

Accepted Manuscript

Preliminary results of Emergency CT guided Ventricular Drain Placement– Precision for the Most Difficult Cases

Andreas Nowacki, M.D., Franca Wagner, M.D., Nicole Söll, Arsany Hakim, M.D.,
Jürgen Beck, M.D., Andreas Raabe, M.D., Werner Z'Graggen, M.D.



PII: S1878-8750(18)30681-8

DOI: [10.1016/j.wneu.2018.03.199](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2018.03.199)

Reference: WNEU 7811

To appear in: *World Neurosurgery*

Received Date: 20 December 2017

Revised Date: 26 March 2018

Accepted Date: 27 March 2018

Please cite this article as: Nowacki A, Wagner F, Söll N, Hakim A, Beck J, Raabe A, Z`Graggen W, Preliminary results of Emergency CT guided Ventricular Drain Placement– Precision for the Most Difficult Cases, *World Neurosurgery* (2018), doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2018.03.199.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Preliminary results of Emergency CT guided Ventricular Drain**
2 **Placement– Precision for the Most Difficult Cases**

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Andreas Nowacki¹, M.D.

6 Franca Wagner², M.D.

7 Nicole Söll¹

8 Arsany Hakim², M.D.

9 Jürgen Beck¹, M.D.

10 Andreas Raabe¹, M.D.

11 Werner Z`Graggen¹, M.D.

12

13 **Affiliations:**

14 ¹Department of Neurosurgery, Inselspital, University Hospital Bern and University of
15 Bern, Bern, Switzerland

16 ²University Institute of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, Inselspital,
17 University Hospital Bern and University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

18

19 **Corresponding Author:**

20 Werner Z`Graggen,
21 Department of Neurosurgery,
22 Inselspital, University Hospital Bern, and University of Bern,
23 Bern, Switzerland

24 e-mail address: werner.zgraggen@insel.ch

25 Telephone number: +41 31 63 20014

26

27 **Key Words:** computed tomography, accuracy, computed tomography, external
28 ventricular drains

29

30 **Abbreviations:** cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), computed tomography dose index (CTDI),
31 confidence interval (CI), dose-length product (DLP), External ventricular drainage (EVD)

1 Introduction

2
3 External ventricular drainage (EVD) catheter placement belongs to the most commonly
4 performed neurosurgical procedures and allows to monitor intracranial pressure and to
5 drain cerebrospinal fluid in case of elevated intracranial pressure. Accuracy of catheter
6 placement and duration of insertion are two important factors, which determine the
7 success of this potentially life-saving procedure in emergency cases. Positions of the
8 EVD tip either in the ipsilateral frontal horn or in the third ventricle through the Foramen
9 Monroe are considered as optimal¹. Rates of up to 23 % of suboptimal placement have
10 been reported¹⁻³. Success rates strongly depend on ventricle width and presence of
11 midline shift¹. If more than one attempt for correct EVD placement is needed the risk of
12 complications like intracerebral haemorrhage, injury of eloquent brain areas and
13 iatrogenic infection increase significantly^{4,5}. Furthermore, the duration of EVD placement
14 increases too, which might have an influence on outcome.

15 EVD placement either can be accomplished in the operating room or in emergency
16 cases necessitating immediate action bedside in the emergency room or on the
17 intensive care unit. Apart from classical landmark-based freehand insertion, several
18 techniques have been described to improve accuracy and efficiency of EVD placement
19 including stereotactic frame-based or frameless navigational systems, endoscopically
20 assisted and ultrasound-guided techniques⁶⁻⁹. According to a recent meta-analysis
21 stereotactic and ultrasound-guided catheter insertions significantly improve accuracy of
22 placement compared to the freehand technique⁹. However, these techniques are
23 elaborate and mostly restricted to application within the operating room. As an
24 alternative to freehand landmark-based catheter insertion outside of the operating room
25 CT-guided approaches have been described^{10,11}. The objective of the current work was
26 to present an easy and reliable CT-guided approach for placement of bolt-kit EVD and to
27 compare accuracy, expenditure of time, cumulative radiation dose as well as
28 complication rates with conventional landmark-based insertions.

29

30

1 **Materials and Methods**

3 **Patients**

4 This is a single-center retrospective case-control study of patients who underwent
5 emergency EVD placement in our department from January 2013 to December 2016.
6 The institutional review board and the local ethics committee gave approval for the
7 access and use of the data collective with the intention for retrospective clinical
8 research. Only patients aged >18 years who underwent placement of the EVD
9 immediately subsequent to the emergency CT scan (128-slice scanner; Somatom
10 Definition Edge, Siemens Healthcare, Erlangen, Germany) bedded on the CT
11 examination table were selected. Two patient groups were compared:

12 A) Patients who had the EVD implanted by freehand technique according to anatomical
13 landmarks from January 2013 to May 2015. These patients served as the control group.

14 B) Patients who underwent CT-navigated bolt-kit EVD placement from May 2015 to
15 December 2016.

16 Patients' charts, microbiology reports and hospital databases were reviewed. Exclusion
17 criteria were incomplete data precluding outcome analysis and missing informed
18 consent. Both groups were analysed for differences with respect to clinical
19 characteristics including age and sex and the underlying clinical pathology necessitating
20 EVD implantation.

22 **EVD placement**

23 Patients in both cohorts were operated by junior residents of the neuro intensive care
24 unit who were usually in their 3rd to 5th year of training. All procedures were supervised
25 by the senior author (WZG). In all patients a bolt-kit silver-bearing EVD catheter system
26 (Silverline-Bolt-Kit-catheter®; Spiegelberg GmbH & Co. KG; Hamburg, Germany) was
27 implanted. For skin preparation povidine-iodine (Betadine®, Mundipharma, Basel,
28 Switzerland) and surgical drapes were used. A skin incision of approximately 5 mm was
29 done at the site of the planned burr-hole trephination. The burr-hole was drilled with a
30 manually operated twist drill. After the dura was perforated the bolt-kit system was
31 screwed in the skull and the EVD was inserted. After successful placement the probe
32 was fixed with the bolt screw.

1

2 Landmark-based freehand EVD placement

3 The Kocher`s point of the non-dominant side was chosen as entrance point. In cases of
4 left-sided pathology, right-sided skull fractures or preceding right-sided craniotomy the
5 left side was chosen. After burr-hole trephination the bolt was fixed with its trajectory
6 aiming at the contralateral medial canthus in coronal plane and 1 cm anterior to the
7 tragus in the anterior-posterior plane according to previous work by Raabe and co-
8 workers¹². Then, the EVD catheter was inserted. Insertion depth was typically no more
9 than 5.5 to 6 cm. If no CSF could be extracted, a CT scan was performed to document
10 catheter position. In case of incorrect placement, the catheter was removed. The
11 surgeon undertook a second freehand placement with a different angulation of the bolt
12 and re-inserted the catheter. This procedure was repeated until the catheter was
13 successfully placed and CSF could be drained. In all cases, an immediate postoperative
14 CT scan was performed, to rule out complications and to assess correct catheter
15 placement.

16

17 CT bolt scan-guided EVD placement

18 The entrance point was chosen as described above. After drilling the burr hole the bolt
19 was superficially screwed into the skull with the same trajectory as described above. An
20 immediate CT bolt scan was performed before the insertion of the ventricular catheter to
21 check its putative trajectory: to reduce the radiation dose, the CT scan only covered the
22 rostral part of the skull including the bolt down to the beginning of the third ventricle. This
23 typically leads to a reduction of the dose length product to 440 mGycm compared to a
24 standard head CT scan (~690 mGycm). The CT data set was immediately reconstructed
25 along the trajectory of the bolt. During this procedure, that usually lasted only 2-3
26 minutes, the patient stayed on the CT table with drapings in situ. If the axis of the bolt
27 did not point towards the ipsilateral ventricle, the angulation of the bolt was adapted.
28 Therefore, the surgeon removed the bolt and reinserted it, again, only superficially with
29 the corrected angulation in order to counterbalance the deviation seen in the
30 reconstructed CT. For instance, if the putative trajectory of the bolt pointed lateral to the
31 ipsilateral frontal horn, the surgeon reangulated the bolt with the tip pointing more medial
32 (Figure 1). A second CT scan was performed to check the new trajectory. This

1 procedure was repeated until the correct bolt angulation was found. Only in this case,
2 the bolt was screwed firmly into the skull and the catheter was inserted. A final
3 postoperative CT scan was performed to assess correct catheter placement.

6 **Determination of radiation exposure**

7 The total number of CT scans (including the pre- and postoperative scans) as well as
8 the cumulative radiation exposure were documented for each patient. The cumulative
9 radiation dose was determined as the sum of the dose-length product of each CT scan:

$$11 \quad \text{DLP} = \text{CTDI}_{\text{VOL}} * nT \quad (1)$$

12
13 with CTDI = computed tomography dose index and nT = product of the number of slices
14 and slice thickness.

15
16 To calculate the effective dose (E) a conversion factor of 0.0021 for the head was
17 applied according to Shrimpton et al.¹³:

$$19 \quad \text{E} = \text{DLP} * 0.0021 \quad (2)$$

21 **Assessment of ventricular configuration and of midline shift**

22 The width of the lateral ventricles was determined on the preoperative CT scan. It was
23 defined as the maximum diameter of the ipsilateral frontal horn measured perpendicular
24 to the frontal horn's axis. Midline shift was measured as the maximum deviation of the
25 septum pellucidum from the midline.

27 **Primary and secondary outcome measures**

28 The primary endpoint was the contingency analysis of correct EVD placements in the
29 ipsilateral frontal horn documented on the postoperative CT scan between the two
30 groups. EVD placement was considered correct, when the catheter tip was placed within
31 the *ipsilateral* frontal horn of the ventricle *or* passed through the foramen of Monro

1 according to Wilson et al.⁹ Placement was considered inaccurate, if the catheter was
2 placed in the contralateral ventricle or outside the ventricular system.

3 Secondary endpoints were the between-groups differences of the number of EVD
4 insertions during the entire procedure, the duration of the intervention, the number of CT
5 scans performed, the mean dose length product as well as an analysis of combined
6 infection parameters according to Fichtner et al.¹⁴ and procedural haemorrhages.

7

8 **Statistical analysis**

9 Data were analysed with descriptive/parametric statistics using Prism software
10 (GraphPad Prism 6, USA). The Shapiro-Wilk normality test was used to test for normal
11 distribution of data sets. The Mann-Whitney-U test was applied to test for significant
12 differences of metric variables between the two groups. Data are presented as mean \pm
13 standard deviation (SD) or mean \pm 95% confidence interval (CI) if not otherwise
14 indicated. The two-sided Fisher exact-test was applied for contingency analysis. A p-
15 value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

16

1 Results

3 Patients' baseline clinical and radiological characteristics

4 34 patients fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were enrolled in the final analysis. 15
5 underwent CT-guided bolt-kit EVD implantation and 19 conventional landmark-based
6 insertion. Baseline clinical and radiological characteristics of the two groups are shown
7 in Table 1. Both groups were well matched for sex, age and underlying pathology
8 necessitating EVD placement. In the CT-guided EVD implantation group the mean
9 preoperative ventricular width was significantly smaller and the mean preoperative
10 midline shift was significantly higher compared to the control group (Table 1).

12 Position of EVD tip

13 Contingency analysis of correct EVD tip position showed statistically significant
14 differences between both groups. 15 out of 15 (100 %) CT-guided implanted EVDs were
15 placed within the ipsilateral frontal horn compared to 12 out of 19 (63%) landmark based
16 inserted EVDs ($p=0.01$, Fisher's exact test). The odds for correct EVD placement was
17 18.6 (0.96 – 358.5 95% CI) for CT bolt scan-guidance. When taking into account all
18 attempts including attempts of reinsertion after unsuccessful placement, contingency
19 analysis showed also significant differences between both groups. 15 out of 22 (68%)
20 CT-guided implanted EVDs were placed within the ipsilateral frontal horn compared to
21 12 out of 33 (36%) landmark based inserted EVDs ($p=0.03$, Fisher's exact test).

22 CT bolt-scan-guidance allowed successful EVD placement with the tip in the frontal horn
23 of the ipsilateral ventricle even in cases with slit ventricles or midline shift (Figure 2):
24 EVD was placed correctly in 5 patients having slit ventricles with a frontal horn diameter
25 of less than 3 mm and in 4 patients who had marked midline shift between 5 mm to 13.1
26 mm.

28 Secondary outcome parameter

29 Table 2 summarizes secondary outcome measures. Mean insertion time for definitive
30 EVD catheter placement did not differ between groups (Table 2). Application of CT bolt-
31 scan guidance reduced the number of unsuccessful EVD placement attempts. Up to 7
32 attempts (unsuccessful EVD placement without CSF drainage) were necessary for

1 correct catheter placement in the freehand group. In 11 of 15 (73 %) patients the
2 catheter was successfully placed at the first attempt in the CT-guided group compared to
3 9 of 19 (47 %) patients in the control group ($p=0.17$, Fisher`s exact test). It is
4 noteworthy, that EVD misplacement within our series of patients undergoing CT bolt
5 scan-guided EVD insertion mainly occurred in the first 3 patients while in 11 of the 12
6 consecutive patients (91.6%), EVD was correctly placed at the first attempt (Figure 3).
7 The overall number of CT scans performed during the entire procedure and the
8 cumulative radiation dose was significantly higher in the CT-guided group compared to
9 the freehand group ($p=0.0001$, Wilcoxon signed rank test). Within the freehand control
10 group, one patient needed 8 CT scans after each attempt due to misplacement until the
11 catheter was definitively placed correctly and fixed.
12 In both groups one patient was diagnosed a postoperative catheter infection (infection
13 rate of 6.6 % in the CT-guided group and 5.2 % in the control group). A small
14 postoperative subdural hematoma without compressive effect was diagnosed in the CT-
15 guided group with no need for surgical evacuation.
16

1 Discussion

2
3 Our results demonstrate that CT bolt scan-guidance for EVD placement is accurate and
4 successful even in very difficult cases of slit ventricles and marked midline shift
5 deforming normal ventricular anatomy. In our series of 15 patients, all EVDs were
6 correctly placed within the ipsilateral frontal horn whereas 37% of EVDs in the control
7 group were misplaced. Application of the CT-guided approach did neither increase
8 operation time nor postoperative complication rate. The increased success rate of
9 correct catheter placement was at the expense of a higher radiation exposure of
10 patients, higher costs and needed a short learning curve.

11 The rate of 37% misplaced EVD catheters in the control group is in line with previous
12 studies. Two retrospective studies involving 346 and 98 patients undergoing bedside
13 ventriculostomy with freehand insertion reported optimal catheter placement in 77% and
14 56.1% of patients^{1,2}. Recently, an analysis was conducted to re-examine the landmarks
15 and rules to determine the entry point and trajectory with the best hit rate for freehand
16 insertion. The authors found only a few entry points and trajectories, which were
17 associated with a chance greater than 80% to hit the ipsilateral frontal horn and did not
18 recommend the ipsilateral medial canthus as a landmark for latero-medial angulation¹².

19 Application of our CT-guided EVD placement approach led to 100% correctly placed
20 catheters. The success rate of correct catheter placement after the first attempt was
21 78% when considering the whole cohort and rose up to 92.6% after the first three
22 patients. Previous studies have already proposed numerous assisted methods to guide
23 and improve accuracy of ventricular catheter placement. Application of stereotactic
24 neuro-navigation for ventricular-peritoneal shunt implantation in the operating room
25 reduced the malposition rate to 1.4% in a series of 70 patients⁷. Furthermore, Stieglitz et
26 al. published a pilot study presenting a frameless neuronavigational tool for ventricular
27 catheter placement and demonstrated successful placement in a series of 4 patients⁸.
28 Wilson et al. compared ventricular catheter placement using freehand technique,
29 ultrasonic guidance and stereotactic neuro-navigation in a retrospective cohort study of
30 249 patients. According to their results, application of ultrasound guidance and
31 stereotactic neuro-navigation significantly improved accuracy of placement: whereas
32 55% catheters were correctly placed in the freehand cohort, 88% and 89% accuracy

1 were achieved by applying ultrasound guidance and stereotactic neuro-navigation
2 respectively¹⁵. The three cited studies analysed ventricular peritoneal shunt implantation
3 in the operating room and, thus, results can hardly be compared to our series of patients
4 undergoing EVD catheter placement in emergency situations. However, it is noteworthy,
5 that the reported success rates of correctly placed catheters is comparable to our series
6 of patients undergoing CT-guided EVD placement.

7 Considering assisted EVD placement, Mahan et al. published a series of 35 patients
8 who underwent MRI-navigated EVD placement on the intensive care unit. Application of
9 this approach led to correctly placed catheters within the ipsilateral frontal horn in 33
10 patients which corresponds to a success rate of 94.3%⁶. Average duration of the
11 procedure was reported to be 2h 32 min⁶ compared to 41 min in our series of patients.
12 EVD placement under live fluoroscopic control has further been demonstrated in series
13 of 5 patients by Fiorella and co-workers¹⁰. According to the authors` results, all catheters
14 were correctly placed within the ipsilateral frontal horn requiring a single pass with no
15 observed complications. However, implantation occurred in the neuroangiography suite
16 and depended on a flat detector CT. Taken together, previous studies have already
17 demonstrated that application of assisted techniques for ventricular catheter placement
18 in general leads to a higher success rate of correct placement. However, the assisted
19 techniques for ventricular catheter placement proposed by most of the previously
20 presented studies increase procedural time and mostly depend on sophisticated
21 neuronavigational equipment and thus, seem inappropriate in cases in which emergency
22 EVD placement is required.

23 To facilitate and increase the accuracy of EVD placement, other devices exist such as
24 the Thomale guide¹⁶. This device is placed on the skull after drilling a burrhole and is
25 supposed to guarantee a right angle in the sagittal plane, whereas in the coronal plane
26 an individual angle can be set with an angle adjustment according to the ventricular
27 anatomy based on the CT scan¹⁷. Instead of adapting the bolt until it has the right
28 angulation to point to the ipsilateral frontal horn, one single CT scan with the Thomale-
29 guide attached to the skull could be sufficient to calculate and accordingly adjust the
30 necessary angulation for correct placement. If this leads to a further increase of
31 precision with a concomitant decrease in the number of needed CT scans, needs to be
32 addressed in future studies.

1 Our study has some limitations. First, we compared the results of our CT-guided
2 approach with patients undergoing anatomical landmark-based EVD implantation within
3 the CT unit serving as the control cohort. The smaller ventricles and more pronounced
4 midline shift in the CT-guided group could point to a selection bias. It is therefore
5 important to emphasize, that the CT-guided approach was exclusively used after the first
6 successful attempt in May 2015. The retrospective study design that included only
7 patients within our CT unit was chosen, as it enabled an analysis of the exact number of
8 misplaced drains and insertion attempts as well as the time of the procedure. These
9 parameters were not systematically documented in our patients` charts undergoing
10 freehand EVD implantation outside the CT unit or operating room and could not have
11 been reliably analysed in these patients. It might be argued that our controls are already
12 selected cases who were implanted under special conditions within the CT unit and,
13 thus, do not constitute a generalizable control cohort for freehand implantation.
14 However, the success rate of correctly placed catheters in our freehand group
15 corresponds to that reported in the literature. Second, our results might not be
16 generalizable to a broader population due to the small sample size and missing
17 predetermined criteria of which patients are suitable for CT bolt scan-guided EVD
18 implantation. Third, the proposed method depends on the use of a bolt-kit EVD system
19 with a bolt type, which can be reliably detected with CT imaging.

20

21

22 **Conclusions**

23

24 CT bolt scan-guided EVD placement leads to accurate catheter placement even in the
25 most difficult cases. Its safe, quick and easy application makes it an appropriate
26 operative technique for patients with difficult ventricular anatomy.

27

28

1

2 **Literature**

3

- 4 1. Kakarla UK, Kim LJ, Chang SW, *et al.* Safety and accuracy of bedside external ventricular drain
5 placement. *Neurosurgery*. 2008;63;ONS162-166; discussion ONS166-167.
- 6 2. Huyette DR, Turnbow BJ, Kaufman C, *et al.* Accuracy of the freehand pass technique for
7 ventriculostomy catheter placement: retrospective assessment using computed tomography
8 scans. *Journal of neurosurgery*. 2008;108;88-91.
- 9 3. Krombach G, Ganser A, Fricke C, *et al.* Virtual placement of frontal ventricular catheters using
10 frameless neuronavigation: an "unbloody training" for young neurosurgeons. *Minimally invasive
11 neurosurgery : MIN*. 2000;43;171-175.
- 12 4. Bauer DF, Razdan SN, Bartolucci AA, *et al.* Meta-analysis of hemorrhagic complications from
13 ventriculostomy placement by neurosurgeons. *Neurosurgery*. 2011;69;255-260.
- 14 5. Binz DD, Toussaint LG, 3rd, Friedman JA. Hemorrhagic complications of ventriculostomy
15 placement: a meta-analysis. *Neurocritical care*. 2009;10;253-256.
- 16 6. Mahan M, Spetzler RF, Nakaji P. Electromagnetic stereotactic navigation for external ventricular
17 drain placement in the intensive care unit. *Journal of clinical neuroscience : official journal of the
18 Neurosurgical Society of Australasia*. 2013;20;1718-1722.
- 19 7. Sampath R, Wadhwa R, Tawfik T, *et al.* Stereotactic placement of ventricular catheters: does it
20 affect proximal malfunction rates? *Stereotactic and functional neurosurgery*. 2012;90;97-103.
- 21 8. Stieglitz LH, Giordano M, Samii M, *et al.* A new tool for frameless stereotactic placement of
22 ventricular catheters. *Neurosurgery*. 2010;67;ons131-135; discussion ons135.
- 23 9. Wilson TJ, Stetler WR, Jr., Al-Holou WN, *et al.* Comparison of the accuracy of ventricular catheter
24 placement using freehand placement, ultrasonic guidance, and stereotactic neuronavigation.
25 *Journal of neurosurgery*. 2013;119;66-70.
- 26 10. Fiorella D, Peeling L, Denice CM, *et al.* Integrated flat detector CT and live fluoroscopic-guided
27 external ventricular drain placement within the neuroangiography suite. *Journal of
28 neurointerventional surgery*. 2014;6;457-460.
- 29 11. Gautschi OP, Smoll NR, Kotowski M, *et al.* Non-assisted versus neuro-navigated and XperCT-
30 guided external ventricular catheter placement: a comparative cadaver study. *Acta
31 neurochirurgica*. 2014;156;777-785; discussion 785.
- 32 12. Raabe C, Fichtner J, Beck J, *et al.* Revisiting the rules for freehand ventriculostomy: a virtual
33 reality analysis. *Journal of neurosurgery*. 2017;1-8.
- 34 13. Shrimpton PC, Hillier MC, Lewis MA, *et al.* National survey of doses from CT in the UK: 2003. *The
35 British journal of radiology*. 2006;79;968-980.
- 36 14. Fichtner J, Jilch A, Stieglitz LH, *et al.* Infection rate of emergency bolt-kit vs. non-emergency
37 conventional implanted silver bearing external ventricular drainage catheters. *Clinical neurology
38 and neurosurgery*. 2014;122;70-76.
- 39 15. Wilson TJ, McCoy KE, Al-Holou WN, *et al.* Comparison of the accuracy and proximal shunt failure
40 rate of freehand placement versus intraoperative guidance in parietooccipital ventricular
41 catheter placement. *Neurosurgical focus*. 2016;41;E10.
- 42 16. Schaumann A, Thomale UW. Guided Application of Ventricular Catheters (GAVCA)--multicentre
43 study to compare the ventricular catheter position after use of a catheter guide versus freehand
44 application: study protocol for a randomised trial. *Trials*. 2013;14;428.

- 1 17. Thomale UW, Schaumann A, Stockhammer F, *et al.* GAVCA Study: Randomized, Multicenter Trial
2 to Evaluate the Quality of Ventricular Catheter Placement with a Mobile Health Assisted
3 Guidance Technique. *Neurosurgery*. 2017

4

5

6

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

1 **Figure Legends:**

2

3 **Figure 1:** Bolt CT-target scanning for correct EVD placement. After slight fixation of the
4 bolt a first CT scan was performed (A). Its angulation was further adapted to point to the
5 ipsilateral frontal horn and right angulation was confirmed by a second CT scan before
6 the catheter was inserted (B).

7

8 **Figure 2:** CT-guided EVD placement in a patient with slit ventricles (A-C) and another
9 patient showing extreme midline shift (D-F): A preoperative CT scan (A,D) was routinely
10 performed. After bolt fixation, a second CT was reconstructed along the axis of the bolt
11 (B,E). When the bolt's axis pointed towards the ipsilateral ventricle, the catheter was
12 inserted. A postoperative CT scan (C,F) served to document correct EVD placement and
13 rule out complications.

14

15 **Figure 3:** Learning curve of CT-guided EVD placements. Two to three attempts for
16 correct final EVD placement in the ipsilateral frontal horn were necessary in the first
17 three patients of our series. In the following 12 patients, only one attempt for correct
18 EVD placement was necessary.


19

| | Landmark-based insertion | CT-guided insertion | p-value |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Sex | | | |
| - male | 13 (68%) | 8 (53%) | 0.48 [~] |
| - female | 6 (32 %) | 7 (47 %) | |
| Age (years) | 53 ± 18 | 46 ± 15 | 0.18 [§] |
| Underlying pathology: | | | |
| - intracerebral haemorrhage | 3 (16%) | 3 (20%) | |
| - traumatic brain injury | 11 (58%) | 8 (53%) | |
| - subarachnoid hemorrhage | 1 (5%) | 2 (13%) | |
| - other | 4 (21%) | 2 (14%) | |
| Ventricular width (mm) | 8.8 ± 6.1 (5.8 – 11.8) | 5.2 ± 3.4 (3.2 – 7.1) | 0.04 [§] |
| Midline shift due to mass lesion (mm) | 0.8 ± 1.7 (0.01 – 1.7) | 3.7 ± 4.0 (1.5 – 6.0) | 0.01 [§] |


Table 1: Baseline clinical and radiological characteristics. Data are given as mean ± SD, and 95%-CI (in brackets), statistical testing based on Fisher exact test[~] and on Mann-Whitney-U test[§]


| | Landmark-based insertion | CT-guided insertion | p-value |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| number of attempts for final catheter placement | 1.7 ± 1.7 (range 1-7) | 1.4 ± 0.74 (range 1-3) | 0.98 [~] |
| correct placement after 1 st . attempt | 9 of 19 (47%) | 11 of 15 (73%) | 0.17 [~] |
| mean insertion time (min) | 35:54 (± 16:42) | 41:43 (± 16:01) | 0.22 [§] |
| number of CT scans | 1.84 ± 2.0 (range 1-8) | 3.6 ± 1.9 (range 2-8) | 0.0001[§] |
| cumulative dose length product (mGycm) and effective dose (mSv) | 738.4 ± 790.2 1.55 ± 1.66 | 1595 ± 766 3.34 ± 1.61 | <0.0001[§] |
| Infection rate | 1 of 19 (5.2%) | 1 of 15 (6.6%) | 1.0 [~] |
| Procedural hemorrhage | 0 of 19 (0%) | 1 of 15 (6.6%) | 0.44 [~] |

Table 2: Secondary outcome measures (attempts, correct placement after first insertion, insertion time, number of CT scans, dose length product, postoperative ventriculitis) between both groups *(statistical testing based on Fisher exact test[~] and on Mann-Whitney-U test[§]).



ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT





ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Highlights

- CT bolt scan-guided approach is based on a dose reduced CT scan after bolt fixation
- immediate image reconstruction along the axis of the bolt to evaluate the putative insertion axis
- CT-guided bolt-kit EVD catheter placement is feasible and accurate in the most difficult cases

Disclosure- Conflict of interest:

The authors did not receive any financial support for the following study. There are no conflicts of interest to be declared.

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT