Vestibular Schwannoma Gamma Knife radiosurgery

- Producing high quality cranial SRS plans with 4Pi planning technique in a commercial clinical solution
- Tumor-targeted Gamma Knife radiosurgery in patients with trigeminal neuralgia secondary to benign tumors
- Impact of Vestibular Schwannoma Management on Cochlear Implant Programming and Outcomes
- Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guidelines Update for the Role of Imaging in the Management of Patients With Vestibular Schwannomas
- Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guideline on Hearing Preservation Outcomes in Patients With Sporadic Vestibular Schwannoma: Update
- Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guideline on the Role of Radiosurgery (Stereotactic Radiosurgery) and Radiation Therapy in the Management of Patients With Vestibular Schwannomas: Updates
- Congress of Neurological Surgeons Systematic Review and Evidence-Based Guideline on Surgical Resection for the Treatment of Patients With Vestibular Schwannomas: Update
- Vestibular Schwannoma in Pregnancy: When Case Reports Become Clinical Compass

---

Gamma Knife radiosurgery is a precise, non-invasive treatment option for **vestibular schwannoma** (acoustic neuroma). It delivers focused radiation to the tumor without the need for an incision, making it an attractive alternative for patients with small to medium-sized tumors who prefer to avoid traditional surgery. Gamma Knife treatment aims to stop tumor growth and preserve nearby nerve functions.

Indications for Gamma Knife Radiosurgery

Gamma Knife radiosurgery is typically recommended for patients who:

- Have **small to medium-sized vestibular schwannomas** (usually < 3 cm in diameter).
- Have **mild symptoms** or minimal functional impact but wish to prevent further growth.
- Are not ideal candidates for traditional surgery due to **medical conditions** or patient preference.
- Have undergone prior surgery but need treatment for a **residual or recurring tumor**.

Procedure Overview

1. Preparation and Imaging

1. High-resolution MRI with contrast is used to precisely locate and map the tumor.

2. A **stereotactic frame** is attached to the patient’s head to ensure stability and accuracy during treatment.
3. The treatment team, including neurosurgeons, radiation oncologists, and physicists, creates a tailored plan based on the MRI images.

2. Radiation Delivery

1. The Gamma Knife machine delivers multiple beams of highly focused gamma radiation that converge at the tumor site.
2. Each beam is weak on its own but, combined at the tumor site, delivers a potent dose to stop tumor cells from dividing.
3. The procedure is typically completed in a **single session** lasting between 30 minutes and 2 hours.

3. Post-Treatment

1. Unlike traditional surgery, there is no incision, and recovery time is minimal.
2. Patients usually leave the hospital the same day and can often resume regular activities within 24-48 hours.

Benefits of Gamma Knife Radiosurgery

- **Minimally Invasive**: No incision or general anesthesia is required.
- **High Precision**: The stereotactic frame and advanced imaging allow for precise targeting, minimizing damage to surrounding healthy tissues.
- **Hearing and Facial Nerve Preservation**: The procedure often preserves hearing and facial nerve function, depending on tumor size and location.
- **Single-Day Treatment**: The entire procedure is usually completed in one session.

Risks and Side Effects

While Gamma Knife radiosurgery is generally safe, potential side effects include:

- **Hearing Loss**: There may be gradual hearing decline in some cases.
- **Balance Issues**: Temporary dizziness or balance problems may occur.
- **Facial Nerve Effects**: Rarely, patients experience facial numbness or weakness.
- **Delayed Effects**: Radiation necrosis or swelling may occur months or even years after treatment.

Follow-Up and Monitoring

1. Following treatment, regular MRI scans are conducted to monitor the tumor for any changes.
2. Additional assessments for hearing, balance, and facial nerve function help detect any delayed

side effects.

Outcomes and Prognosis

Gamma Knife radiosurgery offers high rates of success in controlling vestibular schwannoma growth, with most patients achieving effective long-term tumor control. Many can expect to maintain quality of life with minimal interruption to daily activities and a high likelihood of preserving hearing and facial nerve function.

The use of stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS) expanded to include the treatment of vestibular schwannomas (VSs) in 1969; since then, efforts to increase tumour control and to reduce cranial neuropathy have continued. Using the currently recommended marginal dose of 12-13 Gy, long-term reported outcomes after SRS include not only excellent tumour control rates of 92-100 % but also outstanding functional preservation of the trigeminal nerve and facial nerves, with values of 92-100 % and 94-100 %, respectively. Nonetheless, hearing preservation remains in the range of 32-81 %. Previous studies have suggested possible prognostic factors of hearing preservation such as the Gardner Robertson scale grade, radiation dose to the cochlea, transient volume expansion (TVE) after SRS, length of irradiated cochlear nerve, marginal dose to the tumour, and age [1).].

It is a safe and effective treatment for patients with small to moderately sized vestibular schwannomas (VSs). Reports of stereotactic radiosurgery for large VSs have demonstrated worse tumor control and preservation of neurological function.

After the treatment, the tumor typically react with a transient increase of tumor volume owed to tumor swelling at about 6 months followed by a reduction of tumor volume owed to tumor shrinkage at about 18 months [2)].

Because functional outcome is important, particularly regarding the facial nerve, a policy of near-total surgical resection of a large-size VS has emerged, minimizing damage to the facial nerve. The debate remains whether the surgical remnant should be treated immediately or after established growth.

Initial observation after near total surgical removal of VS is a feasible strategy, with only a minority requiring salvage radiosurgery during follow-up [3)].

Gamma knife surgery (GKS) for vestibular schwannomas (VS) has a long-term clinical and scientific track record. After a period of de-escalation of dose prescription, results show a high rate of tumor control with improvement of clinical outcome (less than 1% facial palsy, 50-70% hearing preservation). Régis et al. (J Neurosurg 2013;119 Suppl.:105-11) suggested recently that proactive GKS management in intracanalicular tumors is better than a « wait and see » strategy when hearing is still useful at the time of diagnosis.

Although early short-term follow-up reports suggest that fractionation yields hearing preservation rates equivalent to modern single-dose SRS techniques, significant questions remain regarding long-term tumor control after the use of fractionation in a late responding tumor with a low proliferative index and α/β ratio. With single-dose SRS, critical hearing preservation variables include:

1) strict attention to prescription dose 3D conformality so that the ventral cochlear nucleus (VCN) receives ≤ 9 Gy;

2) careful delineation of the 3D tumor margin to exclude the cochlear nerve when visualizable with contrast-enhanced T2-weighted MR volumetric imaging techniques and exclusion the dura mater of the anterior border of the internal auditory canal;

3) a tumor margin dose prescription ≤ 12 Gy;

4) optimization of the tumor treatment gradient index without sacrificing coverage and conformality;

5) strict attention to prescription dose 3D conformality so that the modiolus and the basal turn of the cochlea receive the lowest possible dose (ideally < 4-5.33 Gy). Testable correlates for the relative importance of the VCN versus cochlear dose given the tonotopic organization of each structure suggests that VCN toxicity should lead to preferential loss of low hearing frequencies, while cochlear toxicity should lead to preferential loss of high hearing frequencies. The potential after SRS for hearing toxicity from altered endolymph and/or perilymph fluid dynamics either via impaired fluid production and/or absorption has yet to be explored. Serous otitis media, ossicular or temporal bone osteonecrosis, and chondromalacia are not likely to be relevant factors or considerations for hearing preservation after SRS [4).].

Complications

Vestibular Schwannoma Gamma Knife radiosurgery complications

Postradiosurgery Magnetic Resonance Imaging

For clinically stable vestibular schwannoma VS, 6-mo post-SRS MRI does not contribute significantly to management.

Perry et al., recommended omitting routine MRI before 12 mo, in patients without new or progressive neurological symptoms. If extrapolated nationally to the more than 100 active SRS centers, thousands of patients would be spared an inconvenient, nonindicated study, and national savings in health care dollars would be on the order of millions annually [5)].

Repeat Gamma Knife radiosurgery of vestibular schwannoma

Repeat SRS for a persistently enlarging vestibular schwannoma can be performed safely and effectively [6)]

Results support the long-term efficacy and low morbidity of repeat GK treatment for selected patients with tumor growth after initial treatment [7)].

Case series

Gamma Knife radiosurgery of vestibular schwannoma case series.

Case reports

Ogane et al. report two cases of **hydrocephalus following Gamma Knife Surgery (GKS)** for **vestibular schwannoma (VS)**, where **tumor resection without CSF shunting** led to resolution of hydrocephalus. They argue that, in select patients, **surgical debulking** may replace **CSF diversion** as definitive therapy [8].

Strengths — The (Few) Pillars Holding It Up

* **Clinical Relevance**: Post-radiosurgical hydrocephalus in VS is a real dilemma. The study asks a good question. * **Long-Term Follow-up**: 8–14 years of follow-up is commendable, and rare in case reports. * **Surgical Perspective**: The notion that relieving mass effect could normalize CSF dynamics has physiological plausibility. * **Brevity & Structure**: For a case report, it is decently structured and avoids unnecessary verbiage.

Major Weaknesses — Where the Argument Collapses

1. **Sample Size = Two. Evidence = Anecdote**

This is the classic “n=2, therefore generalizable” fallacy. With no control group, no matched comparison, and no standardized metrics, the report offers **no basis for changing clinical practice**—only a narrative of two outliers.

2. **No CSF Flow Studies, No Pathophysiological Insight**

* **Is it obstructive or communicating hydrocephalus?** They never checked. * **No cine MRI, no LP opening pressure, no cisternography.**

Instead, they assume: “The tumor grew = hydrocephalus = resect tumor.” This is mechanistic reductionism masquerading as clinical reasoning. * **Alternative causes** (radiation-induced arachnoiditis, high-protein CSF, necrosis-related inflammation) are **not even discussed**.

—

3. **Radiology: Invisible Evidence**

This is a **neurosurgical journal**. There is no **volumetric tumor data**, no **Evans index**, no **pre/post hydrocephalus grading**, and — astonishingly — **no serial imaging** to support the causal link between tumor volume and ventricular size.

They speak of evolution, but show no evolution.

—

4. **No Comparative Cohort, No Context**

Where are the patients who were shunted for similar presentations? How did they fare? Without this, the claim that “resection may obviate shunting” becomes not a conclusion, but a **speculative editorial**.

—

5. **Unclear Decision-Making Criteria**

Was surgery chosen based on:

* Worsening symptoms? * Imaging threshold? * Patient refusal of shunt?

There is **no algorithm**, **no rationale**, not even a decision tree. The choice to operate is presented as a fait accompli, when it is precisely what needs justification.

—

 Scientific Impact — Modest Idea, Poor Execution

This case report could have been a **valuable hypothesis-generating contribution**. Instead, it flirts with **confirmation bias**, lacks physiological depth, and presents a clinically provocative idea with **no foundation of data, reasoning, or methodology**.

The reader is left with an impression: “Interesting, but I would never change my practice based on this.”

—

 What Should Have Been Done

* **Incorporate CSF dynamics studies** (cine MRI, LP pressures) before and after surgery. * **Present detailed imaging series**, with tumor and ventricular volume correlations. * **Compare to shunted patients**, even in a retrospective manner. * **Discuss pathophysiology**: proteinaceous CSF? radiation necrosis? arachnoid scarring? * **Report outcomes on standardized scales** (mRS, KPS) to quantify functional recovery.

—

 Final Verdict

This is a **case report that overreaches**. It identifies a valid clinical issue, but fails to explore it with rigor, depth, or meaningful evidence. Without imaging, comparative context, or CSF data, the conclusions are premature at best, misleading at worst.

In short:

> *Two lucky recoveries do not make a therapeutic strategy.*

1)
Han JH, Kim DG, Chung HT, Paek SH, Jung HW. Hearing Outcomes After Stereotactic Radiosurgery for Vestibular Schwannomas : Mechanism of Hearing Loss and How to Preserve Hearing. Adv Tech Stand Neurosurg. 2016;43:3-36. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-21359-0_1. PubMed PMID: 26508404.
2)

Mindermann T, Schlegel I. How to distinguish tumor growth from transient expansion of vestibular schwannomas following Gamma Knife radiosurgery. Acta Neurochir (Wien). 2014 Jun;156(6):1121-3. doi: 10.1007/s00701-014-2063-3. Epub 2014 Mar 30. PubMed PMID: 24682634.

3)

Jeltema HR, Bakker NA, Bijl HP, Wagemakers M, Metzemaekers JD, van Dijk JM. Near total extirpation of vestibular schwannoma with salvage radiosurgery. Laryngoscope. 2015 Jan 13. doi: 10.1002/lary.25115. [Epub ahead of print] PubMed PMID: 25583352.

4)

Linskey ME. Hearing preservation in vestibular schwannoma stereotactic radiosurgery: what really matters? J Neurosurg. 2013 Dec;119 Suppl:129-36. PubMed PMID: 25077325.

5)

Perry A, Graffeo CS, Carlstrom LP, Hughes JD, Peris-Celda M, Cray NM, Pollock BE, Link MJ. Is There a Need for a 6-Month Postradiosurgery Magnetic Resonance Imaging in the Treatment of Vestibular Schwannoma? Neurosurgery. 2019 Apr 12. pii: nyz052. doi: 10.1093/neuros/nyz052. [Epub ahead of print] PubMed PMID: 30980077.

6)

Kano H, Kondziolka D, Niranjan A, Flannery TJ, Flickinger JC, Lunsford LD. Repeat stereotactic radiosurgery for acoustic neuromas. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2010 Feb 1;76(2):520-7. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.01.076. Epub 2009 Sep 23. PubMed PMID: 19783373.

7)

Lonneville S, Delbrouck C, Renier C, Devriendt D, Massager N. Repeat Gamma Knife surgery for vestibular schwannomas. Surg Neurol Int. 2015 Sep 28;6:153. doi: 10.4103/2152-7806.166173. eCollection 2015. PubMed PMID: 26500799; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4596053.

8)

Ogane M, Yamakami I, Kubota S, Serizawa T, Higuchi Y. Hydrocephalus after Gamma Knife Surgery for Vestibular Schwannoma Resolved by Tumor Removal without Cerebrospinal Fluid Diversion: Report of Two Cases. NMC Case Rep J. 2025 May 20;12:197-201. doi: 10.2176/jns-nmc.2024-0292. PMID: 40491754; PMCID: PMC12148349.