Results

Cases in this study were classified into 2 groups according to operative procedure. Group A included 11 cases (50%) with Eustachian tuboplasty and myringotomy and group B included 11 cases (50%) with tuboplasty and stenting. (Table 1)

(Table 1), Distribution of studied groups as regards surgical procedure and number of cases)

| Group | A | В | Total |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------|
| | Tuboplasty + | Tuboplasty | |
| Procedure | myringotomy | and stenting | |
| Number | 11 | 11 | 22 |
| % | % 50% | | 100% |

Table (2) Distribution of the study groups according to sex.

| Sex | Males | | Females | | Total | |
|-------------|-------|------|---------|------|-------|-----|
| Study group | No | % | No | % | No | % |
| Group A | 6 | 54.6 | 5 | 45.4 | 11 | 100 |
| Group B | 7 | 63.6 | 4 | 36.4 | 11 | 100 |
| Total | 13 | 59.1 | 9 | 40.9 | 22 | 100 |

According to table (3) Group A included 6 males and 5 females while group B included 7 males and 4 females

Table (3) Mean \pm SD of ages of the study groups.

| Age | | | |
|-------------|----------------|------|--------|
| Study group | $X \pm SD$ | t. | P |
| Group A | 25.7 ± 9.2 | | |
| Group B | 25.9 ± 7.5 | 0.06 | > 0.05 |

X= Mean

SD = standard deviation.

According to table (3) age ranged in this study from 15 to 39 with the mean age 25.7 for group A and 25.9 for group B.

Table (4) Distribution of the main complaint among the study groups.

| Study group | Group A | | Group B | | Total | |
|-------------|---------|------|---------|-----|-------|------|
| Complaints | No | % | No | % | No | % |
| Tinnitus | 8 | 50 % | 8 | 50% | 16 | 100% |
| ↓Hearing | 3 | 50% | 3 | 50% | 6 | 100% |
| Total | 11 | 50% | 11 | 50% | 22 | 100% |

According to table (4) Patients' main complaint was tinnitus in 8 cases of group A and 8 cases of group B while the other 3 cases of each group complained mainly of decreased hearing.

Table (5):- Distribution of studied groups as regards the side of the lesion.

| Study group | Group A | | Gro | ир В | Total | |
|-------------|---------|------|-----|------|-------|-------|
| Side | No | % | No | % | No | % |
| Unilateral | 5 | 62.5 | 3 | 37.5 | 8 | 100 % |
| Bilateral | 6 | 42.9 | 8 | 57.1 | 14 | 100% |
| Total | 11 | 50% | 11 | 50% | 22 | 100% |

 $X^2 = 0.19$

P > 0.05

According to table (5) there were 8 cases with unilateral Eustachian tube dysfunction and 14 cases with bilateral Eustachian tube dysfunction.

Group A included 5 cases with unilateral Eustachian dysfunction and 6 cases with bilateral Eustachian dysfunction, while group B included 3 cases with unilateral Eustachian dysfunction and 8 cases with bilateral Eustachian dysfunction.

In group (A):- there were 6 cases with tuboplasty and myringotomy done in one ear and ventilation tube in the other

ear; the other 5 unilateral cases were managed by tuboplasty and myringotomy only.

In group (B):- there were 8 bilateral cases with tuboplasty and Eustachian tube stenting in one ear and ventilation tube in the other ear, while the other 3 unilateral cases the only affected ear was managed by tuboplasty and Eustachian tube stenting.

Table (6) Tympanometry results of group A preoperatively, 3and 6 months postoperatively.

| Tympanometry | Preoperat | ive | After 3 m | onths | After 6 m | onths |
|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | Tympanometry | ME | Tympanometry | ME | Tympanometry | ME |
| Case No. | Type | pressure | Type | pressure | Type | pressure |
| Case 1 | С | -320 | A | +20 | В | |
| Case 2 | С | -240 | A | -40 | A | -40 |
| Case 3 | С | -300 | A | -44 | A | -36 |
| Case 4 | С | -325 | A | -10 | A | 0 |
| Case 5 | С | -200 | A | -50 | В | |
| Case 6 | С | -310 | A | -20 | В | |
| Case 7 | С | -210 | A | -100 | A | -30 |
| Case 8 | С | -320 | A | +10 | В | |
| Case 9 | С | -400 | A | +30 | В | |
| Case 10 | С | -250 | A | -40 | В | |
| Case 11 | С | -180 | A | -60 | A | -20 |

Table (6) shows that 3 months postoperatively all cases of group (A) showed type A tympanometry, these cases showed marked improvement of their symptoms. While after 6 months 5 cases showed type A tympanometry with improved ME pressure and improved symptoms, success rate 45.5%. and 6 cases of group A showed type B tympanometry with flat curve with failure rate 54.5%.

Table (7) Means \pm SD of middle ear pressure preoperative and 3 months postoperatively among group A.

| ME pressure | $X \pm SD$ | $X \pm SD$ of | SE | Paired t | P |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|------|----------|---------|
| Time | | difference | | | |
| Preoperative | | | | | |
| (n = 11) | -277.7 ± 66.8 | | | | |
| After 3 months | | 250.1± 101.7 | 30.6 | 8.16 | < 0.001 |
| (n = 11) | -27.6 ± 38.4 | | | | |

X = mean, SD = standard deviation, SE = statistical error.

This table shows that there was significant difference between middle ear pressures after 3 months among group A.

Table (8) means \pm SD of middle ear pressure preoperative and 6 months postoperative of improved cases among group A.

| ME pressure | $X \pm SD$ | $X \pm SD$ of | SE | Paired t | P |
|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|----------|---------|
| Time | | difference | | | |
| Preoperative | | | | | |
| (n = 5) | -251 ± 60.7 | | | | |
| After 3 months | | -225.8 ± 67.8 | 30.27 | 7.46 | < 0.001 |
| (n=5) | -25.2 ± 15.97 | | | | |

X = mean, SD= standard deviation, SE= statistical error.

This table shows that there was a significant difference between middle ear pressures of improved cases among group A.

Table (9) Tympanometry results of group B preoperatively, 3and 6 months postoperatively.

| Tympanometry | Preoperative | | After 3 mo | onths | After 6 mo | After 6 months | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------|--|--|
| | Tympanometry | ME | Tympanometry | ME | Tympanometry | ME | | |
| Case No. | Туре | pressure | Type | pressure | Туре | pressure | | |
| Case 1 | С | -400 | A | -100 | A | 0 | | |
| Case 2 | С | -300 | С | -200 | С | -300 | | |
| Case 3 | С | -200 | С | -250 | A | +50 | | |
| Case 4 | С | -400 | В | | В | | | |
| Case 5 | С | -350 | В | | В | | | |
| Case 6 | С | -150 | A | -50 | A | 0 | | |
| Case 7 | С | -250 | A | -100 | A | 0 | | |
| Case 8 | С | -250 | A | -100 | A | -50 | | |
| Case 9 | С | -300 | A | -100 | A | 0 | | |
| Case 10 | С | -200 | A | -50 | A | 0 | | |
| Case 11 | С | -400 | A | -100 | A | 0 | | |

Table 9 shows that 3 months postoperatively 6 cases of group B showed type A tympanometry, these cases showed marked improvement of their symptoms.

In cases 4 and 5 the stent was extruded spontaneously during the 1st month and their tympanometry at 3 months postoperatively showed type B tympanometry. Although adhesions were released and crustations were suctioned from the

tubal orifice their tympanometry after 6 months was still of type B.

In cases 2 and 3 of group B the stent was extruded spontaneously during the 2nd month and their tympanometry at 3 months was of type C, adhesions were removed and crustations were suctioned, at 6 months follow up case number 3 showed type A tympanometry while case number 2 showed type C tympanometry.

After 6 months 8 cases showed type A tympanometry with improved ME pressure and improved symptoms, 2 cases with type B tympanometry and one case with type C.

Table (10) Means \pm SD of middle ear pressure preoperatively and 3 months postoperatively among group B.

| ME pressure | $X \pm SD$ | $X \pm SD$ of | SE | Paired t | P |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|------|----------|---------|
| Time | | difference | | | |
| Preoperative | | | | | |
| (n = 9) | -272.3 ± 87 | | | | |
| After 3 months | | -155.6 ± 95.01 | 31.7 | 4.91 | < 0.001 |
| (n = 9) | -116.7 ± 55.9 | | | | |

X = mean, SD = standard deviation, SE = statistical error.

This table shows significant difference between middle ear pressures of 9 cases among group B after 3 months.

Table (11) Means \pm SD of middle ear pressure preoperatively and 6 months postoperatively among group B.

| ME pressure | $X \pm SD$ | $X \pm SD$ of | SE | Paired t | P |
|----------------|---------------|------------------|------|----------|---------|
| Time | | difference | | | |
| Preoperative | | | | | |
| (n = 8) | -272.3 ± 87 | | | | |
| After 6 months | | -239 ± 124.4 | 41.5 | 5.76 | < 0.001 |
| (n = 8) | -33.3 ± 103.1 | | | | |

X = mean, SD = standard deviation, SE = statistical error.

This table shows significant difference between middle ear pressures of 8 cases among group B after 6 months.

Table (12) Means \pm SD of middle ear pressure preoperative and postoperative among the study groups.

| Study group | | Group A | | Group B | | |
|----------------|----|------------------|----|------------------|------|---------|
| Time | N | $X \pm SD$ | N | $X \pm SD$ | t. | P |
| Preoperative | 11 | -277.7 ± 6.8 | 11 | -290.9±88.9 | | > 0.05 |
| | | | | | 0.39 | |
| After 3 months | 11 | -27.6 ± 38.4 | 9 | -116.7±55.9 | | < 0.001 |
| | | | | | 4.06 | |
| After 6 months | 5 | -25.2±15.97 | 8 | -33.3 ± 03.1 | | > 0.05 |
| | | | | | 0.41 | |

This table shows that there was no significant difference between middle ear pressures of improved cases of the 2 groups.