

A Study on the Association Between Accessory Maxillary Ostium and Maxillary Sinus Mucosal Thickening Using Cone Beam Computed Tomography

Shishir Shetty (✉ shishirshettyomr@gmail.com)

University of Sharjah <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8097-6024>

Saad Wahby Al Bayatti

University of Sharjah

Natheer Hashim Al-Rawi

University of Sharjah

Rani Samsudin

University of Sharjah

Hesham Marei

Gulf Medical University

Raghavendra Shetty

Ajman University

Hossam Abdelatty Abdelmagyd

Gulf Medical University

Sesha Reddy

Gulf Medical University

Research

Keywords: Maxillary sinus, Nasal cavity, CBCT, sinusitis, mucosal thickening, accessory maxillary ostia

Posted Date: December 23rd, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-131886/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at Head & Face Medicine on July 14th, 2021.
See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13005-021-00284-0>.

Abstract

Background- Accessory maxillary ostium (AMO) has a major role to play in the aetiology of maxillary sinusitis. Mucosal thickening is one of the key radiographic features of chronic maxillary sinusitis. The aim of this study was to establish the relation between maxillary sinus mucosal thickening (MT) and occurrence of AMO using cone beam computed tomography (CBCT).

Methods- CBCT scans of 400 maxillary sinuses from the records of 200 patients who sought various dental treatments at the University Dental Hospital, Ajman, United Arab Emirates were evaluated. The incidence, anatomical position and maximal length of accessory maxillary ostia (AMO) in the maxillary antrum were reviewed using CBCT by two examiners. The association between MTs and AMOs were also analysed.

Results- AMOs were found in 142 maxillary antra (35.5%). The inter-observer reliability for using CBCT to detect AMO was ($k=0.83$). There was no significant difference in the frequency of AMOs when the age ($P=0.19$) and gender ($P=0.54$) distribution were considered. Sinuses with AMOs, showed significantly greater frequency of MTs ($p=0.001$). AMOs with maximal length of less than 1mm were most commonly observed (51.40 %). AMOs with larger greater maximal length were associated with higher degrees of MT. The location of the AMOs, were not affected by the degree of MT.

Conclusion- The study demonstrates a clear association between degree of MT and occurrence of AMO in the maxillary sinus. There is a greater probability of finding an AMO in the maxillary sinus if the MT in the sinus is more than 3 mm.

Background

Chronic maxillary sinusitis [CMS] is one of the most common disease conditions that takes a patient to the otolaryngologist.^[1] CMS has a multifactorial etiology ranging from bacterial infection and allergy to nasal anatomical variations.^[1] AMO is believed to play a role in CMS aetiology.^[2] Some researchers believe that mucous that has been drained through primary ostium may re-enter into the maxillary sinus through the AMO leading to "mucus recirculation".^[3,4] However other researchers state that AMO develops following an acute maxillary sinusitis. Therefore, whether AMO is the cause or the result of maxillary sinusitis, is still uncertain. It is also debatable whether AMO is congenital or acquired.^[5] There has been a significant correlation between AMO and CMS in previous studies carried out using computed tomography.^[6,7] Symptoms of maxillary sinusitis may sometimes appear in the maxillary dento-alveolar region and CBCT may be performed as part of dental investigation. This increases the possibility of a dental surgeon, finding an AMO during evaluation of the CBCT scans. While CT offers superior image, quality compared to CBCT, the latter exposes the patient to a substantially lower radiation dose.^[8]

The aim of this study was to identify the location of the AMOs and investigate the association between MT and AMO.

Materials And Methods

CBCT images from 200 patients (n=400 maxillary sinuses) who underwent maxillofacial scans at University Dental Hospital, Thumbay Medicity, Ajman, United Arab Emirates (UAE) were evaluated in this retrospective study. Human Ethical Approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Gulf Medical University (Ref. no. INT/COD/FR/006-2020). The CBCT image examinations of the sino-nasal variants were performed using a ProMax 3D Mid machine (Planmeca, Helsinki, Finland), operated at 90 kVp and 10 mA with a 9 X 16 cm field of view. Assessment of CBCT scans was performed directly on a 1920 X 1080 pixel and 23-inch DELL monitor screen. The voxel edge length was 0.2 mm. CBCT scans of subjects within the age range of 18 to 65 years were included in the study. Scans with streak artifacts and incomplete images were excluded from the study. Subjects with history of mid facial trauma, tumor, cleft palate, and syndromes effecting the mid face were excluded from the study. All selected CBCT scans of the study were evaluated by two radiologists (A) and (B) with more than ten years of clinical experience in dento-maxillofacial radiology. In case of inter-observer disagreement, a third oral radiologist (C) with equivalent clinical experience was consulted for the final decision. In order to identify and confirm the existence of the AMO, the examiners used coronal (**Figure 1A**), axial (**Figure 1B**) and sagittal views (**Figure 1C**). Horizontal and vertical annotation overlays directed the radiologist to correctly display the AMO in all three planes. Inter-observer reliability was evaluated using Cohen Kappa test. The distance of the AMO from the floor of the sinus (C) was calculated using the coronal CBCT sections, by measuring the distance between 2 horizontal lines A1-A and B1-B passing through the most inferior point of the AMO and corresponding to most inferior point on the floor of the maxillary sinus respectively (**Figure 2**). The antero-posterior location of the AMO was evaluated on the axial CBCT sections by measuring the distance (D) between 2 horizontal lines F1-F and E1- E passing through the most anterior point of the AMO and corresponding most anterior point of the sinus in the corresponding axial section respectively. (**Figure 3**). The longest dimension of AMO in the sagittal CBCT segment was measured as suggested by Hung et al (**Figure 4**).⁹ The mucosal thickening was evaluated and classified based on criteria used by Sheiki et al.¹⁰ According to the criteria the MT is measured at six points in each of the sinuses. The mesial and distal sides of the second premolar and first and second molar teeth were the six points of measurement. Among these six points, the highest point of the thickened mucosa of the sinus floor was considered to be the representative value of MT for that sinus (**Figure 5**). In the edentulous cases measurement of MT was performed at six equidistant points on a line connecting most of the anterior and posterior points on the sinus floor in the sagittal section (**Fig 6**). Only MT in the floor of the sinus was considered in our study. The classification of MT based on the radiographic evidence of thickness is described in (**Table 1**).

Table 1
Classification of the MTs per
criterion set by Sheiki et al.

Type	Degree of thickening
Type 1	< 1 mm
Type 2	1–3 mm
Type 3	3–6 mm
Type 4	6–10 mm
Type 5	> 10 mm

Data analysis

The data obtained regarding the occurrence, anatomical location, maximal length of AMOs and their association with MTs were evaluated using IBM SPSS statistics (Version 22, Armonk, NY: IBM Corp). Chi Square test and Fisher Exact Test were used to determine difference among study groups., Spearman's Rho was used, to evaluate the association between the study groups. To avoid bias two observers were used to identify AMO and PMO (A & B).

Results

The inter observer reliability using Cohens Kappa test was 0.83. We used the rubrics by Regier et al 2012 for kappa rating.¹¹ The intra-observer reliability for detecting the presence of AMO was 0.85 for the oral radiologist A and 0.79 for B.

In the present study, 400 maxillary sinuses from a total of 200 CBCT scans were evaluated for the presence of AMO. Among the 200 CBCT scans 131 (262 maxillary sinuses) belonged to male subjects and 69 scans (138 maxillary sinuses) belonged to female Subjects. A total of 142 AMOs were found, 90 AMOs were found in male subjects and 52 in female subjects. There was no statistically significant gender difference in the occurrence of AMO [OR = 1.1306, P = 0.54 (95% CI: 0.7596 to 1.6827)]. The age range of the subjects in the present study was between 22–65 years with the mean of 41.32 years.

AMOs were found in 142 of the 400 maxillary sinuses. Primary maxillary ostium was patent in 392 of the 400 maxillary sinuses (Table 2) There was radiographic indication of obstruction of primary maxillary ostium (PMO) in 8 sinuses. Among the sinuses with PMO obstruction six sinuses showed the presence of AMO and 2 did not reveal the presence of AMO.

Table 2
General Characteristics of PMO and AMOs
in the sinuses

Variable	Present	Absent
	N (%)	N(%)
AMO	142 (35.5%)	258 (64.5%)
PMO	392 (98%)	8 (2%)

The maximal length of the AMOs in the sagittal section varied from 0.5 mm to 7 mm. The AMOs were categorised into Class I, II and III based on their maximal length. On evaluation of the AMOs, 73 (51.40%) were less than 2 mm in length (Class I), 56 (39.43%) were 2–4 mm in size (Class II), whereas 13(9.15%) were greater than 4 mm in size (Class III).

MT was observed among 132 of the 400 maxillary sinuses that were evaluated. When maxillary sinuses with AMOs ($n = 142$) were evaluated for the presence of MT, 96 maxillary sinuses (67%) had evidence of MT, while 36 maxillary sinuses (33%) had no radiographic evidence of MT. When the maxillary sinuses without AMOs ($n = 258$) were examined, it was found that 36 maxillary sinuses had radiographic evidence of MT, while 222 sinuses had no radiographic evidence of MT. In sinuses with AMOs, there was a significantly higher occurrence of MTs [$P < 0.0001$ OR = 0.2064 (95% CI: 0.1337 to 0.3187)].

When the size of MTs were categorized according to criteria defined by Sheiki M et al, it was noted that 47 (35.6%) sinuses belonged to Type 1, 35 (26.5%) sinuses belonged to Type 2, 32 (24.2%) sinuses belonged to Type 3, 12 sinuses belonged to Type 4 and 6 sinuses belonged to Type 5. (Fig. 7).

Type 3 MT had the highest occurrence of AMOs. (Fig. 8). There was a significant ($P = 0.006$) association between the occurrence of AMOs and types of MT (Table 3).

Table 3
Association between mucosal thickening and presence of accessory maxillary ostium

Types of Mucosal Thickening	Accessory maxillary ostium		Total sinuses	Fisher's Exact Test p-value
	Present	Absent		
No MT	36 (13.4%)	232(86.5%)	268 (100%)	0.006*
Type 1	27 (57.4%)	20 (42.6%)	47 (100%)	
Type 2	25 (71.4%)	10 (28.6%)	35 (100%)	
Type 3	30 (93.8%)	2 (6.3%)	32 (100%)	
Type 4	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	12 (100%)	
Type 5	5 (83.3%)	1(16.7%)	6 (100%)	

*p < 0.05 Statistically Significant, p > 0.05 Non-Significant, NS

There was a significant difference in the occurrence of AMOs between Type 1 and Type 3($p < 0.001$), Type 4($p < 0.001$), Type 5($p < 0.001$). Similarly, there was a significant difference in occurrence of AMOs between MT of type 2 and Type 3($p = 0.02$), Type 4 ($p = 0.05$), Type 5 ($p = 0.05$). However, there was no statistically significant difference in the occurrence of AMOs between MT of Type 1 and 2 ($p = 0.07$). Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in the occurrence of AMO between MT of Types 3 and Type 4 ($p = 0.24$), Type 4 and Type 5($p = 0.07$) (Table 4). No significant correlation was observed between the occurrence of AMOs and type of MT was observed ($r_s = -0.7$, $P = 0.18812$).

Table 4
Comparison of difference in the occurrence of AMOs among types of MT

Type of MT	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
Type 1	0.19(NS) #	< 0.001*#	< 0.001*#	< 0.001##
Type 2		0.02*#	0.05##	0.05 ##
Type 3			0.12(NS)##	0.41(NS) ##
Type 4				1.00(NS) ##

#Chi Square test ##Fisher Exact Test

*p < 0.05 Statistically Significant, p > 0.05 Non-Significant, NS

The mean distance from the most inferior point on the floor of the sinus to the inferior border of AMO in the coronal CBCT sections was 19.93 ± 1.68 mm. There was no significant difference in the mean distance among the different Types of MT (Tables 5 and 6). There was no significant correlation between the mean distance of AMO from the sinus floor and type of MT ($r_s = 0.3$, $P = 0.62384$).

Table 5
Association of the mean distance between the floor of the sinus to the AMO in different types of MT

Types Mucosal Thickening	Number of sinuses in each group	Mean distance of the AMO from the floor of the sinus in coronal CBCT section (mm = millimetres)	Fisher's Exact Test
		Mean(mm)	p-value
No mucosal thickening	36	18.95 ± 2.45	0.32
Type 1	27	20.23 ± 1.06	
Type 2	25	18.56 ± 2.13	
Type 3	30	21.85 ± 1.93	
Type 4	9	19.07 ± 0.78	
Type 5	5	20.96 ± 1.78	
Total	132	19.93 ± 1.68	

Table 6
Comparison of the mean distance between the floor of the sinus to the AMO in different types of MT

Type of MT	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
No MT	0.07(NS) #	1.26(NS) #	0.07(NS) #	0.13(NS) ##	0.3(NS) ##
Type 1		0.26(NS) #	< 0.17(NS) #	< 0.62(NS) ##	1.00(NS) ##
Type 2			0.08(NS) #	0.24(NS) ##	0.07(NS) ##
Type 3				0.41(NS) ##	1.00(NS) ##
Type 4					0.07(NS) ##

#Chi Square test ##Fisher Exact Test

p < 0.05 Statistically Significant, p > 0.05 Non-Significant, NS

Table 7
Association of the mean distance between the anterior most point of the maxillary sinus to the AMO among different types of MT

Types of Mucosal Thickening	Number of sinuses in each group	Mean distance of the AMO from the anterior most point in the maxillary sinus in axial section (mm = millimeters)	Fisher's Exact Test
			p-value
No mucosal thickening	36	14.32 ± 1.75	0.63
Type 1	27	16.54 ± 2.06	
Type 2	25	15.27 ± 1.05	
Type 3	30	14.92 ± 1.86	
Type 4	9	16.07 ± 2.01	
Type 5	5	15.22 ± 2.21	
Total	132	15.39 ± 1.82	

The mean distance of the anterior most point of AMO to the anterior most point of the maxillary sinus in the axial section was 15.39 ± 1.82 mm. There was no significant difference in the mean distance among different Types of MT (Table 8). There was no significant correlation between the distance of AMO from the anterior-most point sinus and type of MT ($r_s = -0.5$, $P = 0.391$) .

Table 8
Comparison between the mean distance from the floor of the sinus to the AMO in different types of MT

Type of MT	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
No MT	0.07(NS) #	1.26(NS) #	0.07(NS) #	0.13(NS) ##	0.3(NS) ##
Type 1		0.26(NS) #	< 0.17(NS) #	< 0.62(NS) ##	1.00(NS) ##
Type 2			0.08(NS) #	0.24(NS) ##	0.07(NS) ##
Type 3				0.41(NS) ##	1.00(NS) ##
Type 4					0.07(NS) ##

#Chi Square test ##Fisher Exact Test

* $p < 0.05$ Statistically Significant, $p > 0.05$ Non-Significant, NS

A statistically significant ($P = 0.001$) association was observed between the maximal length of AMOs and the type of MT (Table 9). Class 1 AMOs were predominantly found with Type 3 MT, Type 2 MT and no MT. Class 2 AMOs were predominant in Type 1 and Type 2 MTs. Class 3 were predominant in Type 4 and 5 MTs.

Table 9
Association and between the maximal length of AMO and occurrence of types of MT

	Length of AMO			Total
	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	
No Mucosal thickening (MT)	24	19	3	46
	52.2%	41.3%	6.5%	100.0%
Type 1- Mucosal thickening	10	16	1	27
	37.0%	59.3%	3.7%	100.0%
Type 2- Mucosal thickening	14	10	1	25
	56.0%	40.0%	4.0%	100.0%
Type 3- Mucosal thickening	27	2	1	30
	90.0%	6.7%	3.3%	100.0%
Type 4- Mucosal thickening	2	2	5	9
	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%	100.0%
Type 5- Mucosal thickening	1	2	2	5
	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Fishers Exact test	< 0.001*			

Discussion

Maxillary sinus is an anatomic structure located in a vital location with close proximity to nasal cavity and the roots maxillary posterior teeth.^[12] Maxillary sinuses are often associated with anatomic variations particularly the osteo-meatal complex which predisposes them to disease conditions.^[13] AMO is one among the variations of the osteo-meatal complex. It is important to note that sinus disease does not necessarily mean the presence of osteo-meatal variation.^[14] The term AMO was first coined in the year 1993 by Rice and Scheaffer, as a terminology for all the openings on the lateral nasal wall, other than a single primary ostium.^[15] It is not very clear whether AMO is congenital or acquired. Some researchers believe that AMOs usually occurs after an episode of acute maxillary sinusitis.^[16] Some recent studies have highlighted the "recirculating mucus ring" phenomenon in which mucus circulation takes place between the normal ostium and the maxillary sinus AMO.^[17] Apart from routine imaging procedures nasal endoscopy has been used for the detection of AMO.^[18, 19]

In our study, 35.5% of the maxillary sinuses in the population were found to have AMOs. The prevalence of AMOs was examined in hospital / clinic settings using computerized tomography (CT) and endoscopy,

while in anatomical research, cadavers were assessed. AMOs were present in 29.5 percent of paranasal CT scans of the research cohort in one published study on the Jordanian population.^[7] Recent CT based studies on AMOs reported a prevalence 19.1–46.3% of the sinuses in Turkish population and 18% in Indian population.^[6, 20, 21] In another CT and endoscopy-based research on the Indian population conducted in 2018, AMOs were found in 23 percent of the cohort.^[1] Similar percentages were reported by purely endoscopic studies in the Indian population.^[19] AMOs were reported in 13.8–26% of the cadavers as per few recently study published anatomical studies.^[15, 22–25] Studies carried out on Chinese, Indian and Turkish population revealed prevalence rates of AMOs to be 47.2 percent, 23.7 percent and 38.8 percent, respectively.^{9, 26, 27} In general, the prevalence of AMOs ranges from 20 percent to 50 percent in studies using CT, CBCT scans and endoscopy. The likely explanations for this difference may be ethnic difference and the sensitivity of investigative imaging system. However, cadaveric studies have shown a lower prevalence of AMOs relative to studies using live subjects using CT, CBCT, or endoscopy. Post mortem anatomical distortion may be the likely cause for this lower prevalence.^[28] Therefore prevalence studies using imaging are more reliable.

Intra- and inter observer agreement is a vital issue in medical imaging interpretation and this must be assessed with the most suitable test for an accurate outcome of any imaging study.^[29] In our study the inter observer reliability was 0.83 and intra-observer reliability for detecting the presence of AMO was 0.85. The observers' reliability values in our study were consistent with the values found in the study by Hung et al.^[9] Nevertheless, few other researchers did not evaluate the components of inter and intra observer variability in their studies.^[6]

In our study there was no statistically significant difference in the occurrence of AMOs between male and female subjects, although the occurrence was numerically higher in male subjects. Similar observations were found in the studies by Bani-Ata et al and Ghosh et al.^[1, 7] However, Hung K et al found AMOs to be more commonly present in, CBCT scans of female subjects.⁹ It is important to note that there was no statistical difference in terms of gender in any of the studies reiterating the fact that, gender had no significant influence on the occurrence of AMO.^{1, 7} We found no statistically significant difference in the occurrence of AMOs when age was considered. The mean age of the research subjects was higher than that of the Hussein et al and Sahin et al studies.^[30, 31] In most studies, the frequency of AMOs has not been significantly dependent on the age group.^[1, 6, 7, 18] However, there was a higher prevalence of AMOs in older age groups in one study by Dedeoğlu N and Altun O. The authors attributed the greater incidence of AMOs in the elderly to be due to the age-related phenomenon and the resorption phenomenon that accompanied age-related edentulism.^[27]

In our study majority of the AMOs (90.83%) were less than 4 mm in size. This was consistent with the findings of Hung K et al.^[9] Based on the maximal length, we divided the AMOs into three classes. We also identified the location of the AMO based on its distance from the floor and the anterior wall of the maxillary sinus. The location of the AMO was determined by some of the studies and case reports based

on the landmarks on the lateral nasal wall, such as the anterior and posterior fontanelle [1, 9, 32, 33, 34] Other studies have identified the location of the ostium based on their distance from the landmarks such as floor of the sinus and anterior wall of the sinus.[35, 36, 37] Due to the variability of landmarks on the lateral nasal wall, we chose the latter approach based on measurements.[38, 39] In our study the height of the AMO from the floor of the sinus was 19.93 ± 1.68 mm. Radiographical studies have shown that the normal maxillary sinus height varies from 28 mm to 34 mm.[40, 41] Following the above measurements, AMOs are most likely to be found at a point between half and three-fourths of a line connecting the floor of the sinus to the roof. The fragility of the lateral nasal wall in this area might be the explanation for the incidence of AMOs at this site. [42] During inflammation, the maxillary sinus is almost half filled with inflammatory fluid in gel consistency. The cohesive forces prohibit normal ciliary transport of the fluid into the ostium, which is situated at a higher level. Therefore, the fluid content finds a point of structural fragility on the lateral nasal wall to escape the sinus. [42]

MT is associated with collection of inflammatory fluid within the maxillary sinus.[43, 44, 45] Many recent studies have highlighted the relationship between periapical and periodontal health of maxillary dentition, sinus floor mucosa and maxillary sinusitis. [46] There are many approaches used by researchers to classify mucosal thickening in the maxillary sinus using CT and CBCT. [47, 48, 49] Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was also used in one of the earlier studies for the classification of MT in the maxillary sinus. [50, 51] MT has been graded by researchers either on the basis of thickening (mild/ moderate / severe, polyps, pseudocyst retention) or on the basis of numerical measurement ranges. [10, 52] We used Sheiki et al's classification, which is based on measurements. In the present study, there was a statistically significant difference in the occurrence of AMOs when the thickening size exceeded 3 mm. It is important to note that, there is no consensus on the threshold values above which MT is considered to be pathological. [53] In our study, sinuses with radiographic evidence of MT, showed significantly higher occurrence of AMOs than those without such features. Similar results were obtained in a CT based study by Gusrov M et al, who suggested that AMO may be an accelerating factor in the transformation of sinus mucosal pathologies like retention cyst to antrochoanal polyps.[20] This association was also reflected in endoscopy-based and CBCT studies which revealed higher frequency of occurrence of AMOs in rhinosinusitis patients.[18, 31, 54] A CT-based analysis by Yenigun A et al concluded that a probability of finding MT in the same sinus was correlated with the existence of AMOs. Additional observations from our study also suggest that the probability of finding an AMO during the radiographic evaluation of the maxillary sinus is higher if there is co-existing mucosal thickening of more than 3 mm in the sinus floor. Such results suggest the Acquired Development Hypothesis model for the existence of AMO rather than the theory of congenital development. The length of the ostium plays a major role in the mucous circulation and thus will influence the mucosal thickening of the maxillary sinus. If the size of the AMO is up to 4 mm, the mucous secretions with a normal viscidness tend to circumvent the AMO in the maxillary sinus. In this situation the secretions do not pass through the AMO. However, the same phenomenon does differ for situations where the size of the AMO exceeds 4 mm in diameter, whereby the mucous secretion portion of the mucous carpet flowing over the centre of the AMO flows into the centre of the meatus. The

part of the mucous secretions in the margin of the AMO continues to pass along its borders of the AMO to finally reach the main natural ostium. The mucous secretions that have moved out of the maxillary sinus, through the main natural ostium, return to the same maxillary sinus when it makes a downward journey due to gravity and encounters AMO on its path. The secretions are laden with pathogenic micro-organisms from the nasal cavity layer during the re-entry process into the maxillary sinus. This malicious recirculation of secretions regularly aggravates the sinus condition, causing the sinus mucosa to pathologically thicken. [2, 16]

Our study revealed that the MT did not have any statistically significant correlation with the location of the AMO. However, when we evaluated the maximal length the of AMOs with the type of MT, it was observed that larger AMOs were associated with higher degree of MT. This was similar to the observation in the study by Hung K et al. [9] They proposed that AMO decreases the clearance of mucus secretions in the corresponding maxillary sinus, which could make the sinus susceptible to pathologies. [6, 9]

Conclusion

The study findings indicate that the presence and thickness of MT was correlated with an increased occurrence of AMOs. AMO 's location is not affected by the type of MT. Higher degrees of mucosa thickening are correlated with larger AMOs. The findings also show that there is a greater chance of discovering an AMO if the MT in the sinus is more than 3 mm. The findings of our study demonstrate the possibility of using CBCT to assess the occurrence and location of AMO in the osteo-meatal complex. It also encourages the use of CBCT in otolaryngology as a substitute for CT for imaging osteo-meatal complex with comparatively lower doses of radiation.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate- Obtained (*Ref. no. INT/COD/FR/006-2020*)

Consent for publication- Obtained

Availability of data and material- Submitted as supplementary material. Also available at figshare; doi 10.6084/m9.figshare.13385141

Competing interests- NIL

Funding- No sources of funding

Authors' contributions

Author name	Contribution
Dr Shishir Ram Shetty	Concept, data collection, manuscript writing
Saad Wahby Al Bayatti	manuscript writing
Prof. Natheer Hashim Al-Rawi	manuscript writing
Prof. AR Samsudin	manuscript writing
Prof Hesham Marei	data collection
Dr Raghavendra Shetty	manuscript writing
Prof Hossam Abdelatty Abdelmagyd	data collection
Dr Sesha Reddy	data collection

Acknowledgements- We acknowledge the Dr Vinayak Kamath for providing statistical support for the research.

Author information- Mentioned in title page.

References

1. Ghosh P, Kumarasekaran P, Sriraman G. Incidence of accessory ostia in patients with chronic maxillary sinusitis. *Int J Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2018;4:443–7.
2. Gutman M, Houser S. Iatrogenic maxillary sinus recirculation and beyond. *Ear Nose Throat J.* 2003;82:61–3.
3. Chung SK, Dhong HJ, Na DG. Mucus circulation between accessory ostium and natural ostium of maxillary sinus. *J Laryngol Otol.* 1999;113:865–7.
4. Yanagisawa E, Yanagisawa K. Endoscopic view of recirculation phenomenon of the maxillary sinus. *Ear Nose Throat J.* 1997;76:196–8.
5. Mladina R, Vuković K, Poje G. The two holes syndrome. *Am J Rhinol Allergy.* 2009;23(6):602–4.
6. Yenigun A, Fazliogullari Z, Gun C, Uysal İl, Nayman A, Karabulut AK. The effect of the presence of the accessory maxillary ostium on the maxillary sinus. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2016;273(12):4315–9.
7. Bani-Ata M, Aleshawi A, Khatatbeh A, Al-Domaiddat D, Alnussair B, Al-Shawaqfeh R, Allouh M. Accessory Maxillary Ostia: Prevalence of an Anatomical Variant and Association with Chronic Sinusitis. *Int J Gen Med.* 2020;13:163–8.
8. Lechuga L, Weidlich GA. Cone Beam CT vs. Fan Beam CT: A Comparison of Image Quality and Dose Delivered Between Two Differing CT Imaging Modalities. *Cureus.* 2016;8(9):e778.
9. Hung K, Montalvao C, Yeung AWK, Li G, Bornstein MM. Frequency, location, and morphology of accessory maxillary sinus ostia: a retrospective study using cone beam computed tomography

- (CBCT). *Surg Radiol Anat.* 2020 Feb;42(2):219–28.
10. Sheikhi M, Pozve NJ, Khorrami L. Using cone beam computed tomography to detect the relationship between the periodontal bone loss and mucosal thickening of the maxillary sinus. *Dent Res J (Isfahan).* 2014 Jul;11(4):495–501.
11. Regier DA, Narrow WE, Clarke DE, Kraemer HC, Kuramoto JS, Kuhl EA, Kupfer DJ. DSM-5 Field Trials in the United States and Canada, Part II: Test-Retest Reliability of Selected Categorical Diagnoses. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2013;170:59–70.
12. Gu Y, Sun C, Wu D, Zhu Q, Leng, Zhou Y. Evaluation of the relationship between maxillary posterior teeth and the maxillary sinus floor using cone-beam computed tomography. *BMC Oral Health.* 2018;18:164.
13. Asaumi R, Sato I, Miwa Y, Imura K, Sunohara M, Kawai T, et al. Understanding the formation of maxillary sinus in Japanese human foetuses using cone beam CT. *Surg Radiol Anat.* 2010;32:745–51.
14. Earwaker J. Anatomic Variants in Sinonasal CT. *RadioGraphics.* 1993;13:381–415.
15. Singhal M, Singhal D. Anatomy of accessory maxillary sinus ostium with clinical application. *Int J Med Sci Public Health.* 2014;3(3):327–9.
16. Genc S, Ozcan M, Titiz A, Unal A. Development of maxillary accessory ostium following sinusitis in rabbits. *Rhinology.* 2008 Jun;46(2):121–124.
17. Chung SK, Dhong HJ, Na DG. Mucus circulation between accessory ostium and natural ostium of maxillary sinus. *J Laryngol Otol.* 1999;113(9):865–7.
18. Varadharajan R, Sahithya S, Venkatesan R, Gunasekaran A, Suresh S. An endoscopic study on the prevalence of the accessory maxillary ostium in chronic sinusitis patients. *Int J Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2020;6(1):40–4.
19. Mahajan A, Mahajan A, Gupta K, Verma P, Lalit M. Anatomical variations of accessory maxillary sinus ostium: an endoscopic study. *Int J Anat Res.* 2017;5(1):3485–90.
20. Gursoy M, Erdogan N, Cetinoglu YK, Dag F, Eren E, Uluc ME. Anatomic variations associated with antrochoanal polyps. *Niger J Clin Pract.* 2019;22:603–8.
21. Kakade AG, Chaudhari NH, Baviskar SM, Bagga RR, Patni ZM. Evaluation of Variations of Maxillary Sinus on Computed Tomography. *MVP J Med Sci.* 2018;5(2):172–7.
22. Prasanna LC, Mamatha H. H. The Location of Maxillary Sinus Ostium and Its Clinical Application. *Indian J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.* 2010;62(4):335–7.
23. Nayak JN, Varalakshmi KL, Sangeetha M, Naik S. An anatomical study on location of maxillary sinus ostium and it's surgical importance. *Int J Current Res Rev.* 2014;6(18):7–9.
24. Patil M, KY M. Ostium maxillare accessorum - a morphologic study. *Nat J Clin Ana.* 2012;1(4):171–5.
25. Sindel A, Turhan M, Ogut E, Akdag M, Bostancı A, Sindel M. An endoscopic cadaveric study: Accessory maxillary ostia. *Dicle Med J.* 2014;41(2):262–7.

26. Ali IK, Sansare K, Karjodkar RR, Vanga K, Salve P, Pawar AM. Cone-beam computed tomography analysis of accessory maxillary ostium and Haller cells: Prevalence and clinical significance. *Imaging Sci Dent.* 2017;47(1):33–7.
27. Dedeoğlu N, Altun O. Evaluation of maxillary sinus anatomical variations and pathologies in elderly, young, posterior dentate and edentulous patient groups with cone-beam computed tomography. *Folia Morphol.* 2019;78(3):595–9.
28. Almutairi S. A Cadaveric Study on the Efficacy of Surface Marking and Bony Landmarks Used in Sacral Neuromodulation. *Cureus.* 2020 Jul;12(7):e9153.
29. Benchoufiab M, Matzner-Loberc, Molinari N, Jannot AS, Soyer P. Interobserver agreement issues in radiology. *Diagn Interv Imaging.* 2020;101(10):639–41.
30. Hussein A. The association of maxillary accessory ostia with chronic rhinosinusitis what is essential; ventilation or drainage. *Life Sci J.* 2013;10(1):2958–66.
31. Sahin C, Ozcan M, Unal A. Relationship between development of accessory maxillary sinus and chronic sinusitis. *Med J DY Patil Univ.* 2015;8:606–8.
32. Chung YS, Choi JM, Shin DH, Kim YW, Jeong KH, Cho JH, et al. Does Nasal Polyps Influence on the Location of Nasal Fontanelle? *Korean J Otorhinolaryngol-Head Neck Surg.* 2014;57:27–31.
33. Jankowski R, Rumeau C, Nguyen DT, Gallet P. Maxillary sinus pain with radiolucent sinuses due to agenesis of the membranous ostium. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis.* 2019 Feb;136(1):43–6.
34. Ho JPK, Wong E, Singh NP. Bilateral Chronic Maxillary Atelectasis with a Unilateral Accessory Ostium. *Eur J Rhinol Allergy.* 2020;3(1):23–5.
35. Butaric LN, Wadle M, Gascon J. Pediatric Imaging, Neurocognition and Genetics Study. Anatomical Variation in Maxillary Sinus Ostium Positioning: Implications for Nasal-Sinus Disease. *Anat Rec (Hoboken).* 2019 Jun;302(6):917–30.
36. Şimşek Kaya G, Daltaban Ö, Kaya M, Kocabalkan B, Sindel A, Akdağ M. The potential clinical relevance of anatomical structures and variations of the maxillary sinus for planned sinus floor elevation procedures: A retrospective cone beam computed tomography study. *Clin Implant Dent Relat Res.* 2019 Feb;21(1):114–21.
37. Souza AD, Rajagopal KV, Ankolekar VH, Souza AD, Kotian SR. Anatomy of maxillary sinus and its ostium: A radiological study using computed tomography. *CHRISMED J Health Res.* 2016;3:37–40.
38. El-Shazly AE, Poirrier AL, Cabay J, Lefebvre PP. Anatomical variations of the lateral nasal wall: The secondary and accessory middle turbinates. *Clin Anat.* 2012;25(3):340–6.
39. Yoon JH, Kim KS, Jung DH, Kim SS, Koh KS, Oh CS, Kim HJ, Lee JG, Chung IH. Fontanelle and uncinate process in the lateral wall of the human nasal cavity. *Laryngoscope.* 2000 Feb;110(2 Pt 1):281–5.
40. Kiruba LN, Gupta C, Kumar S, D'Souza AS. A study of morphometric evaluation of the maxillary sinuses in normal subjects using computer tomography images. *Arch Med Health Sci.* 2014;2:12–5.

41. Ryu J, Choi SH, Cha JY, Lee KJ, Hwang CJ. Retrospective study of maxillary sinus dimensions and pneumatization in adult patients with an anterior open bite. *Am J Orthod Dentofacial Orthop.* 2016 Nov;150(5):796–801.
42. Navarro JC, de Lima Navarro J, de Lima Navarro P. Lateral Wall of the Nasal Cavity. In: *The Nasal Cavity and Paranasal Sinuses*. Berlin: Springer; 2001. pp. 37–53.
43. Carmeli G, Artzi Z, Kozlovsky A, Segev Y, Landsberg R. Antral computerized tomography pre-operative evaluation: relationship between mucosal thickening and maxillary sinus function. *Clin Oral Implants Res.* 2011 Jan;22(1):78–82.
44. Okuyemi KS, Tsue TT. Radiologic imaging in the management of sinusitis. *Am Fam Physician.* 2002;66(10):1882–6.
45. Drumond JP, Allegro BB, Novo NF, de Miranda SL, Sendyk WR. Evaluation of the Prevalence of Maxillary Sinuses Abnormalities through Spiral Computed Tomography (CT). *Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2017;21(2):126–33.
46. Maillet M, Bowles WR, McClanahan SL, John MT, Ahmad M. Cone-beam computed tomography evaluation of maxillary sinusitis. *J Endod.* 2011;37(6):753–7.
47. Tadinada A, Fung K, Thacker S, Mahdian M, Jadhav A, Schincaglia GP. Radiographic evaluation of the maxillary sinus prior to dental implant therapy: A comparison between two-dimensional and three-dimensional radiographic imaging. *Imaging Sci Dent.* 2015;45(3):169–74.
48. Yoshiura K, Ban S, Hijiya T, Yuasa K, Miwa K, Ariji E, Tabata O, Araki K, Tanaka T, Yonetsu K, et al. Analysis of maxillary sinusitis using computed tomography. *Dentomaxillofac Radiol.* 1993;22(2):86–92.
49. Iwamoto M, Watanabe M, Yamamoto M, Narita M, Kamio T, Takaki T, Shibahara T, Katakura A. Prognostic factors for maxillary sinus mucosal thickening following Le Fort I osteotomy: a retrospective analysis. *Maxillofac Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2019;41(1):12.
50. Rak KM, Newell JD 2nd, Yakes WF, Damiano MA, Luethke JM. Paranasal sinuses on MR images of the brain: significance of mucosal thickening. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 1991;156(2):381–4.
51. Hansen AG, Helvik AS, Nordgård S, Bugten V, Stovner LJ, Håberg AK, Gårseth M, Eggesbø HB. Incidental findings in MRI of the paranasal sinuses in adults: a population-based study (HUNT MRI). *BMC Ear Nose Throat Disord.* 2014 Nov 25;14(1):13.
52. Drumond JP, Allegro BB, Novo NF, de Miranda SL, Sendyk WR. Evaluation of the Prevalence of Maxillary Sinuses Abnormalities through Spiral Computed Tomography (CT). *Int Arch Otorhinolaryngol.* 2017;21(2):126–33.
53. Costa F, Emanuelli E, Robiony M. Incidence of Maxillary Sinus Disease Before Sinus Floor Elevation Surgery as Identified by Cone-Beam Computed Tomography: A Literature Review. *J Oral Implantol.* 2018;44(2):161–6.
54. Capelli M, Gatti P. Radiological Study of Maxillary Sinus using CBCT: Relationship between Mucosal Thickening and Common Anatomic Variants in Chronic Rhinosinusitis. *J Clin Diagn Res.* 2016;10(11):MC07–10.

Figures




Figure 1

A coronal CBCT section showing AMO in the right maxillary sinus, deviation of the nasal septum and mucosal thickening in the floor of the sinus. B corresponding axial and C sagittal section. Coloured linear annotations are used to precisely locate the site of AMO in all three planes.




Figure 2

Coronal CBCT section showing method of calculation of vertical location of AMO.





Figure 3

Axial CBCT section showing method of calculation of antero-posterior location of the AMO



HU 736

Figure 4

Two-sided yellow arrow depicting the maximal length of the AMO



Figure 5

Sagittal section showing the points at which the mucosal thickening was measured.



Figure 6

Sagittal CBCT section showing six equidistant points (arrows and dots) on a line (yellow discontinuous) connecting the anterior and posterior most points on the floor of the sinus in sagittal section. (Dots indicate areas with no MT)

Distribution of sinuses according to size of mucosal thickening




Figure 7

Distribution of the types of mucosal thickenings.




Figure 8

Occurrence of AMO in different types of mucosal thickenings

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [DatasheetAMOandMT.xlsx](#)