one patient had acute inferior myocardial infarction. Duplex carotid ultrasound and cerebral angiography were done on the same day, within 2 days after the onset of symptoms. B-mode scans demonstrated a mobile,
echogenic intravascular structure in the proximal ICA (Fig 1) in two cases. The movement of the echogenic intravascular structure was synchronous with the cardiac cycle. It moved quickly from the proximal to the distal ICA or CCA during the systole of the cardiac cycle. During diastole, the structure moved slowly from the distal to the proximal ICA or CCA. In all cases, Doppler blood flow signal in the affected CCA showed absent diastolic flow, indicating ICA occlusion. In three of five cases, follow-up duplex carotid ultrasound showed reappearance of diastolic flow, indicating a recanalization of the ICA occlusion, subsequently confirmed with angiography. In the other two cases, the mobile intravascular structure became stable gradually and changed to a nonmobile hyperechoic structure 10 days after the onset. We believe the intravascular structures turned to solid thrombi.

In patients with acute cardioembolic ICA occlusion, the embolus is usually lodged at the top of the ICA. We think that the intravascular mobile structure was probably a fresh thrombus extending from the occluded part of the internal carotid artery to the proximal side. In the acute phase of ICA occlusion, it is important to distinguish between cardioembolic and atherothrombotic stroke because the treatment will vary depending on the cause. We suspect that the mobile intravascular structure detected with ultrasonography may help diagnose embolic ICA occlusion.

Kazumi Kimura
Department of Cerebrovascular Disease
Kumamoto City (Japan) Hospital

Makoto Uchino
First Department of Internal Medicine
Kumamoto University School of Medicine
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Comment
The letter from Drs Kimura and Uchino presents five well-documented cases of cardioembolic cervical carotid artery occlusion. These are relatively rare cases. More commonly, there is evidence of distal ICA occlusion but not of intraluminal thrombus. Doppler ultrasound can reliably show whether the cervical carotid arteries are patent or virtually occluded. In the absence of seeing the rare “intravascular mobile structure,” all five of these patients exhibited no diastolic flow, and a diagnosis of ICA occlusion or near occlusion would have been made. The identification of an intraluminal thrombus is rare in practice, but it is important to recognize it. Although not a subject of their letter, one will occasionally see a thrombus in the proximal ICA without vascular occlusion. These thrombi are usually associated with ulcerated atherosclerotic plaque. When identified, this has been an indication for urgent carotid surgery to avert a threatened stroke.

Perhaps the more interesting question is what if any role Doppler carotid ultrasound should play in the emerging era of intravenous and intraarterial thrombolysis. The recent intravenous alteplase protocols make no mention of Doppler carotid ultrasound. The proponents of intraarterial therapy use diagnostic angiography as their evaluation tool. A combination of carotid Doppler ultrasound and transcranial ultrasound is capable of ruling out both ICA and proximal circle of Willis region vascular occlusion. Is
this reliable enough to avoid arteriography in those patients with a “normal” ultrasound exam? Since time is of the essence in thrombolysis therapy, is the time needed for the ultrasound examination acceptable? If carotid Doppler ultrasound shows ICA occlusion, is intraarterial therapy preferable to intravenous treatment? The answers to these questions lie in future research. At the moment, the identification of intraluminal thrombus with ultrasound is an interesting observation, but its role in therapeutic decision-making remains problematic.

Christopher G. Ullrich
Charlotte Radiology and Department of Radiology Carolinas Medical Center Charlotte, NC

Measuring Intraaneurysmal Flow: Risk of Perforation

I have read with great interest the article by Benndorf et al (1) in the August 1996 AJNR. Although I realize that it is important to understand the hemodynamics of cerebral aneurysms, I would be reluctant to submit a patient with a cerebral aneurysm to the risk of perforation of the sac with the Doppler guidewire, or to the formation or dislodgment of clot within the sac. I am not convinced that the information obtained in these two cases was worth the risks taken. The risks of perforation were probably low because the two aneurysms were giant, but what about small aneurysms? I am not sure that this protocol would be accepted by any Institutional Review Board in this country.

Gerard Debrun
Departments of Radiology and Neurosurgery University of Illinois at Chicago
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Reply

We certainly agree that there is always a risk of perforation during endovascular management of intracranial aneurysms associated with the use of microcatheters, microguidewires, coils, or balloons. This risk is without any doubt higher in ruptured aneurysms than in nonruptured ones. Whether the use of a flow wire with the same characteristics and mechanical properties as a microguidewire usually used for catheterization of aneurysms for endovascular treatment creates any additional risk remains at least questionable. If flow measurements were done with the same technique as we described, there is probably no significant higher risk for patients with large or giant nonruptured aneurysms.

G. Benndorf
Department of Radiology/Neurointervention Virchow Klinikum Humboldt University Berlin (Germany)

Comment

Until quite recently, almost all interventional neuroradiologic procedures were initiated, performed, and monitored entirely through the use of anatomic (ie, angiographic and indirect physiological) observations. Benndorf and colleague’s article provides an excellent example of the type of endeavor that, in my view, is essential for advancement of these capabilities to a higher level. When one considers that while, on the one hand, most practitioners accept and understand the established concepts of the origin, growth, and rupture of saccular aneurysms and hemodynamic stresses but, on the other, are still “flummoxed” when faced with the challenge of accurately predicting aneurysm behavior (risk) in an asymptomatic patient, the importance of trying to add physiological measurements to our armamentarium becomes painfully obvious.

I appreciate Dr Debrun’s concern that use of the Doppler wire might increase the risk of aneurysm rupture during the time of endovascular treatment. Personal experience with this device, however, would make me believe that if, as suggested by Benndorf et al, the Doppler wire is not used for aneurysm catheterization, but only is deployed into an aneurysm after catheter position has been established, the added risk would be nil. The tip of this wire is no different from many other wires used on a daily basis in our practices.

When I sought funding from my institution to travel to Paris in the late 1970s to learn something about detachable balloons from Gerard Debrun, questions were raised by some colleagues regarding the ethics of using these homemade devices, which at that time could be sterilized only by placing them for some hours into an ice chest containing formaldehyde chips. How tragic it would have been for all those who have had their vascular lesions cured by detachable balloons if Debrun’s creativity and pioneering efforts had been thwarted by such undue conservatism. Current and emerging technologies offer the very real promise of allowing tremendous improvement in the ability to diagnose and treat patients with vascular disease of the central nervous system. Although caution and care are surely warranted, an aggressive attempt at exploiting these advances is appropriate.

Charles M. Strother
Departments of Radiology, Neurology, and Neurosurgery University of Wisconsin Madison
MR Techniques for the Internal Auditory Canal

I read the article by Allen et al (1) in the August 1996 AJNR with great interest. We described the fast spin-echo technique of MR cisternography in the evaluation of the internal auditory canal (IAC) in 1993 (2). We found pseudodefects in the internal auditory recesses on individual sections in 1% of cases. These apparent defects were not seen in the composite maximum intensity projection images and can result from partial volume effect from adjacent bone in patients with a narrow IAC and, infrequently, can be caused by cerebrospinal fluid pulsation artifact. To increase the accuracy of the MR cisternographic exam, we included individual and composite maximum intensity projection sections in coronal view and have recently added a sagittal oblique view with sections directed along the plane of the IAC annotated from the axial scan (3) (Fig 2).

We used a technique similar to that recommended by the authors (fast spin-echo, matrix 512 x 384) in the evaluation of the pituitary region (2) and found that it was inadequate because of pulsation artifacts from the carotid arteries. The saturation pulse used by the authors might have improved this problem. We have also used another modified fast spin-echo technique for MR myelographic studies (4), using more sections in a shorter time, but with less spatial resolution than with MR cisternography. A primary value of MR cisternography is that it is cost-effective in screening evaluations for a large number of patients with sensorineural hearing loss for whom, currently, contrast-enhanced MR is performed and is negative. However, contrast-enhanced studies should still be obtained in the evaluation of the IAC in cases of multiple lesions, such as in patients with neurofibromatosis type II and subarachnoid metastases. Also, contrast-enhanced studies should be used for acoustic neuromas shown with MR cisternography to involve the fundus of the IAC, since the contrast-enhanced study can show tumor extension into the adjacent inner ear structures better.

Taher El-Gammal
Department of Radiology
University of Alabama at Birmingham
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Reply

There is no question that our technique represents a refinement of Dr El-Gammal’s so-called MR cisternographic technique. A reference to his AJNR article would have been appropriate had we made the connection between his more general article and our more tightly focused effort. In his original work on MR cisternography, Dr El-Gammal reported a 1% incidence of “pseudodefects,” which he ascribed to either partial volume averaging in narrow IACs or cerebrospinal fluid pulsation artifact. This artifact was not present on his maximum intensity projection images. At the time of our study, we also found pseudodefects in the fluid spaces of the IAC and cerebellopontine angle. The absence of these pseudodefects on the orthogonal view of this area and their disappearance from view on the maximum intensity projection images minimized this problem. The previous 3-mm two-dimensional fast spin-echo technique has since given way to a 1-mm three-dimensional fast spin-echo technique using flow compensation. This later pulse sequence overcomes both the small IAC volume averaging problem and the pseudodefects that arise from cerebrospinal fluid pulsation artifacts.

We completely agree with Dr El-Gammal’s statement that “a primary value of MR cisternography is that it is cost-effective in screening evaluations for a large number of patients with sensorineural hearing loss for whom, currently, contrast-enhanced MR is performed and is negative.” We have now had a busy (10 to 20 cases per week) screening program in place for 2 years with unenhanced high-resolution fast spin-echo MR for patients suspected of having acoustic schwannoma. This fast spin-echo MR examination has completely replaced conventional contrast-enhanced T1-weighted MR imaging of the IAC–cerebellopontine angle as the initial study in this clinical situation. The conventional full study, including the contrast-enhanced axial and coronal IAC–cerebellopontine angle T1-weighted MR imaging with full-brain T2-weighted MR im-

Fig 2. Sagittal oblique MR cisternogram shows a tiny intracanalicular tumor in the fundus of the right IAC.
aging, is reserved for equivocal fast spin-echo MR studies (1 in 25). We consider the fast spin-echo exam equivocal whenever the individual cranial nerves of this area cannot be seen clearly. Usually patient motion is the cause of equivocal fast spin-echo MR exams. Only if the fast spin-echo MR exam is less expensive than the conventional MR exam and replaces this exam is it a cost-effective screening study.

Finally, if one uses the phased-array temporomandibular joint coil and maximizes the 3-D fast spin-echo technique, the resolution of the study is such that IAC—cerebellopontine angle and inner ear schwannomas are clearly delineated. We have not found it necessary to use enhanced T1-weighted MR images to define the relationship of the tumor in the fundus of the IAC to the adjacent inner ear compartments.

H. Ric Harnsberger
Neuroradiology

Clough Shelton
Otolaryngology—Head and Neck Surgery
University of Utah Medical Center
Salt Lake City

Comment

We agree with both authors that in screening for acoustic neuromas, high-resolution MR techniques in cases where the cerebrospinal fluid is of high signal intensity can be very competitive with contrast-enhanced T1-weighted imaging. There are many techniques that allow the cerebrospinal fluid spaces of the IAC, the cerebellopontine angle, and the fluid-filled otic capsule structures to be exquisitely seen without contrast enhancement (1–5). These authors have focused on 2-D fast spin-echo techniques. I also agree that there is greater difficulty when the IAC or the tumors are small. This is to be expected, since the cerebrospinal fluid acts as an inherent contrast agent outlining the normal nerves and abnormalities. When there is no cerebrospinal fluid, the nerves cannot be seen well. Thus, smaller tumors will be more commonly missed or confused. These author’s 3-mm-thick image protocols are not truly high resolution with such thick sections. We acquire the images with sections ranging from 1.5 to 0.5 mm thickness.

We do disagree with some of Allen et al’s statements about the disadvantages of gradient-echo imaging compared with fast spin-echo imaging. We have already published data (6) showing that spin-echo images are not immune to serious magnetic susceptibility misregistration artifacts. Fast spin-echo images have their own set of limitations, including increased blurring with longer echo trains, long echo times, limited number of excitations, and long repetition times. To overcome the inherent limitations with gradient echoes, we use very short echo times (3.8 milliseconds with standard 10 mT/m, and 1.9 to 2.3 milliseconds with high-speed 22 mT/m gradient coils) and acquire different excitation pulse phase angles followed by averaging. This permits acquisition of true 3-D data, with similar spatial resolution in all dimensions. We have shown that this gradient-echo technique can generate images that improve signal-to-noise ratios over 2-D fast spin-echo when using standard gradient coils. Most recently, our preliminary study using high-speed gradients showed a twofold increase in signal-to-noise ratio and fewer artifacts for our gradient-echo technique than comparable 3-D fast spin-echo techniques (Fig 3). It is possible to see individual nerves in the cerebellopontine angle and IAC. The overall image quality is better than with fast spin-echo, and the artifacts related to magnetic susceptibility are similar.

We propose that the true imaging goal of screening for acoustic schwannoma should not be just to see the IAC or cerebellopontine angle, but rather to achieve direct continuous visibility of the individual nerves of the seventh and eighth cranial nerve complex and the otic capsule. As this technology becomes common, the need for contrast to diagnose lesions in the fluid spaces will shrink.

There is a greater challenge in the evaluation of patients with retrocochlear symptoms, since defining acoustic neuromas is one of the easier tasks. Symptoms in patients with hearing and vestibular functional disorders are notoriously nonspecific (7). I believe that unenhanced exams can be used to diagnose most patients who have normal-sized IACs and most acoustic tumors, but this may not be adequate for the complete evaluation of this diverse patient group. The true underlying disease in many of these patients might be not an acoustic tumor, but rather something else, such as multiple sclerosis, encephalitis, cerebrovascular disease, mastoiditis, meningioma, tortuous vessels, aneurysm, dermoid, epidermoid (temporal bone or cerebellopontine angle), vestibulitis, giant vestibular aq- ueduct, otosclerosis, Meniere disease, carcinomatosis, or meningitis. We believe we will have more problems in sorting out these patients than simply determining whether they have an acoustic tumor. In most patients we might need to return to a more global exam to discover one of these other masqueraders. Contrast enhancement might help, as might MR angiography, diffusion imaging, high-resolution T1-weighted gradient-echo imaging (8, 9), and magnetization transfer.

Donald W. Chakeres
Petra Schmalbrock
Department of Radiology
Ohio State University
College of Medicine
Columbus
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A Plea for Proper Recognition: The Syndrome of Maestre de San Juan–Kallmann

I am writing to correct the unintentional neglect of a true pioneer in three recent papers that appeared in the *American Journal of Neuroradiology* (1, 2, 3). These papers are on the so-called Kallmann syndrome (a form of congenital hypogonadotropic hypogonadism with anosmia), which has been attributed traditionally to a publication by Kallmann in 1944 (4). Evidence has been found to prove that the Spanish pathologist Aurelio Maestre de San Juan described the association of olfactory and genital abnormalities in postmortem studies as far back as 1856 (5). Subsequently, a report of a syndrome associating these two conditions was made by Weidenreich in 1914 (6). The syndrome has regained radiologic attention because of MR imaging, which nicely contributes to its diagnosis and depiction. However, of the three papers that have appeared in *AJNR*, only the one by Truwit et al (3) recognized the earlier work of Maestre de San Juan (5).

Since a scientific paper should be accurate in its recognition of historical origin of scientific observation, we propose that this disease be referred to as *Maestre de San Juan–Kallmann*, or possibly the syndrome of *Maestre de San Juan–Weidenreich–Kallmann*.

Recognition of original observations in recent years resulted in the renaming of some syndromes such as the Chiari syndrome, formerly Arnold-Chiari syndrome. Sensitivity to historic contribution indicated that the original observation was that of Chiari. Consequently, the second-
ary placement of Chiari in naming this syndrome was considered inappropriate.

Alberto Muñoz
Elisa Dieguez
Sección de Neurorradiología
Servicio de Radiodiagnostico
Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre
Madrid, Spain
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Editor’s note.—Drs Muñoz and Dieguez have raised an interesting point. The appearance of this letter in a peer-reviewed journal will possibly result in its appearance in Index Medicus. From there it’s a short step to dictionaries of medical eponyms and perhaps ultimate immortality for Professor Maestre de San Juan. If such happens, Drs Muñoz and Dieguez will certainly receive the credit for bringing this to the attention of the medical community.

Errata
In the April 1997 table of contents, there was an error in the summary of “Measurement of the Normal Optic Chiasm on Coronal MR Images” by Wagner et al (page A6). The summary should have read “MR measurements of the area and width of the optic chiasm reveal values of 43.7 mm² and 14.0 mm, respectively.”

In the April 1997 issue, some figure parts were labeled in error in the article by Bergui et al, “Uncommon Symptomatic Cerebral Vascular Malformations” (1997; 18:779–783). Figures 1B and 1C should have been switched, and Figures 2B and 2C should have been switched. As the figures appeared, 1B showed the venous phase and 1C the arterial phase; 2B showed the late arterial phase and 2C the early arterial phase.