

Cranioencephalic Topography of Sulcus Centralis by MRI

Dana Maria Albulescu¹, Dragoş Ovidiu Alexandru², Cristian Constantin³, Radu Stanescu¹, Adrian Camen⁴, Smaranda Adelina Preda⁵, Nina Ionovici⁶

¹Department of Anatomy, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania

²Department of Medical Informatics and Biostatistics, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania

³Department of Radiology, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania

⁴Department of Oro-Maxilo-Facial Surgery, University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania

⁵Research Assistant, Faculty Of Dental Medicine, University Of Medicine And Pharmacy Of Craiova, Romania

⁶Department of Occupational Medicine, University Of Medicine And Pharmacy Of Craiova, Romania

*Corresponding Author: Adrian Camen

Abstract: Cranioencephalic topography is useful for the neurosurgeons to locate different structures on the skull surface. The aim of this study is to ascertain a simplified algorithm to locate sulcus centralis. **MATERIALS AND METHODS:** we performed intrinsic cerebrometry and correlational cranio-cerebrometry on 228 RMN images, using CorelDraw 9 for image processing and IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 for statistical analysis. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS** data showed wide variation between absolute values, but constancy of relative values, with a slight, but distinct deviation of upper extremity of sulcus centralis towards occipital pole. In **CONCLUSIONS**, despite the fact that the only rigorous and definite way to locate projection of cortical sulci on calvaria external surface is medical imaging, we suggest an effective projection of upper extremity of sulcus centralis at a straight distance from Glabella representing 3/5 straight distance between Glabella and Inion. **KEYWORDS:** cranio cerebral topography, morphometry, sulcus centralis cerebri, topography techniques.

Date of Submission: 26-05-2018

Date Of Acceptance: 08-06-2018

I. Introduction

Cranio-cerebral topography is not just a simple scientific or didactical exercise. Encephalic neurosurgery is like „fishing in ice hole” and surgeons are constrained to firmly locate the lesion due to its narrow and stiff transcranial admittance.

The work on craniocerebral topography reported to date has used anatomical dissections in the skull as a study material¹⁻⁵; the results show differences of just a few millimeters between the different classic craniocerebral topography methods and the conclusion is that these methods maintain their usefulness and specificity in locating the different brain grooves.

Today, magnetic resonance imaging can offer another method of study of the cranio-cerebral topography, given the possibility of detailed analysis of the anatomical structures⁶.

The aim of this study is to simplify in an useful manner for the neurosurgeons this main cranioencephalic topography problem. In a previous work⁷, we studied the variability of the craniometrical points classified on geometric, topologic and local extreme invariants criteria. Now, we go further to study the variability vs. stability of the cranioencephalic points and, finally, to lay down as a rule an algorithm both simple and useful to locate the sulcus centralis (described by Rolando).

The classical anthropometrical methods were combined with new imagistic ones.

II. Material And Methods

Magnetic resonance imaging was obtained from the Radiology Department of the Craiova Emergency Clinical Hospital.

Out of 2238 RMN images from 540 subjects, we selected only 228 on the following criteria: a) no suspicion of pathological changes and b) an adequate position, so we can perform precise morphometry.

Measurements were performed on sagittal T1 weighted spin echo with a GE Healthcare Signa Explorer, 1.5 Tesla MRI machine.

Intrinsic cerebrometry:

1. Three cerebrometrical points were identified: F = frontal pole, i.e. anterior extremity of the cerebral hemisphere; O = occipital pole, i.e. posterior extremity of the cerebral hemisphere and C = upper extremity of the sulcus centralis (Fig. 1).
2. A standard cerebral triangle ΔFCO was defined as a peculiar object (fig. 1).
3. The sides of ΔFCO were measured; though dedicated soft (eFilm Lite™) was able to perform them easily, we choused the common image processor CorelDraw 9 OEM, taking into account that we will work out further mathematical steps.
4. Morphometrical data were processed with tabelar calculus soft Microsoft Excell (in Office 2003) and extreme values (minimum, maximum) were identified.
5. For each triangle, absolute values were converted in relative values, i.e. F-O side = 1 unit.
6. We performed statically processing of relative values: minimum, maximum, median and quartiles.

Correlational cranio-cerebrometry:

1. Craniometrical points G = Glabella and I = Inion were identified (Fig. 2).
2. C* point was defined, as vertical projection of C on skull surface; then, similarly:
3. Standard cranian triangle ΔGC^*I was defined as a peculiar object (fig. 2).
4. The sides of ΔGC^*I were measured using image processor CorelDraw 9 OEM.
5. Morphometrical data were processed and extreme values (minimum, maximum) were identified.
6. For each triangle, absolute values were converted in relative values, i.e. G-I side = 1 unit.
7. We performed similarly processing of relative values: minimum, maximum, median and quartiles.

Fig.1. Cerebrometrical points

Fig.2. Craniometrical points

Statistical analysis was performed using Microsoft Excel 2010 (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA, USA), together with the XLSTAT 2014 add-on for MS Excel (Addinsoft SARM, Paris, France), and IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA), for processing the data.

III. Results

Because the distributions of the data sets were not Gaussian we used non-parametric tests to compare the paired measurements.

First we compared the eccentricity indices of the cerebrometrical and cranio-cerebrometrical relative measurements (FC/CO versus GC*/C*I), to determine if the relative position of the upper extremity of the sulcus centralis and its projection on the skull surface are the same.

By comparing eccentricity index measured for the cerebrometrical and cranio-cerebrometrical measurements, we found there are statistically significant differences ($p < 0.05$), as proven by the Wilcoxon's signed-rank test for paired samples (Table 1, Fig. 3).

Table 1. Eccentricity index

Eccentricity index	Cerebrometrical measurements	Cranio-cerebrometrical measurements
Minimum	1.018	0.950
1 st quartile	1.107	1.049
Median	1.158	1.102
3 rd quartile	1.219	1.154
Maximum	1.372	1.413
p Wilcoxon=	0.008 < 0.05	

Fig.3. Eccentricity index – graphical representation

Because we observed a statistically significant difference we proceeded to compare the anterior and the posterior relative distances to the central sulcus upper extremity.

By comparing the anterior and posterior relative measurements for the upper extremity of the sulcus centralis, and it's vertical projection C on skull surface relative to the frontal - occipital poles distance or glabella-inion distance we found there are statistically significant differences for the posterior position ($p < 0.05$), and no significant differences for the anterior position ($p < 0.05$), as proven by the Wilcoxon's signed-rank test for paired samples (Table 2, Fig. 4, Table 3, Fig. 5).

Table 2. Anterior relative distance

Anterior relative distance	F – C	G – C*
Minimum	71.59%	71.16%
1 st quartile	77.71%	79.74%
Median	79.46%	81.01%
3 rd quartile	82.68%	84.35%
Maximum	86.27%	87.95%
p Wilcoxon=	0.345 >0.05	

Fig.4. Anterior relative distance – graphical representation

Table 3. Posterior relative distance

Posterior relative distance	C – O	C* – I
Minimum	61.38%	61.36%
1 st quartile	65.61%	69.70%
Median	68.21%	73.70%
3 rd quartile	70.67%	75.89%
Maximum	76.05%	81.12%
p Wilcoxon=	0.012 <0.05	

Fig.5. Posterior relative distance – graphical representation

Thus, we observed that the eccentricity indices are different mainly because of the posterior relative distances. This can be due to the inion position being lower than the projection of the occipital pole on the skull.

IV. Discussion

Our previous paper⁷ emphasised the constancy of those craniometrical points that we call geometrical bioinvariants (obvious changes of the osseous relief), as Glabella and Inion.

Cerebrometrical results analysis reveals a restricted variability, especially when those values are converted to relative ones. Eccentricity index showed a gentle, but distinct deviation of upper extremity of sulcus centralis towards occipital pole. To find exactly its projection is naively, but a suitable approximation is available when cerebrometrical measurements are correlated with craniometrical geometrical bioinvariants, i.e Glabella and Inion, as correlational cranio-cerebrometry proved.

Skull development is stimulated first by brain spread^{8,9} through dura mater^{10,11}. As brain spreads, skull sutures respond by desmal bone adding and skull adapt itself to growing brain. Interestingly, cell divisions take place not in the middle of the suture, but in the osteogenical front of bones¹²⁻¹⁴.

V. Conclusions

The only rigorous and definite way to locate projection of cortical sulci on calvaria external surface is medical imaging. Craniometrical points as Glabella and Inion are useful in proportional algorithms by approximation.

In case of necessity, we suggest an effective projection of upper extremity of sulcus centralis at a straight distance from Glabella representing 3/5 straight distance between Glabella and Inion, because the Inion position is usually lower than the projection of the occipital pole on the skull, thus approximating the position of the upper extremity of the sulcus centralis to a position that is lower than the real one.

References

- [1]. Broca P: Diagnostic d'un abcès situé au niveau de la région du langage; trepanation de cet abcès [in French]. Rev d'Anthrop **5**, 1876, p.244–248
- [2]. Reid RW: Observations on the relation of the principle fissures and convolutions of the cerebrum to the outer surface of the scalp. Lancet **2**, 1884, p.539–540
- [3]. Rhoton AL Jr: The cerebrum. Neurosurgery, **51**, 2002, p.S1–S51
- [4]. Poirier PJ: Topographie Cranio-Encéphalique [in French]. Paris, Lescrosnier et Babè, 1891.
- [5]. Reis CVC et al Comparative study of cranial topographic procedures: Broca's legacy toward practical brain surgery, Neurosurgery, **62**, 2008, p.294–310
- [6]. Otağ I, Tetiker H, Koşar MI, Otağ A, Atalar M, Çimen M. Central region morphometry in a child brain; Age and gender differences. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice, **17** (3), 2014, p.352-355

- [7]. Stănescu M.R., Iuliana Nicolescu, Dana Maria Albulescu, I. Mîndrilă, R. Stănescu. Variability of the craniometrical points: a topological point of view. *Revista Română de Anatomie funcțională și clinică, macro- și microscopică și de Antropologie*, **6(2)**: 2007, p.147-150.
- [8]. Baer M.G. Patterns of growth of the skull as revealed by vital staining. *Hum Biol.* **26(2)**, 1954, p.80-126.
- [9]. Moss M.L. Growth of the calvaria in the rat; the determination of osseous morphology. *Am J Anat.* **94(3)**, 1954, p.333-361.
- [10]. Kokich V.G.. The biology of sutures. In: Cohen MMJ , editor. *Craniosynostosis: diagnosis, evaluation, and management*. New York: Raven Press. 1986, p.81-103.
- [11]. Cohen M.M. *Craniosynostosis: diagnosis, evaluation, and management*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000, p.207-214
- [12]. Pritchard J.J., Scott J.H., Girgis F.G. The structure and development of cranial and facial sutures. *J Anat.* **90(1)**, 1956, p.73-86.
- [13]. Opperman L.A., Chhabra A., Nohen A.A., Bao Y., Ogle R.C. Dura mater maintains rat cranial sutures in vitro by regulating suture cell proliferation and collagen production. *J Craniofac Genet Dev Biol.* **18(3)**, 1998, p.150-8.
- [14]. Iseki S, Wilkie AO, Morriss-Kay GM. Fgfr1 and Fgfr2 have distinct differentiation- and proliferation-related roles in the developing mouse skull vault. *Development* **126**, 1999, p.5611-5620

Adrian Camen, "Cranioencephalic Topography Of Sulcus Centralis By Mri "IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS), vol. 17, no. 6, 2018, pp 94-97