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The leptomeninges are anatomically defined as the pia mater and the arachnoid, tissue envelopes that encase the brain and the spinal cord. Invasion of the leptomeninges or the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) by cancer is called leptomeningeal metastasis or neoplastic meningitis. These are general terms that encompass

1. Carcinomatous meningitis (metastases caused by carcinoma such as lung and breast)
2. Meningeal gliomatosis (dissemination of CSF caused by malignant glial tumors)
3. Leptomeningeal metastases secondary to other underlying solid tumors (e.g., rhabdomyosarcoma, neuroblastoma, medulloblastoma, other primitive neuroectodermal tumors)
4. Lymphomatous meningitis (metastases caused by lymphoma)
5. Leukemic meningitis (metastases caused by leukemia) (Chamberlain, 1992; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991; Kaplan et al., 1990; Posner and Chernik, 1978; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). In contrast, leukemic and lymphomatous meningitides frequently represent the first site of tumor recurrence without evidence of systemic disease (Kaplan et al., 1990). In approximately 5% to 10% of patients, leptomeningeal metastases are the initial presentation of cancer. In such cases, disease staging must be initiated to define the primary tumor and its pattern of metastases (Chamberlain, 1992; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991). This chapter discusses leptomeningeal metastases, with a primary emphasis on leptomeningeal metastases from solid tumors. It includes a review of the diverse clinical presentation of this disease entity, provides current information on diagnosis and management, and discusses new therapeutic options that are in preclinical or early clinical stages of development.

LEPTOMENINGEAL METASTASES BY CANCER TYPE

Reported histologic variability between series in organ-site tumors that lead to leptomeningeal metastasi-
sis reflects differences in hospital referral patterns. Solid tumors are disproportionately represented because of their overall greater prevalence and, in some series, because disseminated primary brain tumors and leukemic and lymphomatous meningitis are excluded. Of the solid tumors causing leptomeningeal metastases, those from breast occur in 30% of patients (range, 22% to 64%); lung in 16% (range, 10% to 26%); malignant melanoma in 11% (range, 7% to 15%); and the gastrointestinal tract in 6% (range, 4% to 14%). Carcinomas of an unknown primary origin constitute 1% to 7% of all cases of leptomeningeal metastases in most clinical series (Little et al., 1974; Theodore and Gendelman, 1981; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). The frequency of occurrence of primary brain tumors causing leptomeningeal metastases is from 10% to 32% depending on histology, patient age, and referral patterns (Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom, 1991; Kaplan et al., 1990; Shapiro et al., 1977; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). Lymphomatous meningitis associated with non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma in patients with the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) is also an increasingly common cause of leptomeningeal metastases. This has been reported to occur in approximately 20% of patients with AIDS who have systemic non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma and in 25% of those who have primary lymphoma of the CNS (Chamberlain and Kormanik, 1997; Chamberlain and Dirr, 1993).

Autopsy studies demonstrate an even higher incidence of leptomeningeal metastases than that established through clinical studies of patients with known leptomeningeal metastases. In the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center experience, 8% of 2375 patients with cancer demonstrated leptomeningeal metastases at autopsy (Posner and Chernik, 1978). Similarly, in a National Institutes of Health study of patients with small cell lung cancer, 11% manifested leptomeningeal metastases while alive compared with a 25% incidence found at postmortem examination (Rosen et al., 1982).

**CLINICAL PRESENTATIONS**

Unlike other cancers that affect the CNS, the clinical signs and symptoms of leptomeningeal metastases are highly variable because they affect all levels of the neuraxis (Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom, 1991; Kaplan et al., 1990; Little et al., 1974; Olson et al., 1974; Theodore and Gendelman, 1981; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). The degree of clinical pleomorphism of leptomeningeal metastases is problematic as clinical recognition may be delayed because of unfamiliarity with the wide spectrum of associated signs and symptoms. As shown in Table 16–1, these signs and symptoms are traditionally referable to three broad domains encompassing the neuraxis, including the cerebral hemispheres, cranial nerves, spinal cord, and exiting nerve roots. Site-specific symptoms and signs are summarized in Table 16–2.

Symptoms referable to the cerebral hemispheres include, in decreasing order of frequency, headache, mental status change, nausea and vomiting, and hemibody weakness and seizures. Headache, the most common symptom of cerebral dysfunction caused by leptomeningeal metastases, may be the only symptom and usually involves the entire head or the occiput and the neck. Frequently, headache, like nausea and vomiting, is a consequence of raised intracranial pressure resulting from either obstructive or communicating hydrocephalus. Hydrocephalus is a common consequence of leptomeningeal metastases that results from an intraventricular tumor or from base-of-the-brain leptomeningeal infiltration (Kokkoris, 1983). Mental status changes range from slight slowing of thought processes (so-called oligophrenia) to depressed levels of consciousness. In late stages of leptomeningeal metastases, patients often manifest profound changes in mental status, referred to as carcinomatous encephalopathy, a process that is immediately progressive and contributes to death from leptomeningeal metastases. Seizures and hemibody weakness are uncommon manifestations of leptomeningeal metastases and often coexist with bulky intraparenchymal or subarachnoid tumor.

**Table 16–1. Mean Frequency of Initial Symptoms and Signs of Leptomeningeal Metastasis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom (%)</th>
<th>Signs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral hemisphere</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranial nerves</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal cord and roots</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple site</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Data are from Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom (1991), Kaplan et al. (1990), Little et al. (1974), Olson et al. (1974), Theodore and Gendelman (1981), and Wasserstrom et al. (1982).*
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Table 16–2. Symptoms and Signs of Leptomeningeal Disease by Site and Decreasing Order of Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>Signs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral hemisphere</td>
<td>Headache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental status change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nausea/vomiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hemibody weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seizures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranial nerves</td>
<td>Diplopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facial numbness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreased vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal cord and roots</td>
<td>Limb weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gait instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bladder dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bowel dysfunction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signs referable to the cerebral hemispheres include, in decreasing order of frequency, mental status changes, seizures, papilledema, and hemiparesis. Mental status changes may manifest as dementia; in general, these signs are resistant to treatment. Papilledema, like headache, nausea, and vomiting, reflects raised intracranial pressure and, usually, hydrocephalus. Signs and symptoms of raised intracranial pressure caused by leptomeningeal metastases may transiently respond to combined treatment with whole-brain irradiation and intrathecal chemotherapy (Chamberlain, 1992; Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom, 1991).

Symptoms of cranial nerve involvement include, in decreasing order of frequency, double vision, hearing loss, facial numbness, and loss of vision. The most frequent signs of cranial nerve involvement include ophthalmoplegia (affecting, in order, cranial nerves VI, III, and IV); facial weakness (affecting cranial nerve VII); diminished hearing (affecting cranial nerve VIII); trigeminal neuropathy (affecting cranial nerve V); and hypoglossal weakness (affecting cranial nerve XII). A disturbance in eye movement with resultant diplopia or oscillopsia is frequently an early, and often isolated, sign of leptomeningeal metastases. Patients with cancer manifesting new onset of lateral rectus palsy (affecting cranial nerve VI) should be evaluated for possible leptomeningeal metastases following a negative neuroradiographic evaluation for intracranial tumor. Occasionally patients present with a disturbance of hearing (either unilateral or bilateral), facial weakness, or decreased facial sensation in a trigeminal distribution (trigeminal motor dysfunction, i.e., trouble opening or closing the jaw), although these findings occur more often in cases of advanced leptomeningeal metastases in which multiple cranial neuropathies coexist. As with altered mental status, multiple cranial nerve dysfunction, especially with rapid temporal evolution, is a poor prognostic sign. In addition, focal deficits such as cranial neuropathies respond poorly, if at all, to either radiotherapy (whole brain or base of brain) or intrathecal drug therapy. Cranial nerve dysfunction appears to reflect the tumor’s preferential involvement at the base of the brain with the tumor infiltrating basal CSF compartments (Kokkoris, 1983).

Spinal cord and exiting root symptoms include those resulting from involvement of the spinal cord (cervical, thoracic, or lumbar); the conus medullaris (the caudal-most portion of the spinal cord proper); the cauda equina (nerve roots contained within the lumbosacral dural sac); the exiting nerve roots (contained within dural sleeves); and the spinal meninges. The most common of these symptoms are limb weakness or numbness, pain (i.e., meningismus), gait instability, and bladder and bowel dysfunction. Limb weakness usually manifests either as a polyradiculoneuropathy (involvement of multiple exiting nerve
roots or cauda equina), in which lower motor neuron findings predominate (decreased limb tone, diminished or absent deep tendon reflexes, and dermatomal or root-referable sensory loss), or as a myelopathy (as with spinal cord or conus medullaris dysfunction), in which upper motor neuron findings predominate (increased limb tone, exaggerated deep tendon reflexes, extensor planar response, and segmental or fixed-level sensory loss). Bladder or bowel dysfunction in isolation is never a finding of leptomeningeal metastases but rather occurs early with spinal cord or conus medullaris dysfunction or late with cauda equina dysfunction in conjunction with other signs of neurologic disturbance. In a patient with cancer and spinal cord dysfunction, if spinal cord compression resulting from an epidural mass is ruled out by computed tomography (CT) myelography or contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the spine, then leptomeningeal metastases should be strongly considered. Pain, like epidural spinal cord compression, may be localized (e.g., neck, interscapular, or lumbar); radicular (conforming to a nerve root distribution); or referred (distant pain such as isolated knee pain). Gait instability is a common disorder of the spinal cord in patients with leptomeningeal metastases and often heralds tumor progression.

Common signs referable to the spine in patients who have leptomeningeal metastases include extremity weakness (lower or upper motor neuron pattern), dermatomal or segmental sensory loss, exaggerated or diminished to absent deep tendon reflexes, nuchal rigidity (meningeal), ataxia, and pain on raising a straightened leg. Spinal cord dysfunction is dominated by focal neurologic deficits that respond poorly to treatment, including limited-field spine irradiation or intrathecal fluid chemotherapy, whereas pain symptoms usually respond to treatment (Chamberlain, 1992; Kaplan et al., 1990).

With progression of leptomeningeal metastases, new signs and symptoms appear and pre-existing findings worsen. Patients with underlying solid tumors are more likely to present with spinal or radicular symptoms, whereas patients with hematologic malignancies more often present with cranial nerve dysfunction. Multifocal neurologic symptoms may be seen in two-thirds of patients and may be a sign of progressive leptomeningeal disease (Van Oostendorp and Twijnstra, 1999). Rapid progression of leptomeningeal metastases involving one or multiple CNS regions is invariably a poor prognostic sign.

**APPROACH TO DIAGNOSIS**

The diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases is made by correlating physical signs and symptoms with laboratory findings and neuroimaging studies. In the past, the presence of malignant cells in the CSF was a prerequisite for diagnosing leptomeningeal disease. However, discrepancies may exist between clinical signs and symptoms and results of CSF examination(s). Improvements in neuroimaging technology, particularly the widespread availability of MRI, have increased the feasibility of establishing a diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases using imaging techniques. In some instances the presence of typical clinical features coupled with appropriate neuroimaging abnormalities are adequate for making the diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases (Freilich et al., 1995).

**Cerebrospinal Fluid Examination**

One of the most important diagnostic procedures for establishing the presence of leptomeningeal metastases is examination of the CSF (Table 16–3). Essential elements of the CSF laboratory evaluation include cell count and differential, cytology, and protein and glucose concentrations. In patients who have primary solid tumors, the finding of malignant cells in the CSF provides unequivocal evidence of leptomeningeal metastases. The initial lumbar puncture will show abnormalities in all but a minority of patients when opening pressure and CSF cell count, glucose protein levels and cytology are considered (Kaplan et al., 1990; Olson et al., 1974; Theodore and Gendelman, 1981; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). In approximately 50% of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, the CSF opening pressure will be elevated. Similarly, a majority of patients with leptomeningeal metastases have elevated protein levels, and increased CSF cell counts. A depressed CSF glucose level (so-called hypoglycorrhachia) is seen in a minority (≤30%) of patients with leptomeningeal metastases. However, alone, such abnormal findings in the CSF are non-specific and may be present in various neurologic disorders.

Until recently, the diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases could not be made without finding malignant cells in the CSF. However, improvements in neuroimaging technology have increased the feasibility of establishing a radiographic diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases. In a recent review, in 106
consecutively diagnosed pediatric patients with medulloblastoma, spinal MRI and CSF cytology were evaluated for the presence of leptomeningeal metastases. Of these patients, 8.5% had positive MRI findings with negative CSF cytology; and 11.3% had positive CSF cytology with negative MRIs. Either CSF cytology or spinal MRI alone would have missed leptomeningeal disease in as many as 14% to 18% (Fouladi et al., 1999). Therefore, patients with a clinical syndrome or neuroradiographic findings compatible with a diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases should be treated in a similar fashion to those patients with cytologically proven leptomeningeal metastases (Chamberlain, 1992).

Several series have demonstrated that, in some cases, serial CSF sampling via lumbar puncture or sampling from alternate sites (e.g., cisternal or ventricular) is required to detect malignant cells. The experience of Wasserstrom et al. (1982) in 90 patients with solid tumor leptomeningeal metastases revealed positive cytology in 55% of them after an initial lumbar puncture, increasing to 80% after a second lumbar puncture. Each subsequent lumbar puncture yielded positive cytology in approximately an additional 2% of patients per lumbar examination of CSF. An additional 5% of patients showed positive cytology only after cisternal or ventricular examination of CSF; 10% of patients showed persistently negative cytology for malignant cells in CSF regardless of site or number of examinations.

In a small series of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, Rogers et al. (1992) found that nearly 20% with leptomeningeal metastases demonstrated positive cytology only on cisternal examination of the CSF. In another study of 63 cases of cytologically confirmed leptomeningeal metastases, including solid tumors, leukemia, and lymphoma, Kaplan et al. (1990) reported positive cytologic findings in 71% of patients on the first lumbar puncture and in 21% on the second lumbar puncture; only 8% required more than two lumbar punctures to demonstrate positive cytology. In addition, Kaplan et al. (1990) emphasized that CSF cell count was a poor predictor of positive cytology because cell counts were normal in 29% of cases in which lumbar punctures yielded positive cytologic results.

Similarly, in a small number of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, Murray et al. (1983) emphasized marked variations in CSF composition, including cytologic specimens from different levels of the neuraxis (lumbar, cisternal, and ventricular CSF compartments) in the absence of an epidural block to the CSF flow. Harrison et al. (1998) also suggested that lumbar CSF samples correlate better with imaging findings when compared with ventricular CSF samples. Furthermore, in adults with leptomeningeal metastases, the initial CSF cytology was composed of malignant cells more often in patients with an underlying solid tumor versus those with hematologic malignancies that were predominantly non-Hodgkin’s lymphomas (73% versus 53%) (Van Oostenbrugge and Twijnstra, 1999).

Results from these series suggest a practical approach to the examination of CSF in patients with solid tumors and clinically suspected leptomeningeal metastases: After two tumor-negative cytologic samples from lumbar puncture and negative neuroimaging studies (gadolinium-enhanced MRIs of the brain and spinal cord), examination of the CSF from alternate sites (e.g., cisternal or ventricular) should be considered. A minority of patients will have clinical presentations compatible with leptomeningeal metas-
tases and negative evaluations for malignant cells from CSF along with negative neuroradiographic studies; in these patients treatment may be initiated, assuming there is a known history of an underlying malignancy and other diagnostic possibilities have been excluded (e.g., epidural spinal cord compression, paraneoplastic disorders, and toxic or metabolic complications of cancer therapy).

In patients with leptomeningeal metastases, measurement of CSF tumor markers such as carcinoembryonic antigen and \( \alpha \)-glucuronidase may assist in diagnosis or evaluation after treatment (Chamberlain, 1998b; Schold et al., 1980; Twijnstra et al., 1989). Other biochemical markers for leptomeningeal metastases include \( \alpha \)-fetoprotein, the \( \beta \)-subunit of human chronic gonadotropin, \( \alpha_2 \)-microglobulin, glucose-phosphate isomerase, immunoglobulin indices (either IgG or IgM), and oligoclonal bands (Ennerudh et al., 1987; Klee et al., 1986; Malkin and Posner, 1987; Newton et al., 1991; Schipper et al., 1988). Tumor markers should be simultaneously obtained from serum and CSF to determine if an elevation in a CSF marker is a result of passive diffusion or secondary to leptomeningeal disease (DeAngelis, 1998).

In addition to the specific biochemical markers noted above, other useful adjuncts to CSF cytology include flow cytometry, measurement of immunophenotype, fluorescence in situ hybridization, chromosomal analysis, and immunohistochemical studies. The underlying diagnostic utility of such studies largely depends on the underlying systemic malignancy. For example, lymphocytes in the CSF may not be readily identifiable as malignant by the cytopathologist, but a demonstration of monoclonality (lambda or kappa light chain–directed monoclonal antibody analysis), B-cell lineage, or a specific chromosomal abnormality may differentiate leukemic or lymphomatous meningitis from a normal or reactive T-cell population (Gibas et al., 1987; Goalkham et al., 1984; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991; Recht, 1991; Walker, 1991). Glial fibrillary acidic protein histochemistry of CSF may also facilitate identification of malignant glial cells (Chamberlain, 1995a). Likewise, fluorescence in situ hybridization has been shown to be a feasible modality to aid in the diagnosis of leptomeningeal disease in breast cancer patients (Van Oostenbrugge et al., 1997).

### Neuroradiographic Studies

#### Magnetic Resonance Imaging and Computed Tomography Scans

A variety of neuroradiographic studies may be helpful in establishing a diagnosis, defining the extent of disease (i.e., CNS staging), and following treatment response in patients who have leptomeningeal metastases. Abnormal neuroimaging is seen more commonly in patients with underlying solid malignancies than in those with underlying hematologic malignancies (Van Oostenbrugge and Twijnstra, 1999). As demonstrated by Chamberlain et al. (1990), gadolinium-enhanced imaging of the head and spine are the preferred neuroradiographic studies for the diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases, although contrast-enhanced CT studies may also demonstrate abnormalities. As shown in Table 16–4, gadolinium-enhanced MRI has both a higher specificity and a higher sensitivity than CT imaging.

Contrast-enhanced CT of the head reveals abnormalities in approximately 25% to 56% of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, including

1. Sulcal or cisternal enhancement
2. Ependymal and subependymal enhancement
3. Irregular tentorial enhancement
4. Cisternal or sulcal obliteration
5. Subarachnoid enhancing nodules
6. Intraventricular enhancing nodules
7. Communicating hydrocephalus

#### Table 16–4. Findings in Comparative MRI and CT Contrast-Enhanced Brain Imaging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>MRI Scan (%)</th>
<th>CT Scan (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parenchymal volume loss</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal enhancement</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulcal/dural</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisternal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentorial</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ependymal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodules</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subarachnoid</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenchymal</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocephalus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Chamberlain et al. (1990).*
In addition, as many as 60% of patients whose findings from contrast-enhanced CT suggest leptomeningeal metastases have coexistent parenchymal metastasis. All abnormalities detected on contrast-enhanced CT scans were detected through gadolinium-enhanced MRI, which also revealed additional lesions not otherwise seen. Despite the superiority of gadolinium-enhanced MRI, both modalities have a high incidence of false-negative results (30% for gadolinium-enhanced MRI and 58% for contrast-enhanced CT). Normal findings by either or both examinations do not exclude a diagnosis of leptomeningeal metastases. In the majority of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, gadolinium-enhanced MRI is also more useful than other imaging modalities in demonstrating bulky disease, a pattern of disease most responsive to radiotherapy. Kallmes et al. (1998) have suggested employing high-dose gadolinium-enhanced MRI to diagnose meningeal metastases when a strong clinical suspicion exists following a negative standard-dose gadolinium-enhanced MRI.

Kim et al. (1982) delineated the patterns seen in patients who had leptomeningeal metastases on CT myelography scans, including:

1. Parallel longitudinal striations in the cauda equina caused by thickened nerve roots
2. Irregular intradural extramedullary filling defects with varying degrees of blockage resembling arachnoiditis
3. Multiple intradural nodular defects along nerve roots
4. Amputation of dural root sleeves
5. Focal enlargement of the spinal cord or conus
6. Intradural extramedullary blockage to contrast flow

Similar findings are noted on contrast-enhanced spinal MRI, which is superior in demonstrating intradural extramedullary nodules, focal spinal cord enlargement, clumping of nerve roots, and spinal cord pial enhancement, often termed “sugar coating” (Chamberlain, 1995b; Kramer et al., 1991; Lim et al., 1990; Sze et al., 1988). In a study by Chamberlain (1995a) that directly compared CT myelography with MR imaging of the spine, few discordant results were noted between these modalities. However, MRI is preferred because it is (1) comparable to CT myelography, (2) noninvasive, (3) has a low rate of procedure-related morbidity, and (4) is associated with greater patient acceptance (Chamberlain, 1995a,b).

The optimal contrast-enhanced MRI examination of the spine for evaluating intradural extramedullary disease seen in patients with leptomeningeal metastases includes T1-weighted sagittal scans taken before and after gadolinium administration, with T1-weighted axial images reserved for regions of interest that are detected by sagittal imaging or exist in regions with clinically suspect disease (i.e., the cauda equina) (Sze et al., 1988). It is important to note that MRI changes may be seen following lumbar puncture or a neurosurgical procedure and include meningeal reaction appearing as leptomeningeal enhancement, which may occur at the level of the lumbar roots and extend as far rostral as the cranium. Linear enhancement may persist for weeks to months. To avoid neuroimaging artifacts it is therefore recommended that patients undergo spinal imaging before lumbar puncture (DeAngelis, 1998; Mittl and Yousem, 1994). Similarly, for patients with primary CNS tumors, MR imaging of the spine should be performed before surgery or at a minimum of 14 to 21 days after surgery.

Cerebrospinal Fluid Flow Studies

Cerebrospinal fluid flow studies, using either 111In-dium-diethylenetriamine pentaacetic acid (DTPA), 99mTc-Technetium-DTPA, or 99mTc-Technetium-human serum albumin, are an invaluable tool in the evaluation and treatment of leptomeningeal metastases (Chamberlain, 1995b). Cerebrospinal fluid flow studies provide a safe physiologic assessment of the clinical anatomy of spaces in the CSF (Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom, 1991; Grossman et al., 1982). The CSF circulates through the ventricular system and subarachnoid space that surrounds both the brain and spinal cord (Lyons and Meyer, 1990). Normally, the CSF is elaborated by the choroid plexus of the lateral and fourth ventricles and flows from lateral ventricles through the foramen of Monro and into the third ventricle and then through the aqueduct of Sylvius into the fourth ventricle. Exit of the CSF from the fourth ventricle is directed into the dorsal spinal subarachnoid space through the foramen of Magendie and into the basal cisterns through the lateral foramina of Luschka. Passage of the CSF through the foramen of Magendie into the vallecula and the beginning of downward flow into
the dorsal cervical subarachnoid space precedes the
eexit of CSF from the foramina of Luschka (Chiro et
al., 1976). Cerebrospinal fluid then flows caudally
through the dorsal spinal subarachnoid space, fol-
lowed by its ascent from the basal cisterns to
ward the superior sagittal sinus by way of migration
over the cerebral convexities and along medial routes
through the suprasellar and quadrigeminal cisterns.

Cerebrospinal fluid flow can be assessed following
jection of the radionuclide via lumbar puncture or
cisternal puncture or directly into the ventricles via
an indwelling access device. Intraventricular and
intralumbar routes of radionuclide administration re-
veal several of the same features of CSF flow. For in-
stance, blockage to CSF flow that creates compart-
mentalization may affect the

1. Ventricular system
2. Basal cisterns or foramen magnum
3. Cervical subarachnoid space
4. Thoracic subarachnoid space
5. Lumbar subarachnoid space
6. Lateral cerebral convexity (sylvian cisterns)
7. High cerebral convexity (Chamberlain and
Corey-Bloom, 1991; Grossman et al., 1982)

Radionuclide flow studies are superior for demon-
strating interruption of the CSF flow versus contrast-
enhanced CT, gadolinium-enhanced MRI, CT myel-
ography, or contrast-enhanced MRI of the spine. This
superiority in demonstrating CSF compartmentaliza-
tion is independent of the route of radionuclide ad-
ministration and may reflect the dynamic nature of
the CSF flow, wherein radionuclide is passively car-
rried by the CSF bulk flow. Usual times of the appear-
ance of radionuclides in the CSF compartments fol-
lowing intraventricular administration are given in
Table 16–5.

Cerebrospinal fluid flow studies should be per-
formed for solid tumor patients with leptomeningeal
metastases before administration of intrathecal ther-
apy. Of patients with leptomeningeal metastases, ap-
proximately one-third in studies by Chamberlain
(1995b, 1998a) have abnormal flow better demon-
strated by radionuclide flow studies versus CT myel-
ography or MRI. Clinicians should realize that alter-
ations in CSF flow are not limited to patients with
bulky leptomeningeal metastases. In fact, radionu-
clide imaging studies have shown that as many as 70%
of adult patients with leptomeningeal metastases have
ventricular outlet obstruction, abnormal flow in the
spinal canal, or impaired flow over the cerebral con-
vexities (Grossman et al., 1982). It is important to
identify patients with CSF flow abnormalities prospec-
tively, as they can affect the distribution of intrathe-
cele chemotherapy, leading to decreased efficacy or
severe toxicity (Chamberlain, 1992; Chamberlain and

Other studies suggest that CSF flow abnormalities
appear to correlate with response to treatment and
prognosis. It seems likely that impaired flow is an in-
direct measure of tumor burden and that more ex-
tensive flow abnormalities are associated with worse
disease and prognosis (Chamberlain, 1998a; DeAn-
gelis, 1998; Glantz et al., 1995; Mason et al., 1996).
Obstruction to CSF flow is best addressed by the ad-
ministration of involved-field radiotherapy at the site
of the block. Approximately 50% of base of the brain
and 25% to 30% of spinal subarachnoid blocks re-

<p>| Table 16–5. Time of Appearance (Minutes) for 111 Indium-DTPA Following Intraventricular and Lumbar Spinal Administration |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ventricular</th>
<th>Basal Cisterns</th>
<th>Foramen Magnum</th>
<th>Cervical Cord</th>
<th>Thoracic Cord</th>
<th>Lumbar Cord</th>
<th>Cerebral Convexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intraventricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>5–15</td>
<td>5–20</td>
<td>10–20</td>
<td>25–50</td>
<td>35–90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>20–40</td>
<td>15–35</td>
<td>10–25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

na, no intermediate times measured.
Source: Adapted from Chamberlain (1992).
spond to limited-field radiotherapy or intrathecal chemotherapy with restoration of CSF flow (Chamberlain and Corey-Bloom, 1991).

In summary, the following recommendations regarding neuroradiographic evaluation can be made for a patient with suspected leptomeningeal metastases from a solid tumor. Contrast-enhanced CT or, preferably, gadolinium-enhanced MRI should be performed to define both dural-based and intraparenchymal bulk disease and to document the presence or absence of hydrocephalus. Computed tomography myelography or, particularly, contrast-enhanced MRI of the spine should be performed to define bulk disease, including intradural extramedullary tumor nodules and extradural lesions that compress the epidural spinal cord. For patients for whom treatment with intrathecal chemotherapy is a consideration, radionuclide CSF flow studies, either by intralumbar or intraventricular routes, should be performed to determine whether there is evidence of CSF compartmentalization.

### TREATMENT

The varied manifestations of the heterogeneous group of malignancies that may result in leptomeningeal metastases preclude recommendations in favor of a single treatment approach. The primary treatment modalities for either presymptomatic or overt leptomeningeal metastases include radiotherapy, intrathecal chemotherapy, and high-dose systemic chemotherapy. Factors to consider when making specific treatment recommendations include the histopathology of the primary malignancy, the age of the patient, any history of prior CNS-directed therapy, the extent of systemic disease at initial diagnosis, and the presence or absence of abnormal CSF flow.

Presymptomatic or “preventative” CNS-directed therapy is a standard component of the front-line treatment for most patients who have leukemia or lymphoma. In addition, children who have CNS tumors with a predisposition for dissemination to the neuraxis (e.g., childhood medulloblastoma) may also receive presymptomatic treatment for leptomeningeal metastases (Heideman et al., 1997). It may be difficult to accurately assess the durability of response to treatment of patients with overt leptomeningeal metastases, especially those with underlying solid tumors, as therapy directed at leptomeningeal disease is generally ineffective against the primary malignancy (Chamberlain et al., 1990; Glantz et al., 1995). Systemic cancer accounts for 50% to 60% of deaths of patients who have leptomeningeal metastases, and its treatment accounts for another 5% to 10% of deaths (Chamberlain, 1992; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991; Wasserstrom et al., 1982).

Response to treatment of leptomeningeal metastases is primarily evaluated by cytologic clearing of malignant cells from the CSF and secondarily by improvement of clinical signs or symptoms of leptomeningeal disease (Chamberlain, 1992; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991) and by lack of progression or improvement in neuroimaging studies. Given these considerations, treatment of leptomeningeal metastases from solid tumors is palliative and rarely curative, with a median patient survival of 4 to 6 months for those with overt disease (Chamberlain 1992, 1997; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991; Wasserstrom et al., 1982).

### Radiotherapy

Treatment of leptomeningeal metastases with external beam radiotherapy is, with the exception of acute lymphocytic leukemia and some childhood brain tumors, directed at sites of symptomatic and bulky disease. This intervention is palliative, providing local control of and potential improvement in or resolution of neurologic deficits (DeAngelis, 1998; Grossman and Moynihan, 1991; Wasserstrom et al., 1982). External beam radiation to symptomatic sites, in either the cranium or spine, is often delivered to a total dose of 30 Gy in 10 fractions. This regimen is well tolerated, unlike whole neuraxis radiation, which results in significant morbidity with myelosuppression, and is not curative with the exceptions noted above. In addition to improvements in clinical signs and symptoms such as pain or weakness, directed radiotherapy may in some cases reduce or eliminate abnormalities in CSF flow. Restoration of CSF flow is a prerequisite for the safe administration of intrathecal chemotherapy.

Graniospinal irradiation alone or combined with intrathecal chemotherapy plus systemic chemotherapy may be curative for many children with hematologic malignancies. Graniospinal irradiation is also standard treatment for all patients with medulloblastoma. Graniospinal irradiation plus chemotherapy may be curative for some medulloblastoma patients.
who have subarachnoid dissemination at initial diagnosis (Heideman et al., 1997).

The primary drawback of radiotherapy is that it can be associated with both acute and long-term sequelae; although these effects sometimes are difficult to differentiate from the effects of other aspects of therapy or from manifestations of the disease itself. Craniospinal irradiation may cause significant myelosuppression, as a substantial portion of active bone marrow is irradiated (Kun et al., 1984). Cranial irradiation may result in the “somnolence syndrome,” which consists of a prodrome of anorexia and irritability followed by a variable period of somnolence from which recovery is spontaneous (Freeman et al., 1973). Although this syndrome is more often reported in the pediatric population, it may occur in adults (Faithfull and Brada, 1998; Goldberg et al., 1992). Long-term complications of cranial and craniospinal irradiation include neuroendocrine sequelae such as hypothyroidism (Voorhess et al., 1986; Pasqualini et al., 1991) and disturbances in the secretion of growth hormone (Blatt et al., 1984); neuropsychological sequelae such as decreases in intellect and mild to severe leukoencephalopathy (Moss, 1981; Paolucci and Rosito, 1983; Poplack and Brouwers, 1985); and secondary malignancies (Walter et al., 1998). Crossen et al. (1994) report that the long-term neurobehavioral sequelae occurring in adults following radiotherapy may be underestimated, in contrast with the pediatric population, because children are evaluated routinely for neuropsychological sequelae. Because of the potential for severe long-term complications from radiotherapy, the identification and application of effective and less-toxic treatment strategies for patients with neoplastic meningitis is a high priority.

Chemotherapy

Penetration of most systemically administered antineoplastic agents into the CSF is limited because malignant cells within the CNS are protected from the cytotoxic effects of systemic chemotherapy by the blood–brain and the blood–CSF barriers. To overcome the limitations imposed by the blood–CSF barrier, several pharmacological approaches for treatment and prophylaxis of meningeal malignancy with chemotherapy have been developed. These include (1) high-dose systemic administration of chemotherapy, (2) regional direct administration of cytotoxic chemotherapeutic drugs into the CSF, and (3) pharmacoetically guided dosing to achieve a target CSF drug exposure. Each approach has distinct advantages and disadvantages.

High-Dose Systemic Chemotherapy

The limited CSF penetration of some chemotherapeutic agents can be overcome by administering high doses of the drug systemically. Advantages of this approach include a more uniform distribution of the drug through the neuraxis and better penetration of cytotoxic concentrations of drug into the brain parenchyma and perivascular spaces (Virchow-Robin) spaces. Protracted infusions may result in an equilibrium being reached between plasma and CSF drug levels, resulting in cytotoxic CSF drug concentrations for a prolonged period. In a retrospective study of high-dose methotrexate, Glantz and colleagues (1998) found that this strategy has limited application for the treatment of neoplastic meningitis from solid tumors. Conversely, it has been effectively employed using methotrexate and cytarabine in the treatment and prevention of CNS leukemias and lymphomas (Balis et al., 1985).

Although methotrexate penetration into the CSF is limited (CSF/plasma ratio of 0.03 [Bleyer et al., 1978]), the use of leucovorin calcium rescue along with the administration of very high doses can circumvent this poor penetration. With this approach, cytotoxic concentrations of methotrexate can be achieved within the CSF with doses as high as 33,600 mg/m² and tolerance of an infusion duration as long as 42 hours before administration of leucovorin (Bal is et al., 1985). Whereas regimens using very high-dose systemic methotrexate have been effective, the optimal dose and schedule necessary for efficacious systemic therapy of CNS leukemia has not been clarified. A rational approach to dosing of this and other agents for the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases is to attain a CSF drug concentration and/or duration greater than the optimal in vitro concentration and/or duration. Because rescue agents are not available for many anticancer agents, this strategy is generally not feasible. However, the relative ease of autologous peripheral blood stem cell rescue technology has led to a resurgence of clinical trials that incorporate higher than standard doses of chemotherapy. The impact of this approach on efficacy and long-term sequelae is not yet known.
Cytarabine penetrates into the CSF more effectively than methotrexate and has a CSF/plasma ratio of 0.18 to 0.33 (Donehower et al., 1986). Following systemic infusion of cytarabine, the CSF drug concentration will eventually exceed that in plasma because cytarabine is not deaminated within the CSF but is rapidly deaminated in plasma (Lopez et al., 1985). High-dose regimens of 2 to 3 g/m² administered every 12 hours will result in persistent cytotoxic concentrations of cytarabine in the CSF. Although high-dose intravenous cytarabine has been shown to be efficacious in the treatment of meningeal leukemia (Frick et al., 1984), this approach is associated with significant systemic toxicity and may also be associated with neurotoxicity. Neurotoxicity, primarily in the form of severe and potentially irreversible cerebellar dysfunction, appears to occur in a dose-dependent manner, with an increased incidence in patients who receive total doses exceeding 24 g/m² (Herzig et al., 1985; Barnett et al., 1985).

Another approach to systemic therapy utilizes pharmacokinetic monitoring to adjust drug doses in individual patients in an attempt to achieve a target exposure duration threshold that has previously been defined in preclinical studies (Zamboni et al., 1998). An example of this approach is the studies performed by Zamboni et al. (1998) with topotecan, a topoiso- merase I inhibitor with preclinical activity against medulloblastoma cell lines and xenografts (Houghton et al., 1995). In vitro studies in medulloblastoma cell lines were performed to define the optimal duration and extent of drug exposure required in vivo. Pharmacokinetic studies were then performed in nonhuman primates to determine the optimal dose and administration schedule required to achieve the desired exposure throughout the subarachnoid space.

On the basis of these results, a phase II clinical trial with children with high-risk medulloblastoma was initiated. Topotecan was administered as a 4 hour infusion for 5 consecutive days; the dosage was pharmacokinetically adjusted to attain the target concentration defined in preclinical studies. In addition, serial CSF samples were obtained to determine the length of time that drug exposure in the CSF exceeded the target concentration (Zamboni et al., 1998). The primary advantage of this approach is that it helps to ensure that an individual patient achieves the target drug exposure in both plasma and CSF, which may be very important for agents with marked interindividual differences in pharmacokinetic disposition.

The primary disadvantage of this approach is that it requires numerous resources and may not be feasible in a multi-institutional, cooperative group setting, particularly for drugs that are chemically unstable. Further studies are required to determine the impact of this approach on therapeutic outcome.

**Regional Cerebrospinal Fluid Therapy**

Regional (intrathecal) administration of chemotherapy was one of the first approaches taken for the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases after the limitations of systemic chemotherapy were recognized. Direct administration of drugs into the CSF results in concentrations at the target site (the meninges) using relatively small doses because of the small volume of distribution (140 ml in CSF versus 3500 ml in plasma) and the relatively slow clearance of many drugs after intrathecal dosing (Poplack et al., 1980). As a result, cytotoxic concentrations may be attained in the CSF at a fraction of the dose that would have to be administered systemically to achieve the same concentration (Collins, 1987). Thus, systemic toxicity is rare when chemotherapy is delivered intrathecally.

In the treatment and prevention of leptomeningeal metastases secondary to leukemia or lymphoma, intrathecal drugs are most commonly administered via lumbar puncture. However, ventricular access devices, such as Ommaya reservoirs, are routinely employed for the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases secondary to an underlying primary CNS or solid tumor because of the limitations of intralumbar chemotherapy. In addition to the pain and inconvenience associated with lumbar punctures, radioisotope studies have demonstrated that in approximately 10% of intrathecal injections drug is not delivered into the subarachnoid space but rather into the subdural or epidural space (Larson et al., 1981). There may also be limited and variable drug distribution into the ventricular CSF after an intralumbar injection secondary to the unidirectional flow of the CSF or because of rapid elimination or metabolism of drug in the intrathecal space (Shapiro et al., 1975). Distribution may be further compromised because of alterations in CSF flow associated with disease (Poplack et al., 1980) or patient positioning (Blaney et al., 1995b).

Direct intraventricular administration of chemotherapy overcomes some of the limitations associated with intralumbar injections. Ventricular reservoirs circumvent the problems of local CSF leakage or...
epidural or subdural administration. Distribution of
drug within the CSF is more complete because the
drug no longer has to diffuse in an opposite direc-
tion from CSF bulk flow (Blasberg et al., 1977;
Shapiro et al., 1975, 1977). Administration through
a ventricular reservoir is also associated with less dis-
comfort for patients and allows flexibility in dosing
schedules such as the “concentration times time”
(“C × T”) approach. Repeated intraventricular ad-
ministration of low-dose chemotherapy over a rela-
tively short period increases the duration of CSF ex-
posure to cytotoxic drug concentrations, an important
determinant of cytotoxicity for cell cycle–specific
agents such as methotrexate and cytarabine (Bleyer
et al., 1978). In addition, the C × T approach may
potentially reduce neurotoxicity by avoiding exces-
sively high peak drug concentrations and reducing
the total dose of administered drug (Bleyer et al.,
1978). The obvious drawback of this method is that,
because it requires surgical placement of an in-
dwelling subcutaneous reservoir, there may be an in-
creased risk of infection. In addition, no clinical stu-
dies have demonstrated a survival advantage for
patients with leptomeningeal metastases who receive
drugs into the CSF through the ventricular route com-
pared with the lumbar route (Hitchins et al., 1987).
Unfortunately, even regional delivery of cytotoxic
drugs directly into the CSF via the intralumbar or in-
traventricular route has limitations because intrathe-
cally administered drugs penetrate only very short dis-
tances into brain parenchyma and tumors. Drug
penetration into nodules 2 to 5 mm in diameter is
possible, but penetration of effective drug doses into
5 mm nodules is not feasible (Blasberg et al., 1977).

Intrathecal methotrexate therapy, developed nearly
30 years ago for the treatment of overt meningeal leu-
kemia, remains the most commonly used intrathecal
agent. The pharmacokinetic principle of age-based
dosing rather than dosing based on body surface area
for intrathecal agents was derived from early clinical
studies involving intrathecal methotrexate. These
studies demonstrated that CSF volume is an impor-
tant factor in CSF drug distribution after intrathecal
administration. In children, CSF volume increases
much more rapidly than body surface area so that by
the time a child is 3 years of age this volume is es-
sentially equivalent to that of an adult (Fig. 16–1).
Using age, rather than body surface area, to deter-
dine appropriate dosing of intrathecal methotrexate
resulted in a reduced neurotoxicity and lower inci-
dence of CNS relapse (Bleyer, 1977, 1983). Thus, be-
because CSF volume increases much more rapidly than
body surface area, dosages for all agents adminis-
tered by the intrathecal route should be based on pa-
tient age (unlike systemic administration of chemo-
therapy).

Other drugs routinely administered by the in-
trathecal route include cytarabine, hydrocortisone,
and thiopeta. DTC101, a sustained-release formula-
tion of cytarabine, has recently been approved by the
Food and Drug Administration for the treatment of
lymphomatous meningitis in adults (Glantz et al.,
1999). It should be noted that the disposition and
metabolism of drugs could vary after intrathecal ver-
sus systemic administration. For example, cytarabine
is rapidly converted to the inactive metabolite uracil
arabinoside (ara-U) by a ubiquitous enzyme, cytidine
deaminase, after intravenous injection (Camien-
er and Smith, 1965). In contrast, after intrathecal in-
jection, conversion to ara-U is negligible because of
the significantly lower cytidine deaminase activity in
the brain and CSF. This difference is partially re-
ponsible for the more prolonged half-life of cytarab-
ine in the CSF versus in plasma. This and the fact
that cytarabine clearance from the CSF is only slightly
more rapid than bulk flow absorption from the CSF
(Fulton et al., 1982; Zimm et al., 1984) favors the in-
trathecal route of cytarabine administration for lep-
tomeningeal disease. Likewise, after systemic admin-
istration thiopeta is converted to the active metabolite
TEPA. Both thiopeta and TEPA readily cross the
blood–brain barrier, providing essentially identical

Figure 16–1. Relationship between CNS volume (upper
curve) and body surface area (lower curve) as a function of
age. CNS volume increases at a more rapid rate than body sur-
face area, reaching the adult volume by 3 years of age. (Re-
produced with permission from Bleyer, 1977.)
drug exposure in the plasma and CSF. However, after intrathecal thiotepa administration drug is rapidly cleared from the CSF (nine times the rate of CSF bulk flow), which limits drug distribution throughout the neuraxis. In addition, TEPA is not detectable in the CSF following intrathecal administration (Strong et al., 1986).

The impact of regional therapy on the outcome of patients with leptomeningeal metastases is difficult to address because only a limited number of clinical trials have been performed with this patient population. Clinical trials for the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases are complicated by many factors, including the heterogeneous spectrum and inherent chemosensitivity of the underlying primary tumor; the advanced stage of many patients at presentation; and difficulties inherent in defining cytologic and radiographic response, especially in patients receiving concomitant systemic chemotherapy for the treatment of systemic or bulk CNS disease.

Intrathecal chemotherapy is associated with distinct toxic effects that may be acute, subacute, or delayed. Chemical arachnoiditis, an acute toxic effect common to both methotrexate and cytarabine, is characterized by headache, nuchal rigidity, vomiting, fever, and CSF pleocytosis occurring within hours to 1 to 2 days after administration of the drug (Pizzo et al., 1979). Less frequently, intrathecal cytarabine can result in acute neurotoxic effects consisting of seizures or paraplegia (Eden et al., 1978; Wolff et al., 1979). Within days or weeks after administration of intrathecal methotrexate, a subacute myelopathy or encephalopathy may occur that is sometimes irreversible (Pizzo et al., 1979; Bleyer, 1981). This syndrome is characterized by a weakness of limbs, cranial nerve palsies, ataxia, visual impairment, seizures, and coma. Leukoencephalopathy, a chronic, progressive demyelinating encephalopathy, is a delayed toxicity that can appear months to years after treatment with intrathecal methotrexate and cranial irradiation. The encephalopathy consists of dementia, spastic paralysis, seizures, and coma. Whereas arachnoiditis is noted to occur in adults, other acute, subacute, and delayed toxicities have been reported, primarily in the pediatric population.

Accidental intrathecal drug overdose, usually the result of inadvertent intrathecal injection of a higher dose appropriate for systemic administration, can produce severe and frequently lethal toxic effects. Extreme caution must therefore be exercised by clinicians administering drugs by this route. With the widespread use of intrathecal chemotherapy, however, the possibility of fatal dosing errors will continue to exist. In an effort to rescue patients who accidentally receive high doses of methotrexate intrathecally (the most frequent type of overdose), intrathecal administration of carboxypeptidase G2 (CPDG2), a recombinant bacterial enzyme capable of rapidly inactivating methotrexate by cleaving its glutamate residue, has been studied in a nonhuman primate model (Adamson et al., 1991b). Administration of CPDG2 following otherwise lethal doses of intrathecal methotrexate saved animals from death by decreasing the methotrexate concentration in CSF by more than 100-fold within 5 minutes of enzyme administration. The successful use of CPDG2 in conjunction with ventriculolumbar perfusion for the treatment of inadvertent intrathecal methotrexate overdose in humans has also been reported (O’Marcaigh et al., 1996).

**NEW PHARMACOLOGIC APPROACHES**

The need to develop new approaches and combination therapy for the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases is an area of ongoing research. Evaluating the safety and effectiveness of chemotherapeutic agents administered intrathecally presents unique challenges not encountered in evaluating systemically administered drugs. For phase I (toxicity and dose-schedule trial) development of a new intrathecal agent, the classic approach, in which cohorts of patients receive progressively escalated doses until toxic effects are consistently observed, is not appropriate because the expected dose-limiting toxicity is neurologic. The wide experience with intrathecal methotrexate provides ample evidence for exercising extreme caution when escalating intrathecal doses of a drug. In studies of patients treated with doses of intrathecal methotrexate based on body surface area, neurotoxicity was found to correlate with an elevated concentration of the drug in the CSF (Bleyer et al., 1977). The manifestations of neurotoxic effects were often irreversible or fatal and included severe meningismus, sustained grand mal seizures, reversible cerebellar dysfunction, quadriplegia, and fatal myelopathy.

Characteristics of an optimal intrathecal agent include:
1. Demonstration of cytotoxicity in in vitro and in vivo models
2. Absence of neurotoxicity following systemic administration
3. Novel mechanism of antitumor activity
4. Formulation suitable for intrathecal administration

Our laboratory has taken a three-step approach to the development of new intrathecal chemotherapeutic agents using a nonhuman primate model and in vitro cytotoxicity studies. Initially, a target cytotoxic concentration and schedule dependency of a drug is determined in vitro using human tumor cell lines. Next, the CSF and plasma pharmacokinetics of the drug following intrathecal dosing are determined in the nonhuman primate. When the intrathecal dose of a drug has been calculated to achieve or exceed the desired cytotoxic effect in the CSF and has been proven safe to administer in the nonhuman primate, a phase I trial in humans is initiated, with escalation of the dose to the target cytotoxic concentration of drug exposure. The pharmacokinetic parameters derived in the nonhuman primate predict human CSF pharmacokinetics, after known differences in CSF volume and bulk flow rate are corrected for, and are the basis for the starting dose in the phase I trial. Typically, the starting dose for phase I clinical trials is approximately 10% to 20% of the dose shown to exceed cytotoxic concentrations in nonhuman primates. Several agents that have been developed using this approach are summarized below.

**Mafosfamide**

Mafosfamide, a chemically stable thioethane sulfonic acid salt of cyclophosphamide, is a preactivated derivative of cyclophosphamide that, unlike cyclophosphamide, does not require activation by hepatic microsomal enzymes to express an antitumor effect. Mafosfamide has a spectrum of antitumor activity similar to cyclophosphamide, and an in vitro cytotoxic target concentration has been defined. Preclinical pharmacokinetic studies in a nonhuman primate model showed that, after intrathecal dosing, ventricular CSF mafosfamide concentrations in excess of in vitro cytotoxic levels could be attained at doses that were not associated with systemic or neurologic toxicity. On the basis of these results, a phase I study currently nearing completion was initiated with patients with leptomeningeal metastases (Blaney et al., 1992). In addition, the feasibility of administering intrathecal mafosfamide in infants and young children with newly diagnosed primary CNS embryonal tumors, tumors with a known predilection for leptomeningeal spread, is currently being evaluated in a Pediatric Brain Tumor Consortium study (SM Blaney is the PI).

**Topotecan**

Topotecan, a topoisomerase I inhibitor that has demonstrated promising evidence of antitumor activity against a broad spectrum of tumors, is another example of an agent with a novel mechanism of action that has entered clinical trials after initial evaluation in the nonhuman primate model. Preclinical studies in nonhuman primates revealed that intraventricular topotecan administration was safe and was not associated with either systemic or neurologic toxicity. Following administration of a 0.1 mg intraventricular dose, the ventricular CSF drug exposure to the parent drug was 450-fold greater than following intravenous administration of a 40-fold higher dose (10 mg/m²). In addition, peak lumbar levels approached 1 μM. Plasma levels of both the lactone and opening form were not measurable. Thus, compared with systemic topotecan administration, intrathecal administration resulted in a dramatic pharmacokinetic advantage of drug exposure in the CNS. Furthermore, there were no significant systemic or neurologic toxicities associated with intrathecal topotecan administration in nonhuman primates (Blaney et al., 1993, 1995a). A phase I study of intrathecal topotecan has recently been completed (Blaney et al., 1998), and a phase II study for children with leptomeningeal metastases has been initiated in the Children’s Oncology Group.

**Other Cytotoxic Agents**

The same approach has been used in the development of several other intrathecal agents, including 6-mercaptopurine (Adamson et al., 1991a), diaziquone (Berg et al., 1992a), and sustained-release cytarabine (DTC101) (Kim et al., 1993). In addition, other agents were not brought to clinical trial after unexpected neurologic toxic effects were observed in the nonhuman primate. 5-Fluorouracil administered into the lumbar space resulted in significant injury to the...
spinal cord in a cohort of animals, and that drug was deemed unsafe for clinical trial (Berg et al., 1992b). Neuropathologic studies demonstrated local necrosis of the spinal cord at the level of intrathecal drug administration. Similarly, a series of other anticancer agents administered intrathecally to experimental animals resulted in paralysis or death (Table 16–6). Using a preclinical model has thus averted the testing of drugs that could result in severe or irreversible neurotoxic effects when administered intrathecally to patients.

**Monoclonal Antibodies**

Monoclonal antibodies have the theoretical advantage of selectively targeting malignant cells expressing specific antigens while sparing normal tissues that do not express the same epitopes (Berg and Poplack, 1995). Several preliminary studies have been performed in which tumor-specific monoclonal antibodies were conjugated to $^{131}$Iodine isotope in doses from 25 to 160 mCi and administered intrathecally (Brown et al., 1996; Coakham and Kemshead, 1998; Pizer and Kemshead, 1994; Kemshead et al., 1998). Acute toxicities following intrathecal monoclonal antibody administration include aseptic meningitis and myelosuppression. A long-term follow-up report of 52 patients treated with $^{131}$Iodine-labeled antibodies between 1984 and 1993 showed the best results in patients with primitive neuroectodermal tumors ($n = 22$) with 53% of evaluative cases having responses and 11% demonstrating stable disease. The mean survival of responders was 39 months compared with 4 months for nonresponders (Coakham and Kemshead, 1998). Additional studies are needed to better define the role of this therapy for leptomeningeal metastases.

**Immunotoxins**

Preclinical studies with animal models have evaluated the treatment of leptomeningeal metastases with intrathecal administration of monoclonal antibodies conjugated to myriad immunotoxins, including M6-ricin A-chain immunotoxin, B43 (anti CD19) pokeweed antiviral protein, and anti-CD7-ricin A-chain immunotoxin (Zovickian and Youle, 1988; Gunther et al., 1995; Herrlinger et al., 1998). Antitumor effects have been observed in these preclinical studies. Laske et al. (1997) reported the findings of a phase I study using intraventricular 454A12-rRA in patients with leptomeningeal spread of systemic neoplasm. In patients receiving 120 μg, toxicity with CSF inflammation resulting in transient headache, vomiting, and altered mental status was seen. The acute inflammation was responsive to steroids and CSF drainage. No systemic toxicity was identified. Four of the eight patients studied had a transient reduction in CSF tumor cell counts. Further clinical trials are needed to evaluate the utility of this therapeutic approach for patients with leptomeningeal metastases.

**Gene Therapy**

The feasibility of administering adenoviral gene vectors in rat models of leptomeningeal disease has been demonstrated (Ram et al., 1994; Rosenfeld et al., 1994; Youle and Zovickian, 1988). Preclinical studies have also been performed in which adenoviral vectors were conjugated to monoclonal antibodies. The feasibility of administering adenoviral gene vectors in rat models of leptomeningeal disease has been demonstrated (Ram et al., 1994; Rosenfeld et al., 1994; Youle and Zovickian, 1988). Preclinical studies have also been performed in which adenoviral vectors were conjugated to monoclonal antibodies.
al., 1997). Recent studies have also described the distribution of adenoviral gene vectors and the pharmacokinetics of the antiviral drug ganciclovir in the nonhuman primate model (Driesse et al., 1999; Serabe et al., 1999). Preclinical studies to assess the feasibility and distribution after intralumbar injection of an adenoviral vector to nonhuman primates are in progress. This novel therapeutic approach may have potential application for the treatment of patients with leptomeningeal metastases; however, extensive preclinical and clinical studies are still required.

**CONCLUSION**

The successful treatment of leptomeningeal metastases continues to pose a significant challenge to the clinical oncologist. Research efforts to date have focused on the identification, dosage, and safety of new intrathecal and intraventricular chemotherapeutic agents or other treatment modalities as well as on methods to improve upon the use of currently available agents. While considerable progress has been made during the past several decades in the treatment and prevention of leptomeningeal leukemias and lymphomas, such progress has not been realized for patients with leptomeningeal metastases arising from and underlying solid or primary CNS tumors. Research using combination chemotherapy and other novel therapies, including monoclonal antibodies, immunotoxins, and gene therapy, must be pursued. Well-designed clinical trials that focus on efficacy, disease-free progression, and quality of life will be critical for evaluating the impact of these developments in patients with leptomeningeal metastases.
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