Predictive Value of Middle Ear Risk Index (Meri) in Surgical Outcome of Tympanoplasty

Dr. Manisha Dash¹, Dr. Aparna Chavan²

¹Junior resident, Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences, Sawangi Wardha.

²Professor, Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences, Sawangi Wardha.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Manisha Dash, Junior resident, Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences, Sawangi Wardha.

Email address: manishaadash@gmail.com Study Protocol Conflict of Interest: None

Abstract:

BACKGROUND: A mainstream otorhinolaryngeal issue worldwide is chronic suppurative otitis media,in developing countries precisely. This condition results in high morbidity rates. Deafness, academic loss and discontinuation of work triggers the fall of economy of nation. Despite the accessibility of a wide variety of antibiotics, improved surgical methods and procedures are available we are still not able to achieve 100 percent good results in tympanoplasty, which is the modality to reverse back hearing loss. Tympanoplasty, which is the modality to reverse back hearing loss depends on severity of the disease present preoperatively. The Middle Ear Risk Indexconstructed by Becvarovski and Kartushblends the conditions in the middle ear into a number to foresight tympanoplasty. Built on the risk factors, every patient is given a numerical score. The variables judged are otorrhoea, perforation, cholesteatoma, ossicular status and perforation granulation of the middle ear and past surgical history. The overall score is 12. MERI-based, patients are scored as mild (1-3), moderate (4-6), and serious (4-6) diseases. The current study is being piloted to determine the MERI index's prognostic importance on the tympanoplasty result in terms of tympanic membrane graft uptake and audiological gain where the patients are followed for 6 months.

OBJECTIVE:To ascertain the Middle Ear Risk Index (MERI) in patients with CSOM doingtympanoplasty and to scrutinize the correspondence between MERI score and success of tympanoplasty.

METHODOLOGY: Patients(15yrs-60yrs) diagnosed with CSOM and willing to get operated for tympanoplasty to the sector of OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY & Head and Neck Surgery (HNS).

EXPECTED RESULT: The data obtained will be analyzed statistically and will be discussed in light of literature available.

CONCLUSION: A better understanding of these factors is helpful for better prognostication of the factors affecting the disease and in planning the surgical procedure.

Keywords: CSOM ,Middle ear risk index, Postoperative outcome, Tympanoplasty

INTRODUCTION-

The main objective behind tympanoplasty in chronic otitis media (COM) is to eradicate pathology and to get a ear safe and dry and reversal of hearing loss to maximum extent. The incidence of the ears becoming dry after surgery and the ears not having recurrent or residual cholesteatoma ranges between 70 to 90 percent in various large clinical trials ^[1].

Tympanomastoidectomy is done for uprooting of pathology from middle ear cleft and tympanoplasty is the stratagem to reform the tympanic membrane and ear ossicles. The success of Tympanomastoidectomy with tympanoplasty is dependent not only upon the surgical principle but also on the pathological factors associated with disease. Although there is huge literature present explaining the techniques of Tympanomastoidectomy with tympanoplasty but the data about factors affecting the outcome is limited. The diseased situation of the middle ear to predictor outcome has been confusing issue in the literature. [2-4].

Middle Ear Risk Index (MERI) of a patient suffering from the COM is a numerical grading to stratify the toughness of disease and forecastthe outcome of tympanoplasty in the particular patient. MERI is decided by assigning a specific value for each risk factor, which are added to get the MERI score. Determination of the Middle Ear Risk Index (MERI) for CSOM in patients planned for tympanoplasty, designate the patients mild, moderate and serious MERI score-based ailment and to research the relationship between the MERI score and the progress of tympanoplasty. The risk factors include Criteria of Belluci to determine the degree of otorrhoea, Austin/Kartush criteria of ossicular status, presence of perforation, middle ear , middle ear granulations/effusion and history of previous surgery. MERI score is assigned as MERI 0 = Normal; MERI 1-3 = Mild disease; MERI 4-6 = Moderate disease; MERI 7-12 = Severe disease ^[5]. In the developing countries surgery cost and absence from the work are major drawback for multipleoperation.

RATIONALE

The main aim of operation for COM is to remove the pathology, get adry ear and to restore hearing. The incidence of the ears becoming dry after surgery and the ears not having recurrent or residual cholesteatoma ranges between 70 to 90 percent in various large clinical trials. Tympanomastoidectomy is the surgery for making the middle ear cleft disease free and tympanoplasty is the procedure for rebuilding of the middle ear. The benefit from the surgery is dependent not only upon the surgical principle but also on the pathophysiological factors associated with disease.

Although there is huge literature present about the techniques of tympanomastoidectomy with tympanoplasty but the data supporting the factors affecting the outcome is limited.[6]There are two schools of thought according to various authors regarding the outcome of surgery of

ear – one group believes that various pathological factors are important in determining the success of the surgery whereas the other claims that the outcome is independent of these factors. Hence it is the need of the hour to study the various factors influencing the disease of the ear. If the surgical outcome of the disease can be predicted based on the presentation it will help in the cost effectiveness of the patient and will also boost the patient compliance. If we can foresee the end point of the surgical procedure based upon the middle ear diseased condition, the cost effectiveness of the surgery can be improved and this will also improve the patients compliance. The pathological factors affecting the surgical outcome of COM has been highlighted by different authors time by time but determinants have been seenseparately and each study has used only on one factor at a time ^[7-9]. There is only one study combining these factors, the surgical, prosthetic, infection, tissue and Eustachian tube (SPITE) method which is an exception ^[2]. This makes it imperative for studying various pathological factors of middle ear disease simultaneously and to provide guidelines for their management.

The main target of this analysis is, to gauge a diagnosed group of patients undergoing tympanomastoidectomy with tympanoplasty with reference to the prognostic significance of Middle ear risk index (MERI) and other components in determining the consequence.

AIM-

To optimize the surgical outcome in severe disease in terms of graft uptake and audiological gain

OBJECTIVES-

- 1. Interconnection of hearing loss with TM perforation and ossicular destruction depending on size and position of the pathology.
- 2. MERI research and the outcome of tympanoplasty by category of risk.
- 3. To test the outcome of tubotympanic CSOMsurgical treatment and its association with MERI.
- 4. Analysis of the outcome of the Eustachian tube feature on tympanoplasty outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

STUDY DESIGN

This is a cross-sectional prospective observational study.

STUDY SETTING

Study will be executed in the province of OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY & Head and Neck Surgery (HNS) in AVBRH, DMIMS, WARDHA.

Study duration-NOV 2020 – NOV 2022

PARTICIPANTS

Patients of severe stage of CSOM in the age group 15–60 years attending OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY& HNS OPD who have given consent are to be included in this study.

Inclusion Criteria

- 1. Patients presenting with unilateral or bilateral COM with or without cholesteatoma.
- 2. Patients between 15 to 60 years of age.
- 3. Patients with satisfactory cochlear reserve.

Exclusion Criteria

- 1. Patients with sensorineural deafness.
- 2. Patients with co-morbidities e.g. hypertension, diabetes mellitus.
- 3. Patients with adenotonsillitis, cleft palate and nasal polyp.
- 4. Patients with intracranial complications of chronic otitis media e. g Bezolds abscess
- 5. Patients not willing for surgery.

VARIABLES

All the cases will undergo detailed history taking and examination according to the proforma. Details will be saved .Otological tests included are-

1. Audiological check

- 1. Pure tone audiometry (PTA).
- 2. Speech discrimination score (SDS).
- 2. Eustachian tube function (ETF).

Eustachian tube function was assessed by three ways:

- 1. Instillation of antibiotic ear drop.
- 2. Auscultation tube test.
- 3. ET functions by tympanometry.
- 3. Otomicroscopy.
- 4. To determine the size of the perforation, thin and transparent plastic paper will be used to measure the size of the perforation and over it graphs of 1 mm2mm will be drawn, oval sections of approximately 9x8 mm will be cut and sterilized by holding in cidex, with magnification under working microscope ~15 sterile plastic over the t.m. with the graph imprinted on it is kept. Number of occupying Square by the perforation would be directly

counted, whether half or more of any square is within, it is taken to be a single square perforation and if less than half, its left.

All patients with ear discharge will receive conservative treatment with antibiotics, antihistaminic, decongestants and topical ear drops and when a dry ear is seen, the patients will be treated with tympanoplasty or myringoplasty. Preoperative ear test(quiescent/inactive) status before surgery, ET function workup(type of hearing loss conductive/mixed/SNHL) will be carried out .MERI score and severity will be noted.

Depending on the extent of the perforation, surgical procedures will be scheduled.

- -The modified inlay method can be used for tiny perforations.
- -The routine underlay approach will be used for small to moderate perforations.
- -The Interlay approach would be done for broad to subtotal perforations or complete perforation.
- -The Anterior tucking technique will be used for anterior perforations with a wide margin.

45th day, 3 months and 6 months follow up visits are required to evaluate graft assimilation by otoscopy, subjective evaluation (hearing, tinnitus, and any other complaints); otoscopy and repeat PTA and ETF were done. The findings are then related with preoperative findings

MERI SCORE

S.NO	RISK FACTOR	RISK VALUE
1	OTORRHOEA	
	I DRY	0
	II OCCASIONALLY WET	1
	III PERSISTENTLY WET	2
	IV WET,CLEFT PALATE	3
2	PERFORATION	
	I ABSENT	0
	II PRESENT	1
3	CHOLESTEATOMA	
	I ABSENT	0
	II PRESENT	1
4	OSSICULAR	
	STATUS(AUSTIN/KARTUSH)	
	O:M+I+S	0
	A:M+S+	1
	B:M+S-	2
	C:M-S+	3

	D:M-S-	4
	E:OSSICULAR HEAD FIXATION	2
	F:STAPES FIXATION	3
5	MIDDLE EAR	
	GRANULATION/EFFUSION	
	NO	0
	YES	1
6	PREVIOUS SURGERY	
	NONE	0
	STAGED	1
	REVISION	2

MERI 0 Normal

MERI 1–3 Mild diseases

MERI 4-6 Moderate disease

MERI 7-12 Severe disease

BIAS

Study will be conducted through a proper study design and data analysis to combat with any source of bias arising at any given point of time in the allotted duration of the study.

STUDY SIZE

In research term a sample is a group of people that are taken from a large population for tabulation of data .The sample should be representative of the population to ensure that we can generalize the findings from the research sample to the population as a whole.

Sample size formula with designed error of margin:

 $n = Z(alpha/2)2 \times P(1-P)/d2$ [10]

where,

Z(alpha/2) is the level of significance at 5%

Level of significance i.e 95% confidence interval-1.96

P=prevalence of CSOM=4%=0.04

d=desired error of margin=7%=0.07

Sample size required=30 patients

STATISTICAL METHOD

Data will be analyzed by using simple statistical methods (t-test) and will be tabulated with the help of MS Office software.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES/RESULTS

The collected data will be tabulated and statistical analysis will be done by estimating means and standard deviations for various measurements. Statistical analysis will be done using standard t test. Direct relation between preoperative meri score and postoperative outcome of tympanoplasty will be derived.

DISCUSSION

CSOM has been elucidated as infection of the middle ear and mastoid cavity with or without ear discharge through a tympanic membrane perforation present for months to years. The main aim of operation COM is to remove the disease, make the ear dry and to restore hearing. The incidence of the ears becoming dry after surgery and the ears not having recurrent or residual cholesteatoma ranges between 70 to 90 percent in various large clinical trials.^[11] There has been difference in opinion about the staging of the surgical procedure for COM. Some studies supported the single stage surgery for both elimination of disease and tympanoplasty. ^[12,13] Whereas others advocate two stage procedure for achieving the different objectives. ^[14-15]

The diseased atmosphere of the middle ear as a factor of outcome has been clouding issue in the past.[16-18]The choice between single or multiple stage procedure for COM can be made depending upon the pathological factors associated with disease. For this purpose a grading system has been put forward, known as middle ear risk index (MERI). MERI of a patient suffering from chronic suppurative otitis media is a numerical grading to stratify the ferocity of the disease. MERI is determined by assigning a specific value for each risk factor which are added to get the MERI score. For each risk factor, MERI is calculated by assigning a particular value. To get the MERI ranking, connect. Belluci parameters are included in the risk factors to determine the degree of Otorrhoea, Austin/Kartushossicular disorder criterion. presence of perforation, cholesteatoma, middle ear granulation/ effusions and experience of prior surgery. The risk categories proposed MERI can be derived as follows: (0= normal; 1-3= mild illness; 4-6= moderate illness; 7-12=Severe)^[19]. There are very less studies to correlate the surgical outcome of the disease taking into account all pathological factors of the disease as most of the studies concentrate on one factor exclusively. [20-22] Few of the related studies were reviewed [23-27]. The present study is being conducted to assess the prognostic value of the various pathological and the technical factors associated with the outcome of the surgery.

45th day, 3 months and 6 months follow up visits are required to evaluate graft assimilation viavarious proposed tests. The findings are then related with preoperative findings.

CONCLUSION

All data collected will be evaluated and conclusion will be derived for better understanding of the etiopathological factors affecting the outcome of tympanoplasty and regaining of hearing to a serviceable level.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Merchant SN, Wang PC, Jang CH, et al. Efficacy of tympanomastoid surgery for control of infection in active COM. Laryngoscope. 1997; 107: 872-877. doi: 10.1097/00005537-199707000-00007
- [2] Black B. Ossiculoplasty prognosis: the spite method of assessment. Am J Otol. 1992; 13: 544-551.
- [3] Albu S, Babighian G, Trabalzini F. Prognostic factors in tympanoplasty. The American Journal of otology. 1998; 19: 136-140.
- [4] Brackman DE, Sheehy JL, Luxford WM. TORPs and PORPs in tympanoplasty: a review of 1042 operations. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1984; 92: 32-37.
- [5] Kartush JM. Ossicular chain reconstruction. Capitu-lum to Malleus. OtolaryngolClin North Am. 1994; 27(4): 689-715.
- [6] Ahmed A, Sharma SC. Middle Ear Risk Index [MERI] as Prognostic Factor in Tympanomastoidectomy with Tympanoplasty. Madridge J Otorhinolaryngol. 2016; 1(1): 15-22. doi: 10.18689/mjol-1000103
- [7] Wasson JD, Papadimitriou CE, Pau H. Myringoplasty: impact of perforation size on closure and audiological improvement. J Laryngol Otol. 2009; 123: 973-977. doi: 10.1017/S0022215109004368
- [8] Pignataro L, Berta LGD, Capaccio P, Zaghis A. Myringoplasty in children: anatomical and functional results. J Laryngol Otol. 2001; 115: 369-373.
- [9] Holmquist I. The role of eustachian tube in the myringoplasty. ActaOtolaryngol (stockh). 1968; 66: 289.
- [10] VK Chadha Sample size determination in health studies, NT-I Bulletin, 2006, 42/3 and 4,55-56
- [11] Merchant SN, Wang PC, Jang CH, Glynn RJ, Rauch SD, McKenna MJ, et al. Efficacy of tympanomastoid surgery for control of infection in active COM. Laryngoscope. 1997;107:872-7.
- [12] Tos M. Late Results in Tympanoplasty. Staging the operation. ActaOto-Laryngologica. 1976;82(1):282-5.
- [13] Hirsch BE, Kamerer DB, Doshi S. Single Stage Management of Cholesteatoma. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1992;106(4):351-4.
- [14] Sheehy JL, Crabtree JA. Tympanoplasty. Staging the Operation. Laryngoscope. 1973;83(10):1594-621.
- [15] Shelton C, Sheehy JL. Tympanoplasty: Review of 400 Staged Cases. Laryngoscope. 1990;100(7):679-81.
- [16] Black B. Ossiculoplasty prognosis: the spite method of assessment. Am J Otol. 1992;13:544-51.
- [17] Albu S, Babighian G, Trabalzini F. Prognostic factors in tympanoplasty. The American Journal of otology. 1998;19:136-40.
- [18] Brackman DE, Sheehy JL, Luxford WM. TORPs and PORPs in tympanoplasty: a review of 1042 operations. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg. 1984;92:32-37.
- [19] Kartush JM. Ossicular chain reconstruction. Capitulum to Malleus. OtolaryngolClin North Am. 1994;27(4):689-715.
- [20] Wasson JD, Papadimitriou CE, Pau H. Myringoplasty: impact of perforation size on closure and audiological improvement. J Laryngol Otol. 2009;123:973-977.
- [21] Pignataro L, Berta LGD, Capaccio P, Zaghis A. Myringoplasty in children: anatomical and functional results. J Laryngol Otol. 2001;115:369-73.
- [22] Holmquist I. The role of eustachian tube in the myringoplasty. ActaOtolaryngol (stockh). 1968;66:289.
- [23] Chaudhari, A., A. Mankar, P. Deshmukh, and S. Agrawal. "Administration of Clonidin as Adjuvant to Infiltration Anaesthesia in Tympanoplasty Surgery." International Journal of Current Research and Review 12, no. 14 Special Issue (2020): 25–29. https://doi.org/10.31782/IJCRR.2020.2529.
- [24] Jain, S., S. Gaurkar, P.T. Deshmukh, M. Khatri, S. Kalambe, P. Lakhotia, D. Chandravanshi, and A. Disawal. "Applied Anatomy of Round Window and Adjacent Structures of Tympanum Related to Cochlear Implantation [AnatomiaAplicada Da Janela Redonda e EstruturasAdjacentesRelacionadasAoImplanteCoclear]." Brazilian Journal of Otorhinolaryngology 85, no. 4 (2019): 435–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjorl.2018.03.009.

- [25] Jain, S., S. Jungade, A. Ranjan, P. Singh, A. Panicker, C. Singh, and P. Bhalerao. "Revisiting 'Meniere's Disease' as 'Cervicogenic Endolymphatic Hydrops' and Other Vestibular and Cervicogenic Vertigo as 'Spectrum of Same Disease': A Novel Concept." Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12070-020-01974-y.
- [26] Jain, S., P. Singh, D. Methwani, and S. Kalambe. "Role of Eustachian Dysfunction and Primary Sclerotic Mastoid Pneumatisation Pattern in Aetiology of Squamous Chronic Otitis Media: A Correlative Study." Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery 71 (2019): 1190–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12070-018-1259-x.
- [27] Mahalle, S. "Osteoma of External Auditory Canal Associated with External Auditory Canal Cholesteatoma and Exuberant Granulation Tissue in Mastoid Air Cell System: A Rare Association." Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery 71 (2019): 1505–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12070-019-01643-9.