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Objectives  After completing this article, readers should be able to:

1. Explain the difference between open and closed neural tube defects.
2. Describe the characteristics of spinal skin dimples that warrant further evaluation.
3. Describe the characteristics of spinal skin dimples that do not warrant further evaluation.
4. Discuss the evaluation of spinal skin dimples and name the findings that suggest occult spinal dysraphism.
5. Discuss the neurosurgical treatment of occult spinal dysraphism.
6. Explain the natural history and clinical manifestations of occult spinal dysraphism.

Definitions
Neural tube defects are among the most common forms of birth defect, affecting 1 in every 1,000 pregnancies. (1)(2) These defects, which result from abnormal fusion of the neural tube during embryonic development, are placed into two broad categories: open and closed. Open neural tube defects are lesions in which brain, spinal cord, or spinal nerves are exposed through obvious defects of the meninges and skull or vertebral column. Examples are anencephaly, myelomeningocele, and meningocele. Closed neural tube defects are skin-covered lesions under which the nervous system structures have not formed normally. These include split cord malformation, dermal sinus tract, tethered spinal cord, and intraspinal lipoma (Table).

Spina bifida is an imprecise term often used to describe a variety of congenital spinal anomalies that range in consequence from insignificant to severe. Spina bifida occulta (SBO) is a radiographic finding that describes incomplete osseous fusion of the posterior elements. It may occur in conjunction with a cutaneous abnormality but is clinically benign and is considered a normal variant. (3) Occult spinal dysraphisms (OSDs) are much less common than SBO and encompass a variety of skin-covered neural tube defects. Because the neural structures are affected, however, neurologic impairment is common. Most forms of OSD have an associated overlying cutaneous abnormality.

Most open neural tube defects are diagnosed prenatally with ultrasonography and serum marker concentrations. Those defects not identified before delivery are apparent at birth. An OSD, on the other hand, is less obvious and may not be diagnosed until later in life, despite its presence at birth. The occult nature can be problematic because the clinical impairments associated with closed neural tube defects, which include paresis, spasticity, sensory disturbance, orthopedic deformity or contracture, and bowel and bladder dysfunction, often progress insidiously over time.

Diagnosis
More than 50% of OSDs are diagnosed when a dimple (Fig. 1) is noted in the lower spine/sacral region. Although the natural history of OSD is not fully understood, early diagnosis and intervention are believed to improve outcome in almost all cases. (4) Hence, the recognition of a suspicious skin dimple and identification of underlying anomalies with prompt radiographic evaluation and neurosurgical referral is crucial. However, not all dimples are associated with an OSD. Distinguishing between cutaneous stigmata associ-
ated with OSD and innocent skin dimples can be difficult and may lead to costly and unnecessary tests or referrals. (5) Therefore, the focus of this review is to provide information on how to identify skin dimples that require further evaluation, what method of evaluation should be used, and when to refer to a specialist.

Most cutaneous stigmata associated with OSD are found in the midline overlying the spinal lesion. A finding of hypertrichosis, capillary hemangioma, atretic meningocele, subcutaneous mass (eg, lipoma), or a caudal appendage (Fig. 2) requires further investigation. Gluteal cleft anomalies other than dimples also have a weak association with milder forms of OSD and warrant further evaluation. Therefore, a deviated or duplicated (“split”) gluteal cleft (Fig. 3) should raise concern for OSD, whether or not a dimple is present. The management of a “dimple” alone, however, demands greater diagnostic acumen because some dimples over the spine represent dermal sinus tracts, although most do not. Dermal sinus tracts are not classified as open neural tube defects because characteristically they do not feature overt meningeal, osseous, and cutaneous defects (despite potential communication between the skin and nervous elements). These skin-covered lesions are marked similarly to other OSDs with overlying dimples or other cutaneous stigmata. (6)

Clinical findings do not predict with certainty which dimples are associated with OSD. However, the following criteria have been found to differentiate best between dimples that require further evaluation and those that require only routine follow-up evaluation: multiple dimples, dimple diameter larger than 5 mm, location greater than 2.5 cm above the anal verge, and association of the dimple with other cutaneous markers. Review of the literature shows that 2% to 4% of all children have a dimple identified in the sacrococcygeal region, but only seven cases have ever been found to be associated with an OSD. (7) For those patients in whom a coccygeal dimple was found in conjunction with an OSD, most had more than one dimple. Notably, the second dimple often was found more rostrally along the spine (ie, cervical, thoracic, or lumbar). Hence, clinical examination should seek to identify dimple location and the number present.

Table. Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Neural Tube Defects</th>
<th>Closed Neural Tube Defects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anencephaly</td>
<td>Dermal Sinus Tract±Inclusion Tumor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myelomeningocele</td>
<td>Split Cord Malformation Diastematomyelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meningocele</td>
<td>Tethered Spinal Cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lipomyelomeningocele or Spinal Cord Lipoma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exposed rudimentary brainstem due to failed closure of the cephalic portion of the neural tube. Hemiation of the spinal cord through an unfused portion of the spinal column. Protrusion of the meninges through a spinal column opening. Division of the spinal cord into two parts that are usually separated by bone or cartilage. Incomplete dysjunction (separation of the cutaneous ectoderm and neuroectoderm), resulting in an epithelial-lined tract that terminates in neural structures. Abnormal attachment of the lower end of the spinal cord to surrounding structures. Premature dysjunction allows mesodermal infiltration between cutaneous ectoderm and neuroectoderm, resulting in a tethered spinal cord attached to a benign fatty tumor in the back.

Figure 1. Solitary dimple whose location greater than 2.5 mm above the anus indicated the need for further evaluation, which revealed an occult spinal dysraphism requiring neurosurgical intervention.
Solitary sacrococcygeal pits located entirely within the gluteal cleft (Fig. 4) have no clinical significance and should be considered anatomic variations of normal. Typically, the coccyx is palpable beneath the dimple and intact skin can be seen at the base (Fig. 5). If there is difficulty discerning whether the lesion is covered completely by skin, otoscopic examination of the dimple often can determine if there is a bottom to the pit. Although most lesions occur in the midline, eccentric lesions (Fig. 6) are not in themselves abnormal unless occurring in conjunction with other lesions or outside the sacral spine. No radiographic evaluation or neurosurgical consultation is required; parental reassurance is the only intervention necessary.

In addition to a thorough inspection of the skin, the pediatrician must perform a careful physical examination, with particular attention to the neurologic and orthopedic aspects. Associated orthopedic findings can include clubfeet, arthrogryposis (contracture of multiple joints leading to fixation of the joints in extension or flexion) of the lower extremities, and hip dislocation. Abnormal curvature of the spine, including kyphosis or scoliosis, also may be present. Abnormal neurologic or orthopedic examination findings indicate the need for further evaluation.

**Management**

When detailed history and physical examination raise the clinical suspicion for OSD, radiographic imaging should be obtained (Fig. 7). Either ultrasonography or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) can be employed to evaluate...
OSD. Ultrasonography of the lumbosacral spine generally is useful only in children younger than 3 months of age because ossification of the vertebral arches has not yet occurred. However, the decision to use ultrasonography versus MRI (for children of any age) as first-line imaging appears somewhat institution-dependent. In one study of a pediatric population who had sacrococcygeal cutaneous lesions, a discordance rate of 17% between ultrasonography and MRI studies was found in which ultrasonography suggested an OSD while MRI yielded normal results. Pediatricians, therefore, should be aware of the possible discrepancy in findings with these imaging modalities and know which study is most appropriate at their respective institutions.

Spinal ultrasonography can assess the level of the conus medullaris, the diameter and echogenicity of the filum terminale, and the position and movement pattern of the spinal cord and nerve roots. Abnormal findings can include a low-lying conus, in which the tip is below the level of the second lumbar vertebral body; a filum terminale diameter greater than 2 mm; and a posteriorly positioned or nonmobile cord, which can indicate tethering. If ultrasonographic findings are abnormal, MRI of the spine is indicated. Findings on MRI vary, based on the type of OSD present. In general, MRI is more reliable and exact in diagnosing OSD.

Neurosurgical referral is appropriate if radiographic evaluation reveals any spinal abnormality. Consideration for early referral (before imaging) is appropriate for dimples superior to the gluteal cleft, especially if any discharge is observed or reported. Such dimples are the hallmark of dermal sinus tracts that predispose the patient to bacterial meningitis or intraspinal abscess. Surgical intervention is aimed at untethering the spinal cord and removing abnormal tissue, when present.

**Prognosis**

Almost all neurosurgical referrals for suspected OSD in children younger than 1 year of age are for evaluation of a dimple. Although the natural history of OSD is somewhat unpredictable, the overall risk of neurologic compromise increases with time. Neurologic deficits can be difficult to identify in young children because the onset of dysfunction is generally insidious and occurs about the same time as expected neurologic function development (eg, crawling, walking, standing). Accordingly, OSD deficits may be mistaken for delayed accrual of normal function, and irreversible damage may occur before symptomatic manifestation. The reasons for neurosurgical referral for children older than 1 year of age suspected of having OSD include chronic urinary tract infections, lower limb deformity (eg, foot drop,
weakness or atrophy in a lower extremity, talipes equino-varus, or dragging one foot), bowel/bladder dysfunction, pain, and lower extremity spasticity or paresis. However, careful inspection of this population often reveals subtle cutaneous stigmata. Therefore, it is important for the pediatrician to be vigilant in searching for midline skin anomalies. Even as common a condition as primary nocturnal enuresis warrants careful examination for midline skin anomalies.

Conclusion

Early diagnosis of OSD often comes from identification of spinal skin dimples. Recognition of suspicious lesions is important to reduce the risk of neurologic, urologic, and orthopedic dysfunction. During examination, the pediatrician should not only look for dimples along the spine but also for other markings such as abnormal hair growth, asymmetric gluteal creases, dermal sinuses/dimples/pits, hyper- or hypopigmentation, capillary hemangiomas, skin tags, and subcutaneous fatty masses that are associated with OSDs. Any lesion along the spine outside of the sacrococcygeal region or identification of more than one skin marking anywhere along the spine warrants further evaluation, including radiographic imaging and neurosurgical referral. (11) Optimal outcome is most likely with early diagnosis and surgical intervention.

Summary

- Spinal skin dimples and other cutaneous markings located outside of the sacrococcygeal region are associated most often with closed neural tube defects or OSD.
- The presence of more than one skin dimple anywhere along the neural axis is an indicator of the likely presence of OSD.
- The neurologic deficits associated with OSD are progressive and frequently not detected until permanent dysfunction has been sustained when diagnosed later in life.
- Early neurosurgical intervention is believed to prevent or halt progression of neurologic deficits due to spinal cord tethering.
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11. Which of the following is the best example of an open neural tube defect?
   A. Anencephaly.
   B. Dermal sinus tract.
   C. Diastematomyelia.
   D. Spinal cord lipoma.
   E. Tethered spinal cord.

12. Among the following, the child most likely to benefit from early referral to a neurosurgeon is:
   A. 1-month-old who has an eccentric sacral dimple.
   B. 1-week-old who has a solitary sacrococcygeal pit.
   C. 2-month-old who has a sacrococcygeal dimple.
   D. 3-month-old who has a dimple superior to the gluteal cleft with discharge.
   E. 3-week-old who has a palpable coccyx beneath the dimple.

13. An 8-month-old girl presents to your clinic with multiple dimples superior to the gluteal cleft, and you suspect OSD. Among the following, the most appropriate next step in her evaluation is:
   A. Computed tomography scan of the spine.
   B. Lumbar puncture.
   C. Magnetic resonance imaging of the spine.
   D. Ultrasonography of the spine.
   E. Radiographs of the spinal column.

14. A father brings his 6-year-old son to you for evaluation of nocturnal enuresis and occasional daytime wetting. On physical examination, you note a sacral dimple. Among the following, the feature most concerning for OSD is:
   A. Eccentric sacral location of the dimple.
   B. History of one urinary tract infection.
   C. Hypertrophy of one foot.
   D. Spasticity of the lower extremities.
   E. Truncal hypotonia.

15. Of the following, the feature that best distinguishes a dimple associated with OSD is:
   A. Cutaneous marker associated with the dimple.
   B. Greater than 3 mm maximal dimension.
   C. Location greater than 1 cm above the anus.
   D. Sacrococcygeal location.
   E. Single dimple.
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5. A 7-year-old girl presents with a 3-day history of bruising and an episode of epistaxis lasting 30 minutes. On physical examination, the only abnormalities are scleral icterus, widespread bruising, and cutaneous as well as mucosal petechiae. Laboratory results include a platelet count of $3 \times 10^9/\mu L$ (3 x 10^9/L), hemoglobin of 7.8 g/dL (78 g/L), white blood cell count of $12.9 \times 10^9/\mu L$ (12.9 x 10^9/L), absolute neutrophil count of $8.8 \times 10^9/\mu L$ (8.8 x 10^9/L), and mean corpuscular volume of 86 fl. Urinalysis is negative for red blood cells. The most appropriate next study is:

A. Antiplatelet antibodies.
B. Bone marrow aspirate.
C. Direct antiglobulin (Coombs) test.
D. Flow cytometry on peripheral blood.
E. Serum blood urea nitrogen and creatinine assessment.

Corrections

The caption for Figure 2 in the article entitled “Focus on Diagnosis: Urine Electrolytes” in the February issue of the journal (Pediatr Rev. 2011;32:65–68) is incorrect. The correct caption should read, “A graphic illustration of a positive urine anion gap, with the number of unmeasured anions exceeding the number of unmeasured cations. When this situation occurs in the context of metabolic acidosis, it is consistent with renal tubular acidosis, indicating an impaired ability to excrete protons in the urine as ammonium.” We regret the error.

The caption for Figure 1 in the article entitled “Sacral Dimples” in the March issue of the journal (Pediatr Rev. 2011;32:109–114) is incorrect. The correct caption should read, “Solitary dimple whose location is greater than 2.5 cm above the anus indicated the need for further evaluation. . . .” We regret the error.
rection, but not far enough to consider broader community concerns.

3. Prestige and ego. Some neonatologists (including the acclaimed father of neonatology) admit that this factor is a motivation in some cases of overtreatment. (9)

4. Indirect and direct application of the law. Many wrongly believe that Baby Doe regulations demand more than what is actually required. (10)

5. Profitability. The market and CMS rates help to contribute to a culture of disproportionate spending. Many hospitals are building NICUs because of this profitability. Lantos and Meadow (11) make this argument in some detail. For example, they cite a study that showed that from 1980 to 1995 the number of hospitals grew by 99%, the number of NICU beds by 138%, and the number of neonatologists by 268%. By contrast, the growth in needed NICU bed days was only 84%.

If clinicians accept the central argument of this article and its applicability to the NICU, attacking the previously cited problems is a good starting point.

References
2. Camosy C. Too Expensive to Treat?—Finitude, Tragedy, and the Neonatal ICU. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Press; 2010

Correction
In the article entitled “Sacral Dimples” in the March issue (*Pediatr Rev.* 2011;32:109–114), Figure 1 inadvertently contains the wrong picture. The image in this correction should be substituted, and the caption should read, “Solitary dimple whose location greater than 2.5 cm above the anus indicated the need for further evaluation, which revealed an occult spinal dysraphism requiring neurosurgical intervention.” Also, Figures 2A and 4 of the same article are published through the courtesy of Janelle Aby, MD. We regret the error.