



A PROSPECTIVE STUDY OF CRANIAL MENINGIOMA

**Dr. Aditya Shrivastava**

Assistant professor ,dept. of neurosurgery G.R.Medical College Gwalior M.P.

**Dr .Neeraj Khara\***

Mch Resident, Dept. Of Neurosurgery G.R.Medical College Gwalior M.P.  
\*Corresponding Author

**ABSTRACT**

**AIM & OBJECTIVE:** To evaluate epidemiology ,surgical options, outcome and recurrence rate of the meningioma.

**MATERIAL & METHOD:** In this study Consecutive patients seen at Department of Neurosurgery, J.A. Group of Hospitas, Gajra Raja medical college, Gwalior, M.P. Over a period of 24 months of period. We take the 50 patients whom clinical and CT/MRI finding showed of meningiomas has been including in this study, patients prepered for surgery and all the patients those were operated, post operative CT/MRI scan done and follow up the patients.

**RESULT & CONCLUSION:** In this study we find that the mean age of diagnosis of meningioma was 47 years and predominantly find among females, with supratentorial convexity meningioma being the most common site. Most of the patients were having complete surgical excision. Histopathological grade of excised tumor were WHO grade I out of which meningothelial was the most common type.

**KEYWORDS :** meningioma, supratentorial tumor

**INTRODUCTION-**

Meningiomas are tumours that develop from meningothelial cells of the arachnoid layer. (1, 2). Meningioma was first described in 1614 by Felix Paster (1, 3), and one hundred and sixty years afterwards, Louis (1, 4) published a series on the pathology of a “fungating tumour of the dura mater”. The 18th century witnessed attempts at surgical resection and in 1887, W.W. Keen performed the first successful excision of a meningioma in the United States (1, 5, 6).

Later in the 20th century Harvey Cushing (1, 5, 7, 8) adopted the term meningioma as a single description for the different pathological types of tumours which arise from the meninges. The difficulties are admittedly great, sometimes insurmountable, and though the disappointments still are many, another generation of neurological surgeons will unquestionably see them largely overcome”(1, 7, 8).

**MATERIAL AND METHODS:**

In this study Consecutive patients seen at Department of Neurosurgery, J.A. Group of Hospitas, Gajra Raja medical college, Gwalior, M.P. Over a period of 24 months of period. We take the 50 patients whom clinical and CT/MRI finding showed of meningiomas has been including in this study, patients prepered for surgery( surgical excision were done according to simpson grade excision) and all the patients those were operated, post operative CT/MRI scan done and follow up the patients .

**Inclusion Criteria**

Criteria for inclusion in the study were as follows:

- a) Patients with clinically and radiologically suspicious intracranial Meningiomas.
- b) Patients with biopsies of intracranial tumours positive for meningioma.

**Exclusion Criteria**

- a) Patients with intracranial tumours whose clinical and radiological features were not suspicious for Meningioma.
- b) Spinal and extra calvarial meningiomas were not included in this study.

**Follow up**

Patients follow up after discharge from neurosurgery department of the study were called for follow up in Neurosurgery OPD at the interval of 15 days initially, and after that advise to patient to follow up in Neurosurgery OPD one month of interval.

**OBSERVATION-**

**Table no. 1 Tumor location**

in our study supratentorial convexity meningioma being the most common (60%) site.

|                 | LOCATION             | NO. OF PATIENT | PERCENTAGE % |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| SUPRA-TENTORIAL | Convexity            | 30             | 60           |
|                 | Falx and parasagital | 03             | 06           |
|                 | Sphenoid ridge-      | 03             | 06           |
|                 | (a) Medial           | 00             | 00           |
|                 | (b) Middle           | 00             | 00           |
|                 | (c) Lateral          | 00             | 00           |
|                 | Olfactory groove     | 03             | 06           |
|                 | Tubercullum sellae   | 02             | 04           |
|                 | Intraventricular     | 00             | 00           |
|                 | Middel Fossa         | 00             | 00           |
|                 | Orbital              | 00             | 00           |
| Intrasylvian    | 00                   | 00             |              |
| INFRA-TENTORIAL | Cerebellar convexity | 05             | 10           |
|                 | Tentorial            | 03             | 06           |
|                 | Cp angle             | 01             | 02           |

**Table No. 2 : Age wise distribution of patients**

| S.No. | Age (yrs)    | No. of patients | Percentage % |
|-------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1.    | 0-10         | 0               | 0            |
| 2.    | 11-20        | 0               | 0            |
| 3.    | 21-30        | 4               | 8            |
| 4.    | 31-40        | 9               | 18           |
| 5.    | 41-50        | 26              | 52           |
| 6.    | 51-60        | 8               | 16           |
| 7.    | 61-70        | 1               | 2            |
| 8.    | > 70         | 2               | 4            |
|       | <b>Total</b> | <b>50</b>       | <b>100</b>   |

Table no. 2 revealed meningioma were most common in 41 - 50 years followed by 31 -40 years of age

Mean age of meningioma : 47

**Table No. 3 : Gender wise distribution of patients**

| S.No. | Gender | No. of patients | Percentage(%) |
|-------|--------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1.    | Male   | 18              | 36            |
| 2.    | Female | 32              | 64            |

Table no. 3 revealed meningioma was common in Female than Male, Female:Male (1.7:1)

**Table No. 4: Presenting complaints**

| S.No | Clinical presentation           | No. of patients | Percentage(%) |
|------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1.   | Headache                        | 48              | 96            |
| 2.   | Seizure                         | 25              | 50            |
| 3.   | Clinical features of raised ICP | 20              | 40            |
| 4.   | Hemiparesis                     | 08              | 16            |
| 5.   | Behaviour problem               | 15              | 30            |
| 6.   | Visual problem                  | 8               | 16            |
| 7.   | Altered sensorium               | 9               | 18            |

Table no.4 revealed, most common presenting complaints was headache 48(96%) of patients, followed by seizure (50%) of patients, other less common clinical feature suggestive of raised ICP( irregular respiration, bradycardia, and hypertension) (40%), ptosis (2%), hemiparesis (20%), behaviour problem (30%), memory difficulties (20%), visual problem found (16%) and altered sensorium (18%).

**Table No 5 -Glasgow coma score (GCS)**

|                       | No. of patients | Post op. at the time of dischare | Followup (2 years) |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| Normal (15/15)        | 43              | 35                               | 48                 |
| Mild (8-14)           | 7               | 15                               | 1                  |
| Moderate (9-13)       | 0               | 0                                | 0                  |
| Severe (5-8)          | 0               | 0                                | 0                  |
| Critical severe (3-4) | 0               | 0                                | 0                  |

Table No. 5 revealed, Out of 50 patients, 43(86%) were in full GCS, at the time of admission. 7 patients were admitted with altered sensorium. None of the patients GCS was less than 8.

**Table No. 6 Glasgow outcome score**

| Glasgow outcome score              | Glasgow coma scale at time of discharge |             | Follow up (24 month of period) |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------|--------------------------------|
|                                    | Mild/ Moderate (9-15)                   | Severe(5-8) |                                |
| Good (Gd V)                        | 18                                      | 00          | 49                             |
| Moderate disability(Gd IV)         | 20                                      | 00          | 00                             |
| Serveve disability(Gd III)         | 12                                      | 00          | 00                             |
| Persistent vegetative state(Gd II) | 00                                      | 00          | 00                             |
| Death(Gd I)                        | 00                                      | 00          | 01                             |

Table no 6 revealsd Glasgow out come score 5 of 18 patients, score 4 of 20 patients and scoe 3 of 12 patients. Follow up of 49 patients were score 5.

**Table No: 7 -Size of the tumour**

| S.No. | Size of the tumour | No. of patients | Percentage (%) |
|-------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1.    | 1-2 cm             | 0               | 0              |
| 2.    | 2-3 cm             | 0               | 0              |
| 3.    | 3-4 cm             | 7               | 14             |
| 4.    | 4-5 cm             | 13              | 26             |
| 5.    | > 5 cm             | 30              | 60             |
|       | Total              | 50              | 100            |

Table no. 7, The size of the tumours ranged from between 1-2cm in diameter to more than 5cm in diameter with the largest tumour sizes of >5cm in their longest dimension accounting for 60% of all the tumours.

**Table No. 8 : Types of flap, Surgical incision and craniotomy/ craniectomy**

|                                    | Tumor location         |                 | Incision     | Flap               | Craniotomy/ craniectomy     |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cerebral convexity meningioma (30) | Frontal                | 15              | Curvi-linear | Frontal            | Frontal                     |
|                                    | Fronto-parietal        | 01              | Curvi-linear | Fronto-parietal    | Fronto-parietal             |
|                                    | Temporal               | 06              | Linear       | Temporal           | Temporal                    |
|                                    | Temporoparietal        | 02              | Linear       | Temporoparietal    | Temporoparietal             |
|                                    | Parietal               | 03              | Linear       | Parietal           | Parietal                    |
|                                    | Parietal-occipital     | 03              | Curvi-linear | Parietal-occipital | Parietal-occipital          |
|                                    | Falx/ parasagittal (3) | Anterior Middle |              | 'U' shape          | Frontal                     |
| Sphenoid (3)                       | Lateral Middle Medial  |                 | Curvi-linear | Fronto-temporal    | Fronto-temporal(pt erional) |
| Olfactory(3)                       |                        |                 | Bi coronal   | Bi-frontal         | Subfrontal                  |
| Tuberculum sellae(2)               |                        |                 | Curvi-Linear | Sub frontal        | Sub frontal craniotomy      |
| Cp angle(1)                        |                        |                 | Linear       | Sub occipital      | craniectomy                 |
| Tentorial (3)                      |                        |                 |              |                    |                             |
| Cerebellar convexity (5)           |                        |                 |              |                    |                             |

**Table No.9 : Distribution of patients according to surgical excision**

| S.No. | Simpson grade | No. of patients | Percentage % |
|-------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1.    | I             | 14              | 28           |
| 2.    | II            | 30              | 60           |
| 3.    | III           | 0               | 0            |
| 4.    | IV            | 5               | 10           |
| 5.    | V             | 1               | 2            |

In our study most common simpson grade Surgical excision of tumor was grade II excision which was (60%), second most common was grade I excision which was (28%).Other (10%) was grade IV excision and (2%) was grade V excision.

In our study we achieve gross total excision (grade I and II) was 88%, partial excision was 10% and simple decompression and biopsy was 2%.

**Table No 10 : Distribution of patients according to histopathology**

| S.No. | Histopathology of Classification |                        | No. of patients | Percentage % |
|-------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1.    | Grade I                          | Meningothelial         | 37              | 64           |
|       |                                  | Fibrous                | 5               | 10           |
|       |                                  | Transitional           | 4               | 8            |
|       |                                  | Psammomatous           | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Angiomatous            | 3               | 6            |
|       |                                  | Microcystic            | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Secretory              | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Lymphoplasmocytic rich | 0               | 0            |
|       | Metaplastic                      | 0                      | 0               |              |
| 2.    | Grade II                         | Choroid                | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Clear cell             | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Atypical               | 0               | 0            |
| 3.    | Grade III                        | Capillary              | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Rhabdoid               | 0               | 0            |
|       |                                  | Anaplastic             | 1               | 2            |

Histopathology grading was done as per WHO classification of CNS tumor. It revealed that most common subtype was meningothelial 64% and second most common sub type was fibrous 10%.

**Table No. 11 - Distribution of patients according to histopathology (WHO grade)**

| S.No. | Grade | No. of patients | Percentage(%) |
|-------|-------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1.    | I     | 49              | 98            |
| 2.    | II    | 0               | 0             |
| 3.    | III   | 1               | 2             |

WHO grade III Meningioma was seen in 1 patient. It was anaplastic which was 2%. In our study we found 98% of tumor was grade I and 2% was grade III.

**Table No. 12: Post op complications**

| S.No. | Post op complications             | No. of patients | Follow up patients |
|-------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1.    | Infection                         | 2               | 0                  |
| 2.    | Seizure                           | 15              | 5                  |
| 3.    | Hemiparasis                       | 12              | 6                  |
| 4.    | Visual loss                       | 5               | 4                  |
| 5.    | Behavior change                   | 10              | 2                  |
| 6.    | Memory deficit                    | 10              | 0                  |
| 7.    | Clinical features of raised (ICP) | 10              | 0                  |

**Table No. 13: Patient follow up data given as frequency**

| S.No. | Follow up | No. of patients | Recurrence |
|-------|-----------|-----------------|------------|
| 1.    | < 1 year  | 49              | 1          |
| 2.    | 1-2 years | 36              | 2          |

During 2 years follow up, In <1 years 50 patients were followed out of which recurrence is found in 1 pt. in CT Scan. Pt. was operated with Simpson's Gd II surgical excision, but couldn't survive due to medical illness

During 2 years follow up of 36 pt. turn out in OPD, out of them 2 were having recurrence in there operative site confirmed by CT Scan. These 2 pts. were having small lesion which was asymptomatic so decided to continue conservative management and follow up.

**DISCUSSION**

There are few prospective studies on histologically proven intracranial meningiomas in the literature. This study therefore serves as a useful baseline study on intracranial meningiomas in our environment.

**Age & sex Distribution**

The incidence of meningiomas increases with age (9). In this study, the youngest patient was 25 years old; the mean age was 47 years. Sex distribution in our study, female to male ratio is 1.7:1, Our study in accordance with the findings of Jaggon and Char (10), Fynn et al (11), Odebode et al (12) & Quiñones-Hinojosa et al (13) and Gasparetto et al (14)

**Clinical Presentation**

in our study most common clinical presentation is headache (96%), other is seizures (50%), clinical feature of raised ICP (40%) and behavior changes (30%), hemiparesis (16%) and visual impairment (14%).

Our study in accordance with Odebode et al (12).

**Location of Tumor**

Supratentorially located meningiomas constitute 85-90% with 5-10% infratentorially located (14).

Our study in accordance with Jaggon and Char (10) (87% and 4% respectively), Odebode et al (12) (94.3% and 5.7% respectively), and

Quiñones-Hinojosa et al (13) (87% and 13% respectively).

**Histopathology**

The most commonly used grading system for meningiomas is that of the World Health Organization (WHO). The WHO classifies meningiomas into 3 grades: benign (WHO grade I), atypical (WHO grade II), and anaplastic or malignant (WHO grade III) and these constitute about 88-94%, 5-7% and 1-3% of cases respectively (15, 16,17, 18). Therefore most meningiomas are benign tumours with the potential for cure after complete surgical excision.

In our study WHO grade I constituted 98% of cases, grade II (00%) and WHO III (2%).

Our study in accordance with Quiñones-Hinojosa et al (19), Jaggon and Char (20) and Das et al (21).

**Recurrence**

Recurrence rate of our study is 6% which was less than other studies

| Comparing the recurrence rate between various studies. | Total recurrence rate |
|--|-----------------------|
| Ayerbe et al. (22)                                     | 21%                   |
| Jaaskelainen (23)                                      | 15.4%                 |
| Papanikolaou Hospital series (24)                      | 21.5%                 |
| <b>Our study</b>                                       | <b>06%</b>            |

**CONCLUSION**

In our study most of the meningioma are supratentorial with female predominance. In 4th decade. Most of the tumors were benign with simons grade II and grade I excision was possible. Most of the cases having good recovery with minimal recurrence and mortality.

**REFERENCES**

- Black PM. Meningiomas. Neurosurgery. 1993;32(4):643-57.
- Lusis E, Gutmann DH. Meningioma: an update. Current Opinion in Neurology. 004; 1 7(6):687-92.
- Netsky M, Lapresle J. The first account of meningioma. Bull Hist Med. 1956;30:465-8. Cited by (1)
- Louis A. Memoires sur les tumeurs fongueuses de la dure-mere. Memories de l'Academie Royale de (Paris). 1774;5:1-59. Cited by (1)
- Al-Rhodan NF, Laws ER. The history of intracranial meningiomas. In: Al-Mefty O, editor. Meningiomas. New York: Raven; 1991. p. 1-7.
- Bingham WF, W W Keen and the dawn of American Neurosurgery. J Neurosurgery. 1986;64:705-12. Cited by (1,5)
- Haddad GF, Al-Mefty O, Abdulauf SI. Meningiomas. In: Winn HR, editor. Youmans Neurological Surgery. Philadelphia: WB Saunders; 2004. p. 1099-131.
- Cushing H. The meningiomas (dural endotheliomas): Their source, and favoured seats of origin. Brain. 1922;45:282-306. Cited by (1,5)
- Haddad G, Chamoun RB. Meningioma. eMedicine Neurology [serial on the Internet]. Nov 14, 2006 [cited 2009 15 February]: Available from: e-medicine.medscape.com/article/.
- Sadetzki, S, et al, Genotyping of patients with sporadic and adiationassociated meningiomas. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2005, 4(4): p. 969-76.
- Fynn E, Khan N, Ojo A. Meningioma - a review of 52 cases. SA Journal of Radiology. 2004;3-5.
- Odebode TO, Akang EE, Shokunbi MT, Malomo AO, Ogunseyinde AO. Factors influencing visual and clinical outcome in Nigerian patients with cranial meningioma. J of Clinical Neurosciences. 2006;13:649-54. 60
- Preston, D.L., et al., Tumours of the nervous system and pituitary gland associated with atomic bomb radiation exposure. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2002, 94(20): p. 1555-63.
- Gasparetto EL, Leite CC, Lucato LT, Barros CV, Marie SKN, Santana P, et al. Intracranial meningiomas: magnetic resonance imaging findings in 78 cases Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria. 2007;65(3a). 62
- Campbell BA, Jhamb A, Maguire JA, Toyota B, Ma R. Meningiomas in 2009: Controversies and Future Challenges. A J Clin Oncol. 2009;32(1):73-85.
- Castillo GC. Meningioma, Brain. eMedicine Neurology [serial on the Internet]. Apr 27, 2 0 0 7 [cited 2 0 0 9 1 5 February]: Available from: e-medicine.medscape.com/article/341624-overview. 61
- Blitshteyn S, Crook J, Jaeckle KA: Is there an association between meningioma and hormone replacement therapy? A study of women at the Mayo Clinic Jacksonville. From the Society for Neuro-Oncology Meetings Abstracts 2004.
- Hsu DW, Efrid JT, Hedley-Whyte ET: Progesterone and estrogen receptors in meningiomas: Prognostic considerations. J Neurosurg 86:113-120, 1997.
- Quiñones-Hinojosa A, Kaprelian T, Chaichana KL, Sanai N, Parsa AT, Berger MS, et al. Pre-Operative Factors Affecting Resectability of Giant Intracranial Meningiomas. Can J Neurol Sci. 2009;36:623-30.
- Jaggon JR, Char G. Epidemiologic Data on Meningiomas in Jamaica: The First from the Caribbean. The Internet Journal of Third World Medicine. 2007;5(1).
- Das A, Chapman CAT, Yap WM. Histological subtypes of symptomatic central nervous system tumours in Singapore. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2000;68:372-4..
- J. Ayerbe, R. Lobato, J. de la Cruz J, et al., "Risk Factors Predicting Recurrence in Patients Operated on for Intrac-ranial Meningioma: A Multivariate Analysis, Acta Neurochirurgica, Vol. 141, No. 9, 1999, pp. 921-932

23. J. Jaaskelainen, M. Haltia and A. Servo, "Atypical and Anaplastic Meningiomas: Radiology, Surgery, Radio-therapy and Outcome," *Journal of Surgery Neurology*, Vol. 25, 1986, pp. 233-242.
24. Department of Neurosurgery, G. Papanikolaou Hospital, Thessaloniki, Greece Email: kaviola@hotmail.com Received November 20, 2011; revised December 8, 2011; accepted December 22, 2011