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#### Abstract

Dimension dynamics of incus plays a important role to achieve the best postoperative results in reconstruction of the ossicular chain but still their length adjustment may pose a problem clinically. Hence the present study is an attempt to identify all possible measurements of incus both parametric and non parametric so as to provide a vivid description for prosthesis manufacture. Clavaria of 30 cadavers were removed and the incuses were extracted of both the sides and their dimensions were measured from digital vernier calliper and weights were measured by digital analytical balance. All the datas were analyzed by medcalc software. The present datas were compared with the previous studies and a positive correlation was deduced between its various dimensions and its weight and angle and distance between the two processes. This study will give a new horizon for prosthesis designer and teaching the medical students about the basic structure of the middle ear as well as its related significance in Clinical Medicine and ENT.
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## Introduction

Incus replacement length during ossiculoplasty should be precise and perfect as it plays a major role in imparting optimal tension between tympanic membrane and malleus and stapes head. In excessive outward movement of tympanic membrane incus glides at the incudomalleolar joint instead of following the full malleolar movement thereby preventing the dislocation of base of stapes. Thus dimension dynamics of incus plays a important role to achieve the best
postoperative results in reconstruction of the ossicular chain. Though a variety of Partial ossicular replacement prosthesis (PORPS) and Total ossicular replacement prosthesis (TORPS) are available commercially but their length adjustment may pose a problem clinically. Hence the present study is an attempt to identify all possible measurements of incus both parametric and non parametric so as to provide a vivid description for prosthesis manufacture.
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## Material and Methods

Present study was performed in 30 human cadavers. The clavaria of skull was incised and brain was removed carefully according to Cunningham's manual of practical anatomy. The tegmen tympani was chipped off by using micro motor, chisel and hammer and the incus was removed and the dimensions were taken by digital vernier calliper with resolution of 0.01 mm . Weight was taken by digital analytical balance with the sensitivity of 0.01 mg . All the results which were obtained were analyzed using medcalc software i.e.
students $t$ test was used for comparing the parametric data(table no. 1) and chi square test (table no. 2) was used for non parametric datas. Regression equation was also calculated between the weight and different parameters and angle and distance between the two processes (table no. 3) The angle of incus was measured using sketch up pro 2014 software.
Incus:
$\mathrm{df}=$ short process, $\mathrm{de}=$ long process,, ef= width between the two process, D1- diameter of incus, $\mathrm{L}=$ lenticular process
index $=$ short process(df)/ long process(ef) X100


Fig 1
Incus with all dimensions and pedicled lenticular process (L)


Fig 2

long process with pedicled lenticular process and short process without a notch


## Fig 4

Difference in angles and pedicled lenticular processes in Fig 4A

Table1: Comparision of parametric data between right and left incus by $t$ test

| Variables | right incus |  | left incus |  | t-test | p-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mean | $\pm$ sd | mean | $\pm$ sd |  |  |
| Angle | 106.1 | 3.72 | 106.73 | 3.8 | 0.65 | 0.91 |
| Long_process__de(mm) | 6.58 | 0.45 | 6.54 | 0.44 | 0.37 | 0.86 |
| Diameter_of_body_D1(mm) | 2.77 | 0.31 | 2.61 | 0.33 | 2 | 0.78 |
| Incus_lenticular_process (L)(mm) | 0.79 | 0.14 | 0.78 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.79 |
| Weight(mg) | 26.66 | 1.46 | 26.91 | 1.27 | -0.72 | 0.47 |
| Index | 92.78 | 10.63 | 92.24 | 9.4 | 0.21 | 0.53 |
| Incus short_process_df_(mm) | 5.04 | 0.34 | 4.97 | 0.35 | 0.76 | 0.85 |
| Incus width_ef(mm) | 6.07 | 0.48 | 6 | 0.4 | 0.62 | 0.35 |

Table no. 2-Comparision of non parametric datas of right and left incus

| Parameters |  | Rt INCUS |  | Lt INCUS |  | Chi <br> square | P value | Contingency <br> coefficient |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Present | Absent | Present | Absent |  | 0.564 |  |
| SHORT <br> NOTCH | PROCESS | WITH | $6.7 \%$ | $93.3 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $96.7 \%$ | 14 | 0.0002 |

Table no. 4 (Regression equation between various dimension of incus and their respective weights)

| Variable |  | Coeff. Of <br> Determination $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ | P value | Regression equation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dependent(y) | Independent $(\mathrm{x})$ |  | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=9.8531+2.5523 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Rt incus Weight | Rt incus long process | 0.7757 | $<0.001$ | $\mathrm{y}=11.0353+2.4370 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Lt incus Weight | Lt incus long process | 0.1032 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=19.8064+1.3844 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Rt incus Weight | Rt incus short process | 0.01 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=25.0598+0.3832 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Lt incus Weight | Lt incus short process | 0.06471 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=23.3469+1.1946 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Rt incus wt | Rt incus diameter of body | 0.0001165 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=27.0758+-0.03956 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Lt incus wt | Lt incus diameter of body | 0.4397 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=65.3014+6.8421 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Rt incus angle | Rt incus width | 0.86 | $<0.0001$ | $\mathrm{y}=57.862+8.14 \mathrm{x}$ |
| Lt incus angle | Lt incus width |  |  |  |

(Rt -right,Lt -left , Coeff-coefficient)
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Graph no. 1- Difference between right and left incus


Rt - right, Lt- left

## Discussion

This study exemplifies an effort by the authors to provide a extensive revelation of measurement of the various parameters of the incus. The literature
available so far is devoid of wide observations even on the gross anatomy of the ossicles. Table no. 4 [1-13] and $5[2,14]$ depicts the comparison of the parameters with that of previous studies.

Table no 4: Comparision of metric values of incus

| Authors | De(mm) | Ef(mm) | Df(mm) | L(mm) | D1(mm) | Angle(o) | Wt(mg) | Index |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Padmini et al 2014 | 5.13 | 4.5 | 3.47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kamal et al 2010 | 6.674 | 6.01 | 5.043 |  |  | 74.342 | 26.3 |  |
| Natekar \& De Souza 2006 | 6.52 | 5.86 | 5.06 |  |  |  | 20.74 |  |
| Erdognan et al. 2002 | 6.5 | 6.1 | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aycan et al. 1990 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arensberg Et al, 1981 | 6.8 |  | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harneja \& Chaturvedi 1973 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angel (1972) | 6.8 |  | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harada(1972 |  |  | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arensberg \&nathan,1971 | 6.4 |  | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bouchet \& Giraut 1969 | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Masali 1968 | 6.4 |  | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heron (1923) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Present study | 6.545 | 5.97 | 5.465 | 0.79 | 2.69 | 106.335 | 26.79 | 92.51 |

$\mathrm{df}=$ short process, de= long process,, ef= width between the two process, D 1 - diameter of incus, $\mathrm{L}=$ lenticular process
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Table no 5: Comparision of non metric values with previous studies

| Parameters |  |  | Arsenberg <br> et al 971 | Whers et al 1999 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Present | $5.00 \%$ |  |  |
|  | absent | $95.00 \%$ | Noticed |  |
| Pedicled lenticular <br> process | present | $86.70 \%$ |  | Noticed absence of long <br> process |
|  | absent | $13.30 \%$ |  |  |

## Conclusion

The osteometric analysis of incus can prove to be a promising base to the otolaryngologist surgeons for implications in ossiculoplasty so as to regain the original mechanics. This study will also give a new horizon for teaching the medical students about the basic and detailed structure of the middle ear as well as its related significance in Clinical Medicine and ENT.
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