Postoperative imaging of the multichannel cochlear implant.
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Postoperative Imaging of the Multichannel Cochlear Implant


PURPOSE: To present the postoperative radiographic appearance of the multichannel cochlear implant and to suggest criteria for the radiographic evaluation of postimplant patients. METHODS: One hundred forty-one patients, 73 female and 68 male, had multichannel cochlear implants inserted. One hundred thirty-five intraoperative radiographs, 31 postoperative radiographic examinations, and 10 postoperative CT examinations were retrospectively reviewed. RESULTS: In 135 patients, a Stenver's or anteroposterior projection confirmed the normal placement of the implant by demonstrating the electrodes to be regularly spaced and gently curved within the first turn of the cochlea. The insertion depth was determined by counting the number of electrodes that projected medial to the cochlear promontory. In 5 patients in whom intracochlear placement of the electrode array could not be confirmed on plain radiographs, CT demonstrated the location of the electrode array. In 3 patients with postoperative infections, CT either correctly identified or excluded the presence of a collection beneath the implant. CONCLUSION: Plain radiographs of the temporal bone are sufficient for the postoperative treatment of the majority of postimplant patients. CT should be performed when plain radiographs cannot adequately show the location of the electrode array or if postoperative infection is suspected.
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The multichannel cochlear implant significantly improves speech recognition in severely to profoundly deaf patients who derive little benefit from hearing aids (1). The multichannel cochlear implant prosthesis consists of both externally worn and surgically implanted components (Figs 1 and 2). The externally worn components include the headset and the speech processor. The implanted components include the receiver/stimulator and the electrode array. The receiver/stimulator is placed beneath the postauricular soft tissues within a well drilled out of the calvarium. The electrode array is inserted into the scala tympani through a cochleostomy, which is drilled into the cochlear promontory approximately 1 mm anterior to the round window.

The preoperative radiographic assessment of patients undergoing cochlear implantation has been the focus of the majority of previous reports in the radiologic and otolaryngologic literature (2–6). The postoperative radiographic assessment of patients after multichannel cochlear implantation has been described in the otolaryngologic literature (5, 7–9). The purposes of this study are to present the postoperative radiographic appearance of the normal and abnormally functioning multichannel cochlear implant and to suggest criteria for the radiographic evaluation of patients after implant insertion.

Materials and Methods

The clinical histories and radiographic studies of 141 patients with Nucleus multichannel cochlear prostheses (Cochlear Corporation, Englewood, Colo) were retrospectively reviewed. Psychophysical data, which reflect the patient’s perceptual response to graded electrical stimulation of specific electrodes, were also reviewed. Sixty-eight patients were male; 73 patients were female. The patients
ranged in age from 1 year to 85 years with a mean age of
25.8 years. Intraoperative Stenver’s or transorbital antero-
posterior views of the temporal bones were obtained in 135
patients. Postoperative Stenver’s, transorbital anteropos-
terior, and supplemental base views were obtained in 31
patients.

The depth of insertion of the electrode array (number of
electrodes and stiffening rods within the cochlea) was es-
estimated surgically in each patient by counting the number
of elements that passed through the cochleostomy. The
depth of insertion was estimated radiographically by
counting the number of elements relative to the cochlear
promontory (Fig 3). Electrodes that projected medial to
the lateral margin of the cochlear promontory were con-
sidered intracochlear. The cochlear promontory, which is
identified as the air-bone interface just caudad to the ves-
tibule (10), was confidently identified on 128 intraopera-
tive studies and on 30 postoperative studies. Failure to
identify the cochlear promontory on 7 intraoperative films
was attributable to patient rotation toward either the lateral
or cranial projection. The cochlear promontory could not
be identified on postoperative films in one patient with
vestibulocochlear dysplasia because of failure to identify
otic capsule landmarks (see Fig 8A).

To demonstrate that the cochlear promontory was an
accurate landmark on which to base estimates of electrode
array insertion, cochleostomy was performed on an iso-
lated cadaveric temporal bone preparation and a cadav-
eric head. Stenver’s views were obtained after electrode
array insertion both before and after a dense barium solu-
tion was painted on the cochleostomy site. The barium
projected over the air-bone interface of the cochlear prom-
ontory in both cadavers (Fig 4). The number of electrodes
that projected over or medial to the cochlear promontory
appeared the same as the number that entered the co-
chlea.

Patients were categorized according to the depth of
electrode array insertion. A full insertion, defined as an
insertion of all 22 electrodes and fewer than 10 stiffening
rods into the cochlea, was observed in 122 patients (Fig
3). A shallow insertion, defined as an insertion of fewer
than 12 electrodes, was observed in 8 patients. An ultra-
deep insertion, defined as insertion of all 22 electrodes and
10 stiffening rods where the arc subtended by the array
within the cochlea measured 360° or more, was observed
in 6 patients (Fig 5). A partial insertion, defined as an
insertion of 12 to 21 electrodes, was observed in 5 pa-
tients.

Ten postoperative computed tomographic (CT) scans
of the temporal bones were obtained in nine patients
(Table). All scans were performed using 1.5- to 3.0-mm
contiguous axial sections with supplemental 1.5- to
2.0-mm coronal sections obtained in eight patients. Seven CT scans were performed at our institution using a General Electric 9800 CT/T scanner (General Electric medical systems, Milwaukee, Wis). Three CT scans from other institutions using a similar scan technique were available for review. Contrast-enhanced CT scans were performed on two patients using a standard bolus and drip technique.

Results

Intraoperative radiographs demonstrated the implanted components of the cochlear prostheses in all patients. In 135 patients the integrity and proper positioning of the implant was confirmed radiographically. The normally inserted electrode array followed a gentle curve within the first turn of the cochlea with regular spacing between the electrodes (Fig 3).

In the 135 patients with normal-appearing electrode arrays, there was a discrepancy of two electrodes or less between the radiographic estimate and the surgical estimate of the depth of insertion. A similar correlation was found between the number of inserted electrodes estimated radiographically and the number of functioning electrodes as shown by psychophysical testing. In our experience, standardization of views did not make a significant difference regarding the radiographic estimate of electrode insertion. Correlation with surgical and psychophysical data demonstrated an error of plus or minus two electrodes regardless of whether anteroposterior or Stenver’s views were used.

Postoperative radiographs were obtained when intraoperative radiographs failed to confirm normal placement of the electrode array, if electrode array extrusion was suspected on the basis of psychophysical testing, or if unusual nonauditory responses such as vibratory or tactile sensations were experienced by the patient. In addition, postoperative radiographs were ob-

Fig 3. Intraoperative Stenver’s view shows a normally inserted electrode array. Between the array of 22 active electrodes (two-headed arrow) and the receiver/stimulator (large white arrow) are 10 electrically inactive stiffening rods (small black arrows). The stiffening rods, which provide mechanical support during insertion, are radiographically identical in appearance to the electrodes. Note the gentle curve of the array within the first turn of the cochlea with regular spacing between the electrodes. The depth of insertion is estimated by counting the number of electrodes or stiffening rods relative to the cochlear promontory (small white arrow), which is the air-bone interface below the vestibule (V). In this example there are 3 stiffening rods lateral to the cochlear promontory, indicating an insertion of 22 electrodes and 7 stiffening rods. This is termed a full insertion, because all 22 active electrodes are intracochlear.

Fig 4. A, Stenver’s view of a cadaveric temporal bone preparation after electrode array insertion. Ten stiffening rods project lateral to the cochlear promontory (open white arrow), and 22 electrodes project medial to it, indicating an insertion of 22 electrodes. Twenty-two electrodes were directly seen to enter the cochlea. V indicates vestibule.

B, Stenver’s view of cadaveric preparation after electrode array insertion after the inner lip of the cochleostomy was painted with a dense barium solution (black arrow). The dense barium overlies the air-bone interface of the cochlear promontory (open white arrow). Twenty-one electrodes were seen to enter the cochlea, which corresponds to the number of electrodes projecting over or medial to the cochlear promontory.
tained before CT was performed for other indications listed in the Table.

Intracochlear placement of the electrode array could not be confirmed on postoperative temporal bone radiographs alone in six patients. Five of these patients subsequently had CT scans for electrode array localization. A CT scan was not obtained on the sixth patient, who was treated at another facility. In all patients the electrode array was bent or compressed or had an atypical configuration (Figs 6A and 7A). In one patient the exact location of the array could not be determined, in part, because of the absence of well-defined otic capsule structures (Fig 8A).

Temporal bone radiographs were used to confirm the diagnosis of electrode array extrusion in one patient. Ten months after implantation, the patient noticed a decrease in speech discrimination ability. Two months later, he had a sharp pain in the region of the ipsilateral eustachian tube. Psychophysical testing revealed a loss of sound perception and a reproduction of the painful response when the first four basal electrodes were stimulated. Temporal bone radiographs demonstrated 17 electrodes within the cochlea compared with an intraoperative film that showed a full insertion of 22 electrodes and three stiffening rods, confirming electrode array extrusion.

Postoperative radiographs were obtained in 12 patients who had nonauditory vibratory or tactile sensations. Eight of these patients were prelingually deaf, and 7 had symptoms refer-

### Indications for postimplant temporal bone CT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Sex/Age, y</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Surgical Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>M/36</td>
<td>Radiographs do not confirm intracochlear insertion</td>
<td>Compressed intracochlear electrode array</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.</td>
<td>M/18</td>
<td>Radiographs do not confirm intracochlear insertion</td>
<td>Compressed intracochlear electrode array</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S.</td>
<td>M/37</td>
<td>Radiographs do not confirm intracochlear insertion</td>
<td>Bent intracochlear electrode array</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.A.</td>
<td>F/5</td>
<td>Radiographs do not confirm intracochlear insertion</td>
<td>Array in hypotympanum, vestibulocochlear dysplasia</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W.</td>
<td>F/61</td>
<td>Facial twitch</td>
<td>Intracochlear insertion, otospongiosis</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>F/4</td>
<td>Severe nocturnal headache</td>
<td>Normal intracochlear insertion</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.J.</td>
<td>F/55</td>
<td>Suspected infection</td>
<td>Collection beneath receiver/stimulator</td>
<td>Sterile seroma with extrusion of receiver/stimulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.S.</td>
<td>F/34</td>
<td>Suspected infection</td>
<td>Collection beneath receiver/stimulator</td>
<td>Abscess beneath receiver/stimulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S.</td>
<td>F/2</td>
<td>Suspected infection</td>
<td>No collection</td>
<td>Necrosis of surgical flap, no abscess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
able to the implantation site. Four patients experienced tactile sensations in distant locations such as the shoulder and abdomen; 1 patient experienced a metallic taste during stimulation. Plain radiographs confirmed normally positioned cochlear implants in all of these patients.

CT scans of the temporal bone were obtained for the indications summarized in the Table. CT scans demonstrated the location of the electrode array in relation to the otic capsule structures in all cases. The exact number of inserted electrodes could not be determined by CT because of metallic artifact from the electrodes themselves (Fig 9).

Five CT scans were performed for location of the electrode array when postoperative radiographs could not confirm an intracochlear insertion. Three CT scans confirmed an intracochlear insertion of the electrode array (Figs 6B and 7B). The degree of intracochlear insertion was determined with CT data in conjunction with plain radiographs and psychophysical data. One CT scan demonstrated the electrode array to be extracochlear in a patient with se-
vere vestibulocochlear dysplasia (Fig 8B). The CT was used to plan a drill out of the otic capsule into which the electrode array was inserted, resulting in a functional implant. After the drill out, plain radiographs could not locate the electrode array, but CT demonstrated a very shallow insertion into the otic capsule adjacent to the carotid canal (Fig 8C).

One patient experienced a facial twitch when certain apical electrodes were stimulated. A CT scan demonstrated a normal intracochlear insertion but showed severe otospongiosis (Fig 10). Absence of the normal bone insulation provided by the facial nerve canal most likely accounted for the aberrant facial nerve stimulation. The offending electrodes were programmed out, eliminating the unwanted motor response.

CT scans were performed to evaluate possible postoperative infections in three patients. Abnormal soft tissue beneath the receiver/stimulator with elevation and rotation of the implant was found in two patients (Fig 11). Radiographic characterization of the abnormal soft tissue was precluded by metallic artifact. One patient had an abscess, which was surgically drained, and the second patient had a sterile seroma, which resulted in extrusion of the receiver/stimulator through the surgical flap. The patient without demonstrable abnormal soft tissue had an area of necrosis of the overlying surgical flap from a chronic low-grade infection without a frank abscess.

Discussion

The multichannel cochlear implant provides direct electrical stimulation to the malfunctioning cochlea in an attempt to bypass the cochlear abnormality in profoundly deaf patients. The externally worn components of the multichannel cochlear implant (microphone, speech processor, and transmitter coil) transform sound into an encoded signal, which is sent across the skin to the implanted components (receiver/stimulator and electrode array), which directly stimulate the cochlea.

The ear-level microphone converts sound into an acoustic signal, which is filtered by the speech processor to extract the information necessary for speech recognition. The speech processor uses a computer to encode the signal digitally in a form suitable for the receiver/stimulator. The computer is programmed during
psychophysical testing to optimize the performance of each patient. The transmitter coil is magnetically coupled to the receiver/stimulator and sends the encoded signal across the skin. The receiver/stimulator decodes the signal and activates the appropriate electrode pair implanted within the scala tympani. The close proximity of the electrode array to the basilar membrane permits direct stimulation of the residual hair cells within the organ of Corti (11). By providing selective stimulation of specific regions within the cochlea, the multichannel implant exploits the tonotopic organization of the cochlea to improve speech recognition (12).

The radiographic evaluation of patients after insertion of the multichannel cochlear implant plays an important role in postoperative treatment. Intraoperative radiographs of the temporal bone demonstrate the integrity, positioning, and depth of insertion of the implant in most patients. In addition, these radiographs provide a baseline for future studies in the event that implant extrusion is suspected.

Temporal bone radiographs are superior to CT scans for estimating the number of inserted electrodes, because metallic artifact on the CT images renders individual electrodes indistinguishable. The technique described by Marsh et al (9) for estimating electrode array insertion depth on postoperative radiographs involved quantifying electrodes relative to a line drawn parallel to the overlapping limbs of the superior semicircular canal. This required the use of standardized views with strict attention to pa-

Fig 9. Coronal CT scan demonstrates the electrode array within the first turn of the cochlea (arrow). Note that the precise number of inserted electrodes cannot be determined.

Fig 10. Coronal CT confirms a normal insertion in this patient with severe otospongiosis. Note the close proximity between the array (straight arrow) and the labyrinthine segment of the facial nerve (curved arrow).

Fig 11. A, Axial CT of a patient with recurrent infections of the surgical bed with fistulization demonstrates elevation and rotation of the receiver/stimulator (white arrows) out of the calvarial well (black arrows). Note the extensive metallic artifact produced by the receiver/stimulator. An abscess beneath the receiver/stimulator was drained surgically, and the implant was removed.

B, Axial CT of a normally seated receiver/stimulator, for comparison, shows the implant (white arrows) flush against the calvarial well (black arrows).
tient positioning. At our institution, intraoperative films were obtained routinely (5). Our technique was developed to provide an accurate method of estimating insertion depth under conditions in which strict control over patient positioning was not possible. This technique was found to be reliable in a large proportion of cases (127 of 135 patients).

Estimates of the depth of electrode array insertion may have prognostic implications with regard to predicting auditory performance. There is the possibility of a direct correlation between insertion depth and auditory performance, because a wider range of frequencies can be stimulated when more electrodes are intracochlear. Preliminary results by Marsh et al (9) show a close correlation between auditory performance in postlingually deaf patients who have received implants and radiographic estimates of insertion depth.

Plain radiographs of the temporal bone are least reliable in determining the location of the electrode array when the array is compressed or bent or has an atypical curvature. A CT scan of the temporal bone definitively demonstrates the intracochlear or extracochlear location of the electrode array in these instances. Postoperative radiographs are useful in evaluating patients with nonauditory vibratory or tactile responses. Plain radiographs can confirm that the electrode array has not migrated and is in the normal position, eliminating the need for sectional imaging.

In patients with suspected postoperative infection, CT is the study of choice for detecting collections beneath the receiver/stimulator even though the images are obscured by metallic artifact. Excessive separation of the implant from the calvarial well, evident on wide window settings, is an accurate indication of the presence of underlying fluid. Although separation of the receiver/stimulator from the calvarium may be demonstrated on plain radiographs, this requires a tangential view necessitating careful patient positioning. CT consistently demonstrates the position of the receiver/stimulator relative to the calvarial well and would be more likely to define a contiguous spread of infection beyond the well.

Plain radiographs of the temporal bone are sufficient for the postoperative treatment of the majority of patients after multichannel cochlear implant insertion. Postoperative radiographs are recommended when intraoperative radiographs cannot confirm normal electrode array placement, when electrode array extrusion is suspected, and in the evaluation of nonauditory responses. CT scans should be performed when postoperative radiographs fail to demonstrate the location of the electrode array adequately or if postoperative infection is suspected.
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