

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Open Access



Response to commentary on “the middle fossa approach with self-drilling screws: a novel technique for BONEBRIDGE implantation”

Peng You¹, Lauren H. Siegel¹, Zahra Kassam², Matthew Hebb³, Lorne Parnes^{1†}, Hanif Ladak^{4†} and Sumit Kishore Agrawal^{1*†} 

Abstract

The aim of this letter is to respond to a commentary on a published article on the middle fossa approach to BONEBRIDGE implantation with self-drilling screws published by the senior authors.

Keywords: Bone conduction implant, BONEBRIDGE, Middle fossa approach, Conductive hearing loss, Surgical technique, Implants

Dear Dr. Carnevale,

We appreciate your support of the middle fossa approach and your feedback on this paper. The senior author (S.K.A.) developed the middle fossa technique with self-drilling screws in 2012 to treat patients with mastoid cavities, and the first patient was implanted following this approach in April, 2013 at the London Health Sciences Centre [1, 2]. This particular technique was previously published [3, 4], and the current series examines the long-term results (40 patients, up to 71 months follow-up).

It is exciting that your group subsequently adopted a similar surgical technique (14 patients, up to 45 months follow-up). Furthermore, it is reassuring that surgical and audiologic outcomes were similar between centres, regardless of whether self-drilling or self-tapping screws were used. We apologize that we were unable to cite your results within the current paper. Unfortunately, our manuscript was completed for submission prior to the publication of your paper in April, 2019.

To the best of our knowledge, the use of a neurosurgical perforator or trocar for the BONEBRIDGE was first published by Barbara et al. in 2013 [5], albeit in the retrosigmoid approach. As mentioned in our paper, we also used the neurosurgical perforator in our first few middle fossa patients. Although use of the perforator was quick to create the initial craniotomy (14 mm outer drill and 11 mm inner drill), expansion of the craniotomy to 16 mm to fit the BONEBRIDGE took additional surgical time. In your paper (and supplementary video), initial craniotomy using the perforator took 14 s, however the total craniotomy time including enlargement with the Kerrison rongeur was not described.

Neurosurgical perforators are associated with complications [6, 7], and have significantly higher costs than regular otologic drills [8]. Use of otologic drills to create the craniotomy is a safe and efficient alternative, and neurotologists comfortable with the middle fossa approach for acoustic neuromas should be familiar with this method. Therefore, the senior authors (L.S.P. and S.K.A.) opted to exclusively switch to otologic drills, and no adverse events or significant increases in operative time were noted.

* Correspondence: sumitagrawal@lhsc.on.ca

[†]Lorne Parnes, Hanif Ladak and Sumit Kishore Agrawal are co-senior authors

¹Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, London Health Science Centre, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, Room B1-333, London Health Sciences Centre – University Hospital 339 Windermere Road, London, Ontario N6A 5A5, Canada

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



Acknowledgements

Not applicable

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally to this response letter. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

There were no sources of funding.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Competing interests

LP is on the surgical advisory board for Med-El. The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹Department of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, London Health Science Centre, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, Room B1-333, London Health Sciences Centre – University Hospital 339 Windermere Road, London, Ontario N6A 5A5, Canada. ²Department of Medical Imaging, St. Joseph's Health Care London, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Canada. ³Department of Clinical Neurological Sciences, London Health Science Centre, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Canada. ⁴Department of Medical Biophysics, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Canada.

Received: 11 September 2019 Accepted: 21 September 2019

Published online: 05 November 2019

References

1. Bone implant gives new hope to hearing impaired. CTV News. 2013. <https://www.ctvnews.ca/sci-tech/bone-implant-gives-new-hope-to-hearing-impaired-1.1277726>. Accessed 1 Sept 2019.
2. LHSC first in North America to perform BONEBRIDGE bone conduction implant. London Health Sciences Centre. 2013. <https://www.lhsc.on.ca/news/lhsc-first-in-north-america-to-perform-bonebridge-bone-conduction-implant>. Accessed 1 Sept 2019.
3. Zernotti ME, Sarasty AB. Active bone conduction prosthesis: BonebridgeTM. *Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol*. 2014;19(4):343–8.
4. Manoj MP, Agrawal S. Middle Fossa approach to bone bridge surgery: presenting author: Manoj M P. *J Laryngol Otol*. 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022215116006149>.
5. Barbara M, Perotti M, Gioia B, Volpini L, Monini S. Transcutaneous bone-conduction hearing device: Audiological and surgical aspects in a first series of patients with mixed hearing loss. *Acta Otolaryngol*. 2013;133(10):1058–64.
6. Vogel TW, Dlouhy BJ, Howard MA. Don't take the plunge: avoiding adverse events with cranial perforators. *J Neurosurg JNS*. 2011. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2011.3.JNS101310>.
7. Caird JD, Choudhari KA. 'Plunging' during burr hole craniotomy: a persistent problem amongst neurosurgeons in Britain and Ireland. *Br J Neurosurg*. 2003;17(6):509–12.
8. Menovsky T, Kamerling N, Plazier M, Maas AI. Letter to the editor: complications with cranial perforators. *J Neurosurg JNS*. 2014. <https://doi.org/10.3171/2012.3.JNS112168>.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

