ascertain the aetiology. It is true that serology may miss some cases of cyssticercosis but our results are not grossly dissimilar. They could demonstrate a single case of cyssticercosis in seven out of 15 cases (46%) while in our series serology was positive in 31%. The number in both studies is relatively small and much should remain to be done. In our opinion persistent lesions should not be compared with disappearing lesions as the two may be entirely different.

Our hypothesis that contrast enhancement is due to a recent seizure is based on well documented evidence in the literature that seizures lead to transient breakdown in blood-brain barrier. This is supported by observation in at least five patients in whom the lesion disappeared, reappearing after a flurry of seizures to disappear again. We are unable to accept the argument that this could all be due to technical factors as suggested by Drs Rajsekhar and Abraham. Since lesions due to other causes are known to show similar CT morphology, it is not wise to state that cyssticercosis is the only underlying cause of “disappearing lesions”. Larger studies using different methods to answer the question and one such study has been initiated in our department.

The lacunar hypothesis

The paper by Drs Anzalone and Landi1 is an interesting contribution to the debate about the validity of the “lacunar hypothesis” that links a small number of clinical syndromes to occlusion of a single perforating artery by specific vasopathies.2 The significant number of non-lacunar lesions in their series certainly seems to justify the early scanning of these patients, but in the context of cerebrovascular disease it is important that the result is not interpreted as a failure of the lacunar hypothesis.

Although the authors do not state the number of CT scans which showed an appropriately situated small deep infarct, our experience using a similar scanner suggests that it is unlikely to be more than about 50%.3 This lack of a definite clinicoradiological correlation in a significant number of cases, made with isolated percent reports of patients with lacunar syndromes and more extensive (non-lacunar) areas of infarction, has meant that concern is still expressed about how often non-lacunar infarction may present in this way. It is despite recent reports which have shown that the majority of patients who present with a lacunar syndrome and a negative CT scan have an appropriate small deep infarct on MRI.4

It is possible that many of the patients who are reported to have had a lacunar syndrome from extensive areas of infarction were examined during the recovery phase and that more extensive clinical deficits, not compatible with a lacunar syndrome, would have been found if the examinations had been performed earlier. The fact that cases of non-lacunar cerebral infarction were seen on CT scanning in this large prospective study where patients were examined very soon after the onset of their stroke lends support to this view and helps to put the previous case reports into perspective.

JOHN BAMPFORD
Neurology Department,
St James’s University Hospital, Leeds


Drs Landi and Anzalone reply:

We were interested to read the comments by Dr Bamford on our paper, which stressed the importance of early CT scanning in patients with very recent onset of a lacunar syndrome.

We agree with Dr Bamford that, in the context of ischaemic cerebrovascular disease, our results should not be interpreted as evidence against the “lacunar hypothesis.” Appropriately situated lacunar infarcts were observed in 37 (42%) of our ischaemic subjects, and no patient had a larger (> 15 mm diameter) or cortical infarct at CT scan.

However, since non-lacunar infarcts have been reported in a small percentage of patients with clinical evidence of a lacunar syndrome, we attribute our absence of such cases in our series to chance. Alternatively, as suggested by Dr Bamford, examination in the acute phase of stroke may have allowed us to exclude those patients who initially manifest extensive clinical deficits who would later improve and present the clinical features of a lacunar syndrome during the recovery phase. This possibility underscores the importance of early neurological assessment in patients considered for inclusion in studies of lacunar infarcts.

GIANLUCA LANDI
NICOLETTA ANZALONE
Neurology Department,
Ospedale Policlinico,
Milan, Italy


Possible benign intracranial hypertension and essential thombocytohaemia

We read with interest the paper by Esack et al5 on benign intracranial hypertension and essential thrombocytohaemia. The syndrome of isolated intracranial hypertension with normal cerebral spinal fluid and CT scan presented by their patient does indeed suggest a familial association with hypertension. Such a diagnosis, however, seems difficult to admit in a patient with essential thombocytohaemia, which has been reported as a possible aetiology of cerebral venous thrombosis,6 and who presents with a popliteal vein thrombosis during the course of his neurological disease.

The authors rightly envisaged sinus thrombosis but ruled it out on a single digitalised intravenous angiography. We think that this investigation alone is not sufficient to exclude this diagnosis in their patient. The timing of the angiography in cerebral venous thrombosis, however, may not be the case in this patient and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies have shown the possibility of rapid repermeation of the vessel.1 The sinus blockage is sometimes incomplete and a greater volume of contrast material may be necessary to evaluate the venous sinuses better.2 Collateral circulation in the sinus wall may simulate the normal opacification of the sinus by contrast material.

Though heparin has a proven efficacy in cerebral venous thrombosis3 the lack of improvement during anticoagulant treatment in their patient does not rule out this possibility. For the dramatic improvement one week after starting hydroxyurea, it is compatible with both benign intracranial hypertension and dural sinus thrombosis.

The hypothesis of an intermittent sinus blockage may well be right. However, in this case the thombocytohaemia the cause of intracerebral hypertension in their patient. However, dural sinus thrombosis has not been fully excluded. It should be looked for with appropriate techniques (four vessel arteriography or MRI) in patients with essential thombocytohaemia presenting symptoms of intracerebral hypertension, be it isolated or associated with epilepsy or focal deficit.

ALAIN TEHINDRANAZARIVELO
MARGUERITA BOUSSEAU
Service de Neurologie,
Hôpital Saint Antoine,
184, rue du Pauvroy Saint Antoine,
Paris, France