DYNAMIC POSTUROGRAPHY AS A TOOL FOR QUANTIFYING THE VISUAL, PROPRIOCEPTIVE AND VESTIBULAR CONTRIBUTIONS IN POSTURAL CONTROL

ريداند

Thesis
Submitted for partial fulfillment of doctor degree in otorhinolaryngology

54004

Presented by Ayman Mohamed EL-Kahky MB, BCh, MCh

6)7.51 A. M

Under the supervision of

Prof. Dr Mamdouh EL- Gouhary Prof. Of Otorhinolaryngology

Prof. Of Otorhinolaryngology Ain Shams University Hospital

Prof. Dr Herman Kingma
Prof. Of Vestibulogy
Maastricht University Hospital

Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University 1996

) By Ja. M. 35.



My Country My Teachers My Parents My Daughter My Friend God Bless Them All

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my deep thanks and gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Mandoh EL-Gohary**, Prof. of Oto-Rhino-Latyngology and Head of the Vestibulogy department, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University Hospital, Cairo, EGYPT, for giving me the privilege to work in this field under his supervision and fatherhood.

I am deeply indebted to **Prof. Dr. Herman Kingma**, Prof. of Vestibulogy and Head of the Vestibulogy department, Faculty of Medicine, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The NETHERLANDS, for his precious ideas, valuable guidance and supervision.

I also express my deepest appreciation to **Prof. Dr. J.J. Manni**, Prof. of Oto-Rhino-Latyngology & Head of the department, Faculty Medicine, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The NETHERLANDS for giving me the chance to do this work in his department and for his support and encouragement.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Miss Marlies Dolmans, Vestibular Analyst and Head of the Vestibular department personnel, Faculty Medicine, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The NETHERLANDS, for her valuable assistance, cooperation, support and encouragement.

I wish to express my deep thanks to Miss Anouk Brandts, Secretary of the Vestibular Department, Faculty Medicine, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The NETHERLANDS, for her cooperation and valuable help to start this work.

I would like to offer my deep gratitude to Iwan De Jong, Harrie Gulikers, and Ron Jongen, Computer programmers, Vestibular Department, Faculty Medicine, University of Limburg, Maastricht, The NETHERLANDS, for their great and indispensable assistance and friendly support.

Thanks to the Faculty of Medicine, University of Limburg, The Netherlands, for giving me the chance to do this work.

I am also very grateful to everyone who helped me throughout this work.

Ayman M. EL-Kahky



CONTENTS

Introduction and Aim of work	Page I
Subjects and Methods	13
Results	40
Discussion	81
Summary and Conclusion	90
Abstract	97
References	98
Appendixes Arabic Summary	



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Schema of balance function indicating the separate pathways of vestibulo-ocular (VOR) and vestibulo-spinal (VSR) reflexes.	Page 2
Figure 2. Sensory organization test: conditions 1 to 6.	3
Figure 3. The calculation of the equilibrium score in the Computerized dynamic posturography.	4
Figure 4. An example of the individual and composite equilibrium scores obtained from a normal sensory organization test.	4
Figure 5. The visual dependent pattern (left) and the visual preference with vestibular dysfunction pattern (right).	5
Figure 6. The results of the sensory organization test in seven patients with complaints of instability.	6
Figure 7. The equilibrium score of the sensory organization test of five normal individuals.	7
Figure 8. The score of body movement strategy in the computerized dynamic posturography.	10
Figure 9. Experimental set-up. Schematic representation of the signal processing.	15
Figure 10. Schematic drawing of the biomechanical model described by Winter (1979).	17
Figure 11. A schematic drawing of the experimental set-up.	20
Figures 12 to 18 display COG traces measured with different techniques .	21-26
Figure 19. The angle of body sway and the cone of stability theory.	27
Figures 20 to 23. Display COG traces measured with different techniques	27-30
Figure 24. A comparison between the measured BSV by the platform's force transducers and the video camera (Y-axis) versus time (X-axis) under static condition.	31
Figure 25. A comparison between the measured BSV by the platform's force transducers and the video camera (Y-axis) versus time (X-axis) under dynamic condition.	31
Figure 26. Display as is seen on the PC-monitor during data acquisition and analysis, using the IR-video tracking system.	32

iv



Figure 30 Body sway velocity (Y-axis) measured by the platform load sensors (first—trace), the angular rate sensor (second trace) and the video camera (third trace) versus time (X-axis) under dynamic condition. The fourth trace shows the angle of the platform around zero degree.	35
Figure 31. Schematic drawing of the experimental set-up.	36
Figures 32 to 34 Disturbance of the propriocepsis, the vision and propriocepsis and vision. An example of the graphs obtained from a subject recruited from group A.	40-41
Figures 35 to 39. Mean gain and S.D. (Y-axis) of the pseudo random moving platform at different sensory conditions (X-axis) of normal subjects, group A.	42-43
Figure 40. The minimal sensitivity of the postural system capabilities for misleading sensory information in normal subjects group A.	46
Figure 41. The minimal sensitivity of the postural system capabilities for misleading sensory information in normal subjects, group \mathbf{D} .	47
Figures 42 to 48. Reproducibility of the new method's results in normal subjects, groups B, C & D.	48-50
Figures 49 to 53 Dizzy subjects, group A1 Mean gain and S.D. (X-axis) of the pseudo random moving platform at different sensory conditions (Y-axis).	52-54
Figures 54 to 73. Dizzy subjects, groups A2, A3, B1, B2, C1 & C2. Mean gain and S.D. (X-axis) of the pseudo random moving platform at different sensory conditions (Y-axis).	Appendix A
Figures 74 & 75. The minimal sensitivity of the postural system capabilities for misleading sensory information in dizzy patients, group A1.	56-57
Figures 76 to 82. The minimal sensitivity of the postural system capabilities for misleading sensory information in dizzy patients, groups A2, A3, B1, B2, C1 & C2.	Appendix B
Figure 83. Reproducibility of the new method's results in six different sensory conditions (A-axis). Y-axis shows the mean of the pseudo-random gain (10 patients from group A1 and 11 patients from group C1).	61
Figure 85. Pie chart representing the new method results in normals compared to dizzy patients, group $A1$.	64
Figures 86 to 91. Pie charts representing the new method results in normals compared to dizzy patients, groups A2, A3, B1, B2, C1 and C2.	Appendix C
Figure 92. Head to trunk AV , to vertical AV , Hip AV and Ankle AV (Y-axis) versus time (X-axis).	65



Figures 93 to 98. Bar graphs show the mean of the Head to trunk AV and to vertical AV . Hip AV . Ankle AV and Hip to Ankle ato (Y axis) under different sensory conditions.	66-68
Figures 99 to 102. Normal subjects. Mean and S.D. (Y-axis) of the Head to trunk AV , Head to vertical AV , Hip AV and Ankle AV at different proprioceptive and/or visual sensory conditions (X-axis).	69-71
Figures 103 to 130. Dizzy patients from groups A1#, A2, A3#, B1, B2#, C1 & C2. Mean and S.D. (Y-axis) of the Head to trunk AV , Head to vertical AV . Hip AV and Ankle AV under different proprioceptive and/or visual sensory conditions (X-axis).	Appendix D
Figures 131 to 137, Normal subjects. Spearman correlation coefficients. Correlation of the pseudo-random gain under different sensory conditions with Ankle ^{AV} . Hip ^{AV} and Hip & Ankle ^{AV} .	77-79
Figures 137 to 186. Dizzy patients, groups A1#, A2, A3#, B1, B2#, C1 and C2. Spearman correlation coefficients. Correlation of the pseudorandom gain under different sensory conditions with $Ankle^{AV}$. Hip AV and Hip & $Ankle^{AV}$.	Appendix G

