


RESEARCH

Open Access



Role of hippocampal location and radiation dose in glioblastoma patients with hippocampal atrophy

Clara Le Fèvre¹ , Xue Cheng^{1,2}, Marie-Pierre Loit, Audrey Keller, Hélène Cebula³, Delphine Antoni¹, Alicia Thiery⁴, Jean-Marc Constans⁵, François Proust³ and Georges Noel^{1*}

Abstract

Background: The hippocampus is a critical organ for irradiation. Thus, we explored changes in hippocampal volume according to the dose delivered and the location relative to the glioblastoma.

Methods: All patients were treated for glioblastoma with surgery, concomitant radiotherapy and temozolomide, and adjuvant temozolomide. Hippocampi were retrospectively delineated on three MRIs, performed at baseline, at the time of relapse, and on the last MRI available at the end of follow-up. A total of 98, 96, and 82 hippocampi were measured in the 49 patients included in the study, respectively. The patients were stratified into three subgroups according to the dose delivered to 40% of the hippocampus. In the group 1 (n = 6), the hippocampal $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy, in the group 2 (n = 13), only the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy, and in the group 3 (n = 30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy.

Results: Regardless of the time of measurement, homolateral hippocampal volumes were significantly lower than those contralateral to the tumor. Regardless of the side, the volumes at the last MRI were significantly lower than those measured at baseline. There was a significant correlation among the decrease in hippocampal volume regardless of its side, and D_{max} ($p = 0.001$), $D_{98\%}$ ($p = 0.028$) and $D_{40\%}$ ($p = 0.0002$). After adjustment for the time of MRI, these correlations remained significant. According to the $D_{40\%}$ and volume at MRI_{last} , the hippocampi decreased by $4 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$ overall.

Conclusions: There was a significant relationship between the radiotherapy dose and decrease in hippocampal volume. However, at the lowest doses, the hippocampi seem to exhibit an adaptive increase in their volume, which could indicate a plasticity effect. Consequently, shielding at least one hippocampus by delivering the lowest possible dose is recommended so that cognitive function can be preserved.

Trial registration Retrospectively registered.

Keywords: Hippocampus, Volume, Dose effect, Glioblastoma

Introduction

Glioblastoma (GBM), the most common brain cancer in adults, is treated by radiotherapy (RT) plus concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide as first-line treatment in fit patients [1]. Some rare patients can expect an enough longer survival to undergo side-effects of the treatment [2]. Brain RT is well-known to be related with

*Correspondence: c.lefevre@icans.eu

¹ Department of Radiation Oncology, UNICANCER, Paul Strauss Comprehensive Cancer Center, Institut de Cancérologie Strasbourg Europe (ICANS), 17 Rue Albert Calmette, BP 23025, 67033 Strasbourg, France

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2021. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

deterioration of neurocognitive functions. New memories were associated with neural stem cells located in the subgranular zone of the hippocampal dentate gyrus [3]. Injury of these cells has been hypothesized to be one of the leading causes of the radiation-induced early cognitive decline [4]. Preclinical studies have shown that low doses of radiotherapy are sufficient to induce a decrease in neurogenesis in the subgranular zone. This loss in neurogenic capacity is reportedly correlated with a decline in new memory formation and impaired recall [5]. Furthermore, clinical trials have demonstrated the validity of these preclinical results by dosimetric analysis [6, 7]. Fortunately, new radiotherapy techniques, such as intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), have helped to protect hippocampi and prevent cognitive decline [8–11].

According to trials investigating brain metastasis, dose constraints have been described for both hippocampi [7, 10]. In the setting of partial-brain irradiation, there has also been evidence indicating that a higher radiotherapy (RT) dose to the hippocampus may be associated with greater memory impairment [6, 12, 13]. Ali et al. demonstrated that redefining the CTV for the GBMs led to decrease dramatically dose delivered to the hippocampi [14].

Trials studying hippocampal shielding and cognitive consequences have mainly been designed for and conducted in patients with whole-brain irradiation or stereotactic irradiation of multiple metastases leading to an equivalent dose in both hippocampi [7, 9, 10]. In glioma, the radiation fields were mainly asymmetrical, leading to a significant delivered dose and allowing for one hippocampus to be shielded [15]. Wee et al. showing that this hippocampi protection did not increase the risk of GBM relapse [16].

Physiologically, the decreasing hippocampi volume in one year was between 0.8 and 4.4% of the initial volume [17]. In a meta-analysis, the hippocampus atrophy rates in the both hippocampi, the left hippocampus, and the right hippocampus were 0.85%, 0.64%, and 0.70%, respectively. For both hippocampi, the atrophy rate differed according to the age and was 0.38%, 0.98%, and 1.12% in patients younger than 50, between 50 and 70, and older than 70, respectively [18]. Hippocampal volume tracking with structural MRI has proven clinical utility in a variety of diseases, including Alzheimer's disease [19, 20], temporal lobe epilepsy [21], and traumatic brain injury [22]. Interestingly, Maguire et al. showed that taxi drivers' hippocampi were larger than those of other people, which was not correlated with innate navigational expertise but with training and their ability to use their spatial knowledge [23, 24].

Many authors have investigated the role of hippocampal and memory disorders in numerous pathologies [12,

21, 25–29]. Thus, complementary studies on the consequences of hippocampal irradiation are warranted to improve memory preservation in brain radiotherapy patients [30].

The first purpose of the study was to evaluate changes in hippocampus size among irradiated GBM patients during the follow-up according to the tumor side and the received dose. Secondly, this study tried to assess whether the changes to the nonirradiated/low-irradiated hippocampus are similar to those of the higher-irradiated hippocampus.

Methods

The institutional review board approved this retrospective study. All patients gave their consent to collect and analyze their data, and all live patients specifically agreed to participate in this study, according to the French CNIL law MR004.

Forty-nine patients with GBM, treated with irradiation, were retrospectively analyzed in this study. There were 34 males and 15 females with a median age of 61-years old (mean: 60.6; min–max: 24–81). Twenty-five tumors were located in the left cerebral hemisphere, and 24 were located in the right cerebral hemisphere.

Imaging acquisition

All MR images were acquired using a Signa Excite HDx 3.0T™ system (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI) with an 8-channel dedicated head coil. The MRI scanning protocol included pre- and postcontrast 1-mm, 3-dimensional (3D) volumetric T1-weighted multiecho magnetization-prepared rapid-acquisition gradient echo (MPRAGE) images, and 3D T2-weighted fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) images. Three MRI image sets were analyzed. The first MRI was obtained with a median interval of 13 days (mean 12.7; min–max: 5–23) before the start of RT (MRI_{dosimetric}), the second at the time of relapse (MRI_{relapse}), with a median interval of 4.6 months (mean 7.2; min–max: 1.1–22.0) after the end of RT, and the third was the last MRI during follow-up (MRI_{last}), with a median interval of 17.6 months (mean 17.7; min–max: 3.3–44.3) after the end of RT. The median time interval between MRI_{relapse} and MRI_{last} was 11.4 months (mean 13.1; 1.9–36.7).

The Planning Target Volume (PTV) included tumors visualized on a gadolinium-enhanced T1 weighted MPRAGE sequence plus a 10 mm-margin completed with edema in the FLAIR sequence, finally encompassed by a 3-mm margin. GBM patients were irradiated at a dose of 60 Gy in 30 daily fractions of 2 Gy, five days a week. All the patients received concomitant chemotherapy with temozolomide at a median daily dose of 140 mg (mean 135.85; min–max: 120–160). Forty-three patients

underwent a median number of 6 cycles (1–10) of adjuvant chemotherapy at a median daily dose of 340 mg (mean 330; 140–400) according to the EORTC/NCIC protocol [31].

Hippocampus delineation

Hippocampi were prospectively delineated on the gadolinium-enhanced T1-weighted MPRAGE sequence with 1-mm slices MRI_{dosimetric} and retrospectively delineated from the same MRI sequence on the MRI_{relapse}, and the MRI_{last}, according to atlas [8, 32]. Hippocampal delineation was performed by a radiation oncologist with a five years of experience (XC) and approved by a radiation oncologist (GN) with over 20 years of experience [33].

Hippocampi were not included if there was any distortion in the hippocampal anatomy due to postsurgical effects or proximity/invasion of the tumor. Hippocampal volumes were stratified into contralateral (H_{contra}) and homolateral (H_{homo}) to the GBM, and the composite bilateral consisted of the sum of H_{contra} and H_{homo} (H_{sum}). At baseline MRI_{dosimetric}, MRI_{relapse}, and MRI_{last}, the numbers of delineated hippocampi were 98, 96, and 82, respectively. No patient had both hippocampi censored.

Scheduled doses to hippocampi

The dose constraint was D_{40%} < 7.4 Gy for H_{sum}. If this aim could not be reached (mainly due to the proximity of one hippocampus to the tumor), then this constraint was imposed on the contralateral hippocampus. In the case of cross-median line GBM, the planning tried to reach the lowest dose as possible in the H_{contra}. However, hippocampal constraint respect was never preferred to the tumor coverage (D98% > 95% of the prescribed dose) to limit the risk of GBM relapse.

Finally, the entire patient group was split into three subgroups according to the dose delivered to 40% of the hippocampus. In group 1 (n=6), the hippocampal D_{40%} was < 7.4 Gy, in group 2 (n=13), only H_{contra} D_{40%} was < 7.4 Gy, and in group 3 (n=30), both hippocampal D_{40%} were > 7.4 Gy. Furthermore, hippocampi were split into four subgroups according to the D_{40%}, < 7.4 Gy, between 7.4 Gy and < 30 Gy, between ≥ 30 Gy and < 50 Gy, and ≥ 50 Gy.

Statistics

Volumes of hippocampi were determined on MRI_{dosimetric} (H_{homo-j0}, H_{contra-j0}, and H_{sum-j0}), on MRI_{relapse} (H_{homo-relapse}, H_{contra-relapse}, and H_{sum-relapse}), and MRI_{last} (H_{homo-last}, H_{contra-last}, and H_{sum-last}).

The minimum dose (D_{min}), mean dose (\bar{D}), maximum dose (D_{max}), D_{2%}, D_{10%}, D_{40%}, D_{50%}, D_{80%}, and D_{98%} were collected for each hippocampus and for the combination of both. According to the linear-quadratic model, for the hippocampi receiving less than 2 Gy per fraction, doses were recalculated with an α/β = 2 Gy. The change in hippocampal volumes was analyzed according to the doses, follow-up time, and contact/proximity to the GBM using Pearson’s product-moment correlation. Comparisons of the distribution of volumes, doses, and percentages between homolateral and contralateral hippocampus were performed with the T.Test. RStudio Version 1.2.5033 was used to perform statistical calculations.

Results

Hippocampal volumes and time of measure

Overall patients

The volumes are presented in Table 1. Regardless of the time of measurement, the volume of H_{homo} was always significantly lower than those of H_{contra},

Table 1 Hippocampi volume, change in volume and percent change according to the interval between MRIs

	H _{homo}	H _{contra}	H _{sum}
	Median volume (min–max) mm ³		
MRI _{dosimetric}	3400 (650–4850)	3540 (2000–4680)	6940 (3600–9530)
MRI _{relapse}	3150 (610–4630)	3410 (2030–4440)	6480 (3080–9050)
MRI _{last}	3060 (400–4230)	3350 (1860–5780)	6340 (3240–8290)
	Median reduction between MRI _{dosimetric} and MRI _{relapse}		
Volume (mm ³)	– 310 (+ 840 to – 2750)	– 140 (+ 500 to – 1160)	– 380 (+ 1170 to – 3460)
%	– 9.5 (+ 36.0 to – 80.9)	– 4.0 (+ 15.9 to – 32.0)	– 5.3 (+ 17.9 to – 87.6)
	Median reduction between MRI _{dosimetric} and MRI _{last}		
Volume (mm ³)	– 520 (+ 500 to – 1157)	– 190 (+ 1720 to – 201)	– 720 (+ 1200 to – 2310)
%	– 17.6 (+ 14.7 to – 61.8)	– 5.4 (+ 42.4 to – 50.1)	– 10.3 (+ 18.3 to – 35.8)
	Median reduction between MRI _{relapse} and MRI _{last}		
Volume (mm ³)	– 150 (+ 960 to – 1470)	– 190 (+ 1390 to – 1370)	– 290 (+ 1400 to – 2230)
%	– 5.0 (+ 25.9 to – 151.5)	– 5.7 (+ 32.2 to – 73.7)	– 4.2 (+ 18.1 to – 57.0)

$H_{\text{homo-j0}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-j0}}$ ($p=0.02$), $H_{\text{homo-relapse}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-relapse}}$ ($p<0.002$), and $H_{\text{homo-last}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-last}}$ ($p<0.003$) (Additional file 1: Annex 1). Regardless of the side, the volume at the last measurement was always significantly lower than that measured at baseline, $H_{\text{homo-j0}}$ versus $H_{\text{homo-last}}$ ($p=0.02$), $H_{\text{contra-j0}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-last}}$ ($p=0.049$). There was no significant difference in the measurements between $\text{MRI}_{\text{relapse}}$ and MRI_{last} , neither for H_{homo} nor H_{contra} (Additional file 1: Annex 1a).

Group stratification

The volumes are presented in Table 2. According to intragroup comparisons, only for group 3 was the volume of $H_{\text{homo-G3}}$ always lower than those of $H_{\text{contra-G3}}$, $H_{\text{homo-j0-G3}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-j0-G3}}$ ($p=0.01$), $H_{\text{homo-relapse-G3}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-relapse-G3}}$ ($p=0.01$), and $H_{\text{homo-last-G3}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-last-G3}}$ ($p=0.01$) (Additional file 2: Annex 2a).

According to intergroup analysis, significant decreases in volume were observed between G1 and G3 for $H_{\text{homo-j0-G1}}$ versus $H_{\text{homo-j0-G3}}$ ($p=0.03$), $H_{\text{homo-relapse-G1}}$ versus $H_{\text{homo-relapse-G3}}$ ($p=0.02$), $H_{\text{homo-last-G1}}$ versus $H_{\text{homo-last-G3}}$ ($p=0.01$) and $H_{\text{contra-last-G1}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-last-G3}}$ ($p<0.01$). There was no significant difference in volume between G1 and G2 and between G2 and G3 (Additional file 2: Annex 2a).

Volume differences between $\text{MRI}_{\text{dosimetric}}$ and $\text{MRI}_{\text{relapse}}$

Overall patients (Table 1)

For H_{homo} , the median volume of reduction was -310 mm^3 corresponding to a difference of -9.5% , ($p=0.02$ and $p=0.02$, respectively) (Additional file 1: Annex 1b). For H_{contra} , the median volume of reduction was -140 mm^3 corresponding to a difference of -3.97% ($p=0.02$ and $p=0.02$, respectively) (Additional file 1: Annex 1b).

Group stratification (Table 2)

According to intra- or inter-group analysis, no significant differences were observed (Additional file 2: Annex 2b, 2c).

Volume differences between $\text{MRI}_{\text{dosimetric}}$ and MRI_{last}

Overall patients (Table 1)

For H_{homo} , the median volume of reduction was -520 mm^3 , representing a difference of -17.6% ($p=0.03$ and $p=0.01$, respectively) (Additional file 1: Annex 1b). For H_{contra} , the median volume of reduction was -190 mm^3 , representing a difference of -5.37% ($p=0.03$ and $p=0.01$, respectively) (Additional file 1: Annex 1b).

Group stratification (Table 2)

According to intragroup analysis, differences were only significant for $H_{\text{contra-dosi-G3}}$ versus $H_{\text{contra-last-G3}}$, and their median volumes were 3640 mm^3 and 3310 mm^3 ($p=0.18$) (Additional file 2: Annex 2b), representing a

Table 2 Hippocampi volume and change in volume between MRIs according to the D40% groups

	$H_{\text{homo-G1}}$	$H_{\text{contra-G1}}$	$H_{\text{homo-G2}}$	$H_{\text{contra-G2}}$	$H_{\text{homo-G3}}$	$H_{\text{contra-G3}}$
	Median volume (min–max) (mm^3)					
$\text{MRI}_{\text{dosimetric}}$	3700 (3070–4410)	3460 (2880–4010)	3540 (2330–4850)	3450 (2180–4680)	3250 (650–4320)	3640 (2000–4350)
$\text{MRI}_{\text{relapse}}$	3260 (3120–4390)	3340 (2760–4070)	3050 (1960–4630)	3380 (2340–4440)	3030 (610–3970)	3500 (2030–4120)
MRI_{last}	3200 (3020–3560)	3350 (3200–3620)	2670 (1970–4230)	3440 (1860–5780)	3080 (400–3620)	3310 (2000–4350)
	Median reduction between $\text{MRI}_{\text{dosimetric}}$ and $\text{MRI}_{\text{relapse}}$					
Volume (mm^3)	-200 (+180 to -1140)	-70 (+220 to -590)	-420 (+840 to -950)	-100 (+330 to -690)	-220 (+580 to -2750)	-220 (+500 to -1160)
%	-5.4 (+5.5 to -26.4)	-1.9 (+7.6 to -17.6)	-10.6 (+36 to -25.9)	-3.1 (+10.8 to -17.8)	-8.7 (+21.5 to -80.9)	-5.3 (+15.9 to -32.0)
	Median reduction between $\text{MRI}_{\text{relapse}}$ and MRI_{last}					
Volume (mm^3)	-60 (+250 to -1370)	$+10$ (+100 to -500)	-150 (+960 to -970)	-20 (+1390 to -1370)	-270 (+500 to -1470)	-210 (+1170 to -1300)
%	-1.7 (+7.5 to -31.2)	$+0.3$ (+3.2 to -13.3)	-4.8 (+35 to -29.5)	-0.6 (+31.7 to -42.4)	-12.4 (+16.0 to -60.2)	-6.9 (+47.6 to -39.4)
	Median reduction between $\text{MRI}_{\text{dosimetric}}$ and MRI_{last}					
Volume (mm^3)	-130 (+130 to -1390)	-180 (+320 to -600)	-620 (+500 to -1400)	-190 (+1720 to -1230)	-500 (+150 to -1570)	-190 (+840 to -2010)
%	-3.5 (+4.2 to -31.5)	-5.1 (+11.1 to -15.5)	-20.9 (+14.7 to -38.1)	-5.6 (+42.4 to -39.8)	-17.6 (+5 to -61.8)	-5.4 (+23.9 to -50.1)

In group 1 (G1: n=6), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; in group 2 (G2: n=13), the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; and in group 3 (G3: n=30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy

difference of - 5.37% ($p=0.03$) (Additional file 2: Annex 2c). According to intergroup analysis, no significant difference was observed.

Volume difference between MRI_{relapse} and MRI_{last}

Overall patients (Table 1)

For H_{homo} and H_{contra}, volume reduction was not significantly different (Additional file 1: Annex 1b).

Group stratification (Table 2)

According to intra- or intergroup analysis, no significant differences were observed (Additional file 2: Annex 2b, 2c).

Dose distribution and volume

Overall patients (Table 3a)

On both sides, the volume decrease at MRI_{last} time was correlated with D_{max}, D_{98%} and D_{40%} ($p=0.0011$, $p<0.001$ and $p=0.0002$, respectively).

For D_{min}, D_{2%}, D_{max}, D_{98%}, \bar{D} , D_{10%}, D_{40%}, D_{50%}, D_{80%}, and D_{100%}, the values for H_{homo} were significantly higher than those for H_{contra} ($p<0.0001$ for all comparisons).

Before and after recalculation with a 2-Gy equivalent-dose, each analyzed dose value was significantly higher for H_{homo} than for H_{contra} ($p<0.0001$ for all comparisons).

Group stratification (Table 3b)

D_{40%} and D_{40%Eq. 2 Gy} were studied among the three groups. For group 1, there was no difference in D_{40%} and D_{40%Eq. 2 Gy} for H_{homo} and H_{contra}. For group 2, the median D_{40%} and D_{40%Eq. 2 Gy} values were significantly higher in H_{homo} than in H_{contra}, 38.5 Gy versus 5.1 Gy ($p<0.001$) and 31.6 Gy and 2.8 Gy ($p<0.0001$), respectively. For group 3, comparable differences were observed for 59.3 Gy versus 18.5 Gy ($p<0.001$) and 58.9 Gy versus 12.1 Gy ($p<0.0001$), respectively.

Table 3 Median dose in the hippocampi

		Dmean	Dmax	D10%	D20%	D30%	D40%	D50%	D60%	D70%	D80%	D90%	D100%	
(a)														
Homolateral hippocampus	Min	1.30	1.86	1.51	1.40	1.34	1.30	1.27	1.24	1.20	1.16	1.12	1.03	
	Max	61.12	63.49	62.82	62.16	61.51	61.35	61.18	60.97	60.75	60.53	60.25	59.65	
	median	53.85	59.99	59.37	59.10	58.74	57.94	56.63	53.93	50.87	45.02	38.21	35.33	
Contralateral hippocampus	Min	1.26	1.99	1.52	1.37	1.31	1.27	1.23	1.10	0.94	0.83	0.73	0.58	
	Max	46.88	61.07	58.33	56.23	52.73	49.68	46.27	42.65	40.35	38.34	37.62	36.71	
	median	13.89	33.26	20.41	16.42	14.57	11.50	11.15	10.87	10.74	10.60	9.72	3.80	
		Dmean	Dmax	D10%	D20%	D30%	D40%	D50%	D60%	D70%	D80%	D90%	D100%	
(b)														
Group 1	Homolateral hippocampus	Min	1.30	1.86	1.51	1.40	1.34	1.30	1.27	1.24	1.20	1.16	1.12	1.03
		Max	5.06	17.63	8.47	7.39	6.02	5.06	4.41	3.91	3.58	3.27	2.98	1.71
		median	2.78	6.32	4.77	3.69	2.64	2.30	2.19	2.04	1.94	1.80	1.71	1.35
	Contralateral hippocampus	Min	1.26	1.99	1.52	1.37	1.31	1.27	1.23	1.19	1.11	1.00	0.90	0.77
		Max	4.80	13.12	6.97	5.77	5.20	4.74	4.36	4.08	3.81	3.52	3.22	1.05
		median	1.99	5.47	3.50	2.11	1.73	1.60	1.47	1.38	1.30	1.20	1.12	0.99
Group 2	Homolateral hippocampus	Min	8.44	17.94	10.78	10.65	10.35	8.56	7.87	7.87	4.12	3.27	2.44	4.79
		Max	59.96	61.83	61.08	60.93	60.78	60.56	60.32	60.32	59.72	59.22	58.88	54.03
		median	35.54	54.95	45.74	43.05	40.98	38.47	34.90	34.90	22.06	17.04	15.34	7.50
	Contralateral hippocampus	Min	3.28	11.30	5.31	3.56	3.15	2.25	1.31	1.10	0.94	0.83	0.73	0.58
		Max	12.59	54.15	34.18	25.58	13.73	7.40	6.22	5.94	5.51	4.91	4.16	3.57
		median	6.16	21.06	10.17	7.43	6.59	5.14	4.70	3.30	3.11	2.94	2.75	2.46
Group 3	Homolateral hippocampus	Min	17.60	25.00	21.30	20.01	19.13	18.17	17.35	16.52	15.75	14.70	9.26	9.25
		Max	61.12	63.49	62.82	62.16	61.51	61.35	61.18	60.97	60.75	60.53	60.25	59.65
		median	57.87	60.77	60.18	59.72	59.31	59.25	58.98	58.73	57.98	56.79	55.49	44.26
	Contralateral hippocampus	Min	8.17	16.02	11.76	11.42	10.64	8.12	5.86	4.61	3.63	2.80	2.21	2.31
		Max	46.88	61.07	58.33	56.23	52.73	49.68	46.27	42.65	40.35	38.34	37.62	36.71
		median	19.57	38.32	29.41	23.58	19.40	18.52	17.95	17.31	16.08	15.47	14.53	13.96

Correlation between hippocampus volumes and dose
Overall patients (Table 4)

There was a significant correlation between the decrease in the volume of the hippocampus, regardless of its side and D_{max} ($p=0.001$), $D_{98\%}$ ($p=0.028$) and $D_{40\%}$ ($p=0.0002$). Adjusted to the time of analysis, these correlations remained significant. According to $D_{40\%}$ and volume at MRI_{last} time, overall hippocampi decreased by $4 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$. However, these changes were not linear when the doses were stratified into four subgroups, $<7.4 \text{ Gy}$, between 7.4 Gy and $<30 \text{ Gy}$, between $\geq 30 \text{ Gy}$ and $<50 \text{ Gy}$, and $\geq 50 \text{ Gy}$. The slopes were $+94.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, $-8.6 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, $-44.5 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, and $-112.2 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, respectively.

Group stratification (Table 4)

For group 1, the change in volume for H_{homo} and H_{contra} from $MRI_{dosimetric}$ to MRI_{last} , according to $D_{40\%}$, was opposite, with slopes of $-124 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$ and $+172 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, respectively.

For group 2, H_{homo} and H_{contra} 's evolution was also opposite, $-15 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$ and $+154 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, respectively.

For group 3, the slopes of the change in volume for H_{homo} and H_{contra} volumes followed the same directions, with $-19.7 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$ and $-19.7 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$, respectively.

Discussion

The dose constraints of hippocampi are currently well defined to dramatically and efficiently decrease the hippocampal dose and, consequently, memory impairment. However, these dose constraints were primarily referenced by $D_{40\%}$, including both hippocampi, and were proposed secondary to the results of the first study, which used whole-brain radiation therapy, where hippocampi were irradiated or shielded symmetrically. In contrast,

only two studies have focused on asymmetric irradiation in glioma [6, 34].

To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate $D_{40\%}$ in hippocampal volumes measured by MRI and to analyze the change in the hippocampus contralateral to the GBM after irradiation. This study clearly showed that the volume of hippocampi decreased after radiotherapy in patients irradiated for GBM. However, the decrease in hippocampal size depended on the tumor side and relied on the received radiation dose. These factors could explain the variability in memory disturbances after brain irradiation.

Delineation of hippocampi, which requires training and support of the atlas, have been recommended [8, 32]. In the study by Gondi et al., for protection, hippocampi were manually delineated according to the protocol but only after the planning dose calculation was determined [6]. Notably, Siebert et al. used an automated segmentation method that is more reproducible than manual tracing that requires more expertise and training. Furthermore, in the Siebert et al. studies, all images were obtained with the same MRI devices, which required conditions to optimize the automated delineation that often deviated from daily practice [35–37]. Computerized segmentation volume methods were shown to be competitive with expert segmentation [25]. The main advantage of automated processes is the decrease in interobserver variability. However, automatic segmentation methods have enabled the subevaluation of hippocampal atrophy that develops over time [38]. In the present study, only one radiation oncologist delineated all the hippocampi, which improved the quality of volume comparison and removed the interobserver variability.

In the current series, the median decrease in hippocampal volumes varied from 4 to 17.6% depending on

Table 4 Volume size changes according to hippocampi groups

	# of patients	Homolateral		Contralateral	
		VL (mm^3/Gy)	%L (%/Gy)	VL (mm^3/Gy)	%L (%/Gy)
(a)					
Group 1	6	-124	+1.5	+172	+4.0
Group 2	13	-15	-0.51	+15	+4.3
Group 3	30	-19.7	-0.04	-19.7	-0.52
	$D_{40\%} \leq 7.4 \text{ Gy}$	$7.4 \text{ Gy} < D_{40\%} \leq 30 \text{ Gy}$	$30 \text{ Gy} < D_{40\%} \leq 50 \text{ Gy}$	$D_{40\%} > 50 \text{ Gy}$	
(b)					
Slope VL	$+94.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$	$-8.6 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$	$-45.4 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$	$-112.2 \text{ mm}^3/\text{Gy}$	
Slope %L	$+2.7 \text{ \%/Gy}$	-0.44 \%/Gy	-1.13 \%/Gy	-5.55 \%/Gy	

(a) Slope values of the volume lost (VL, mm^3/Gy) or percentage of volume lost (L – %/Gy) in each hippocampus (homo or contralateral to the tumor) and for the three groups stratified by $D_{40\%}$ in both hippocampi: In group 1 (G1: $n=6$), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was $<7.4 \text{ Gy}$; in group 2 (G2: $n=13$), the $H_{contra} D_{40\%}$ was $<7.4 \text{ Gy}$; in group 3 (G3: $n=30$), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was $>7.4 \text{ Gy}$. (b) Slope values of volume lost: The volume lost (VL) or percentage of volume lost (%L – %/Gy) according to the dose for both hippocampi between the reference MRI (dosimetric MRI) and last MRI during follow-up

the tumor side, received dose, and time after irradiation. In contrast, Prust et al. did not observe any change in the nine-month MRI-follow-up in 14 patients treated for GBM [39]. This difference of change is likely the consequence of the longer MRI follow-up in the current study, at 17.6 months between the first and the last MRI.

Gondi et al. did not show any correlation with the hippocampus analyzed separately [6]. In contrast, the current study showed that the hippocampal volume decrease is dependent on location of the hippocampus relative to the tumor. At the time of last MRI, the percent decrease in volume was more substantial in the homolateral hippocampus than in the contralateral hippocampus, at 17.6% and 5.4%, respectively. We demonstrated a clear relationship between the post-irradiation time and hippocampal atrophy, with substantial changes appearing in the first months after RT.

In this work, we showed that the median volume of the homolateral hippocampi relative to the glioblastoma was always lower than that of the contralateral hippocampi. The impact of glioblastoma on hippocampi functioning and homeostasis is unknown, but these results suggest an interaction. However, the consequences of surgery always being performed before the reference MRI (MRI_{dosimetry}) cannot be excluded, but other causes should also be considered (medicine, age, addiction, estrogen level, corticosteroid intake...) [40]. Another assumed reason to explain this difference is the possible ability of the contralateral hippocampus to compensate for the decrease in the homolateral hippocampus volume after a low dose of irradiation, as a plasticity effect has already been shown in some variable situations [26, 28, 41].

Animal studies have shown that when the brains of young rats are unilaterally irradiated, the volume of the irradiated hippocampus is reduced compared to that of the nonirradiated side, corresponding to apoptosis, which induces the loss of neural stem cells and progenitor cell proliferation [42, 43]. A postmortem study on patients treated with chemotherapy and cranial irradiation showed profoundly reduced hippocampal neurogenesis. This observation further supports the hypothesis that neurocognitive impairment after brain-directed therapy hampers hippocampal neurogenesis to some degree [44, 45].

In the study by Gondi et al., risk impairment was significantly correlated with a $D_{40\%}$ in the bilateral hippocampi > 7.4 Gy ($p = 0.043$) [6].

Seibert et al. showed that hippocampal volume loss was significantly correlated with the mean RT dose delivered to the hippocampus ($p = 0.03$). The mean hippocampal volume was significantly reduced one year after high-dose (> 40 Gy) radiation therapy, but not after low-dose (< 10 Gy) radiation therapy [34]. In the current study,

there was a correlation between the delivered D_{\max} , $D_{98\%}$, and $D_{40\%}$ with decreasing hippocampal volume. Furthermore, we showed that the volume decreased continuously with $D_{40\%}$ from > 7.5 to > 50 Gy. Notably, for a $D_{40\%} < 7.4$ Gy, hippocampal volumes increased. Dose-dependent brain changes were also demonstrated for white matter [46], the amygdala [47], and left-sided perisylvian white matter [48]. In our study, the hippocampi receiving less than 7.4 Gy were always contralateral hippocampus relative to the GBM, and in 7 cases, the homolateral hippocampus whom $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy because the GBM was far enough away from the hippocampus and consequently, the hippocampus was not in, or near the radiation fields.

Siebert et al. showed a one-year atrophy rate of 6% in the hippocampi that received a dose > 40 Gy [34]. This value is comparable to the 1% volume loss per year observed in the elderly [17, 18] and the 2.2 to 4% volume loss per year observed in Alzheimer's patients with mild to severe cognitive decline [17, 38, 49]. For the entire series, we noted a median decrease of 0.33% in hippocampal volumes over a median period of 17.5 months (time between MRI_{dosimetry} and MRI_{last}), but a median reduction of 5.55% in hippocampi that received more than 50 Gy in the same period.

In our current series, contralateral hippocampi that received a $D_{40\%}$ less than 7.4 Gy did not show any atrophy in the hippocampus; in contrast the volume increased significantly. The lack of hippocampus atrophy at low dose was reported in several previous study [7, 34, 36, 39]. Physiological and functional compensations could explain these observations, but methods to specifically study each hippocampus separately have not yet been developed. At present, our study cannot confirm that when the dose of irradiation was low, the increased volume was an adaptive reaction to irradiation, a natural adaptation to the brain trauma or functional adaptation to compensate memory ability loss. Interestingly, Erickson et al. showed that physical activity training increased hippocampal perfusion, reversing effect of age-related loss [50]. Memory training can also increase the hippocampi volumes as showed studies in taxi drivers [23, 24].

Notably, regardless of the tumor distance, the homolateral hippocampus volume was always significantly smaller than the contralateral hippocampus volume. This relative atrophy suggested that dose was not the sole cause of this decline. Other causes could be vascular disruption and permeability [29], alteration of interneurons [27], and neuroinflammation [46]. This difference in hippocampal volume has already been described in hippocampal sclerosis and epilepsy [17, 21, 25, 38]. However, it is unknown whatever this difference in volume was

due to a variation secondary to atrophy alone (i.e., the contralateral hippocampus having a normal volume) or atrophy and unaltered volume compensation in the contralateral hippocampus [33].

This study was limited by the absence of specific cognitive performance measures to correlate with the observed structural neuroimaging changes. Validated cognitive tests are not always used in routine clinical practice, precluding clinical neurologic observation analysis in retrospective studies. However, these tests should be precise and split the left or right hippocampus [51], and dose thresholds should be relevantly chosen [52] to avoid unclear or confusing analysis. Moreover, advanced imaging access is still limited in medical practice, and other brain regions are involved in cognitive functions [46, 53]. Another drawback is the lack of a control group to measure the change in the hippocampus over time in a population based on age, IQ,.... However, this requirement could be disputed because of the absence of tumors, which probably interact with the hippocampal structure through the microenvironment.

This study showed that the low-irradiated hippocampus volume and/or far from the GBM changes differently than the hippocampus near to the tumor and/or receiving high irradiated doses. These observations suggest that tumor could more deteriorate hippocampus structure and function than radiotherapy and that shielding of H_{contra} could give possibility of hippocampus volume adaptation and function recovery. However, several future improvement have to be directed to demonstrate the clinical hypotheses [30]. The role of protontherapy should be more extensively compared to optimal modulated photon radiation [54]. The volume of protection, total or partial hippocampus, with or without 1-cm margin should be more specify. Because, physical doses can be highly different according to the delivered dose, the dose distribution and the dose per fraction protocol, a better knowledge of biological dose and of the hippocampal α/β value is required [30]. Ultimately, maybe not all patients need a hippocampal protection, a better and more systematic neurocognitive function initial evaluation is required to select the best candidates for useful protection. This evaluation requires standardized tools, able to measure early and late changes, which are likely not be the equal, as well as right and left hippocampal functions probably different [55]. In addition, the testing must be feasible to administer in a busy clinical practice. Finally, cognitive training could improve function, mainly of the shielded hippocampus [50]

To correlate neurocognitive outcomes with structural brain changes, prospective longitudinal trials are needed to examine performance in multiple cognitive domains in concert with serial neuroimaging [56].

Conclusion

This study demonstrated a $D_{40\%}$ -dependent atrophy effect on the irradiated hippocampus. The volume of the contralateral hippocampus increased when irradiated at a $D_{40\%} < 7.4$ Gy increased, suggesting a compensatory reaction. Thus, limiting the radiation dose to the greatest extent possible in at least one hippocampus is recommended, when relevant, in cases of asymmetrical brain cancer.

Abbreviations

FLAIR: Fluid-attenuated inversion recovery; GBM: Glioblastoma; IMRT: Intensity-modulated radiation therapy; MPRAGE: Multiecho magnetization-prepared rapid-acquisition gradient echo; PTV: Planning target volume; RT: Radiotherapy.

Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-021-01835-0>.

Additional file 1. Annex 1: Relevant comparison of volumes according to MRI. Annex 1a: Comparison of volumes measured on MRI. Annex 1b: Comparison between changes in volume during the intervals between MRIs. Annex 1c: Comparison between changes in percent volume during the intervals between MRIs

Additional file 2. Annex 2: Relevant comparison of hippocampal volumes their changes according to the time of the MRIs. Annex 2a: Comparison between volumes at a given MRI time according to subgroup: In group 1 (G1: n=6), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; in group 2 (G2: n=13), the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; and in group 3 (G3: n=30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy. Annex 2b: Comparison between volumes measured on different MRIs and according to subgroup: In group 1 (G1: n=6), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; in group 2 (G2: n=13), the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; and in group 3 (G3: n=30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy. Annex 2c: Comparison between changes in volumes during the interval between MRIs and according to subgroup: In group 1 (G1: n=6), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; in group 2 (G2: n=13), the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; and in group 3 (G3: n=30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy. Annex 2d: Comparison between changes in % volumes during interval between MRIs and according to subgroup: In group 1 (G1: n=6), in both hippocampi, the $D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; in group 2 (G2: n=13), the $H_{\text{contra}} D_{40\%}$ was < 7.4 Gy; and in group 3 (G3: n=30), the $D_{40\%}$ for both hippocampi was > 7.4 Gy

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Authors' contributions

CLF: conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing-original draft, visualization; XC: formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing-original draft, visualization; M-PL: validation, writing-review and editing, AK: validation, writing-review and editing, HC: validation, writing-review and editing, DA: validation, writing-review and editing, AT: software, methodology, formal analysis, validation, writing-review and editing; J-MC: methodology, validation, writing-review and editing, supervision; FP: methodology, validation, writing-review and editing, supervision; GN: conceptualization, methodology, validation, writing-review and editing, resources, supervision, project administration. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations**Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Data are available as required and authorized by French law MR004.

Consent for publication

Data are available as required and authorized by French law MR004.

Competing interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹Department of Radiation Oncology, UNICANCER, Paul Strauss Comprehensive Cancer Center, Institut de Cancérologie Strasbourg Europe (ICANS), 17 Rue Albert Calmette, BP 23025, 67033 Strasbourg, France. ²Department of Radiation Oncology, Chongqing University Three Gorges Hospital, 165 Xin Cheng Road, Wanzhou District, Chongqing 404000, China. ³Neurosurgery Service, Haute-pierre University Hospital, 1, rue Molière, 67000 Strasbourg, France. ⁴Statistical Department, UNICANCER, Paul Strauss Comprehensive Cancer Center, Institut de Cancérologie Strasbourg Europe (ICANS), 17 Rue Albert Calmette, BP 23025, 67033 Strasbourg, France. ⁵Radiology Department, Amiens-Picardie University Hospital, 1 rond-point du Professeur Christian Cabrol, 80054 Amiens Cedex 1, France.

Received: 4 April 2021 Accepted: 6 June 2021

Published online: 22 June 2021

References

- Stupp R, Hegi ME, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, Taphoorn MJ, Janzer RC, et al. Effects of radiotherapy with concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide versus radiotherapy alone on survival in glioblastoma in a randomised phase III study: 5-year analysis of the EORTC-NCIC trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2009;10:459–66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045\(09\)70025-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(09)70025-7).
- Morisse MC, Etienne-Selloum N, Bello-Roufai D, Blonski M, Taillandier L, Lorgis V, et al. Long-term survival in patients with recurrent glioblastoma treated with bevacizumab: a multicentric retrospective study. *J Neurooncol*. 2019;144:419–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-019-03245-5>.
- Eriksson PS, Perfilieva E, Bjork-Eriksson T, Alborn AM, Nordborg C, Peterson DA, et al. Neurogenesis in the adult human hippocampus. *Nat Med*. 1998;4:1313–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/3305>.
- Gondi V, Tome WA, Mehta MP. Why avoid the hippocampus? A comprehensive review. *Radiother Oncol*. 2010;97:370–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2010.09.013>.
- Monje ML, Mizumatsu S, Fike JR, Palmer TD. Irradiation induces neural precursor-cell dysfunction. *Nat Med*. 2002;8:955–62. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nm749>.
- Gondi V, Hermann BP, Mehta MP, Tome WA. Hippocampal dosimetry predicts neurocognitive function impairment after fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy for benign or low-grade adult brain tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2013;85:348–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2012.11.031>.
- Gondi V, Pugh SL, Tome WA, Caine C, Corn B, Kanner A, et al. Preservation of memory with conformal avoidance of the hippocampal neural stem-cell compartment during whole-brain radiotherapy for brain metastases (RTOG 0933): a phase II multi-institutional trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014;32:3810–6. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.57.2909>.
- Gondi V, Tolakanahalli R, Mehta MP, Tewatia D, Rowley H, Kuo JS, et al. Hippocampal-sparing whole-brain radiotherapy: a “how-to” technique using helical tomotherapy and linear accelerator-based intensity-modulated radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2010;78:1244–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2010.01.039>.
- Hsu F, Carolan H, Nichol A, Cao F, Nuraney N, Lee R, et al. Whole brain radiotherapy with hippocampal avoidance and simultaneous integrated boost for 1–3 brain metastases: a feasibility study using volumetric modulated arc therapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2010;76:1480–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.03.032>.
- Tsai PF, Yang CC, Chuang CC, Huang TY, Wu YM, Pai PC, et al. Hippocampal dosimetry correlates with the change in neurocognitive function after hippocampal sparing during whole brain radiotherapy: a prospective study. *Radiat Oncol*. 2015;10:253. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-015-0562-x>.
- Hofmaier J, Kantz S, Sohn M, Dohm OS, Bachle S, Alber M, et al. Hippocampal sparing radiotherapy for glioblastoma patients: a planning study using volumetric modulated arc therapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2016;11:118. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-016-0695-6>.
- Farjam R, Pramanik P, Aryal MP, Srinivasan A, Chapman CH, Tsien CI, et al. A radiation-induced hippocampal vascular injury surrogate marker predicts late neurocognitive dysfunction. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2015;93:908–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2015.08.014>.
- Peiffer AM, Shi L, Olson J, Brunso-Bechtold JK. Differential effects of radiation and age on diffusion tensor imaging in rats. *Brain Res*. 2010;1351:23–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2010.06.049>.
- Ali AN, Ogunleye T, Hardy CW, Shu HK, Curran WJ, Crocker IR. Improved hippocampal dose with reduced margin radiotherapy for glioblastoma multiforme. *Radiat Oncol*. 2014;9:20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-717X-9-20>.
- Bodensohn R, Sohn M, Ganswindt U, Schupp G, Nachbichler SB, Schnell O, et al. Hippocampal EUD in primarily irradiated glioblastoma patients. *Radiat Oncol*. 2014;9:276. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-014-0276-5>.
- Wee CW, Kim KS, Kim CY, Han JH, Kim YJ, Kim IA. Feasibility of hippocampus-sparing VMAT for newly diagnosed glioblastoma treated by chemoradiation: pattern of failure analysis. *Radiat Oncol*. 2020;15:98. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-020-01552-0>.
- Schuff N, Woerner N, Boreta L, Kornfeld T, Shaw LM, Trojanowski JQ, et al. MRI of hippocampal volume loss in early Alzheimer’s disease in relation to ApoE genotype and biomarkers. *Brain*. 2009;132:1067–77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awp007>.
- Fraser MA, Shaw ME, Cherbuin N. A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal hippocampal atrophy in healthy human ageing. *Neuroimage*. 2015;112:364–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.03.035>.
- Heister D, Brewer JB, Magda S, Blenow K, McEvoy LK. Alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging. I predicting MCI outcome with clinically available MRI and CSF biomarkers. *Neurology*. 2011;77:1619–28. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182343314>.
- Kovacevic S, Rafii MS, Brewer JB. Alzheimer’s disease neuroimaging I. High-throughput, fully automated volumetry for prediction of MMSE and CDR decline in mild cognitive impairment. *Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord*. 2009;23:139–45. <https://doi.org/10.1097/WAD.0b013e318192e745>.
- Farid N, Girard HM, Kemmotsu N, Smith ME, Magda SW, Lim WY, et al. Temporal lobe epilepsy: quantitative MR volumetry in detection of hippocampal atrophy. *Radiology*. 2012;264:542–50. <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.12112638>.
- Brezova V, Moen KG, Skandsen T, Vik A, Brewer JB, Salvesen O, et al. Prospective longitudinal MRI study of brain volumes and diffusion changes during the first year after moderate to severe traumatic brain injury. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2014;5:128–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2014.03.012>.
- Maguire EA, Spiers HJ, Good CD, Hartley T, Frackowiak RS, Burgess N. Navigation expertise and the human hippocampus: a structural brain imaging analysis. *Hippocampus*. 2003;13:250–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hipo.10087>.
- Maguire EA, Gadian DG, Johnsrude IS, Good CD, Ashburner J, Frackowiak RS, et al. Navigation-related structural change in the hippocampi of taxi drivers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2000;97:4398–403. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.070039597>.
- Brewer JB, Magda S, Airriess C, Smith ME. Fully-automated quantification of regional brain volumes for improved detection of focal atrophy in Alzheimer disease. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2009;30:578–80. <https://doi.org/10.3174/ajnr.A1402>.
- Maggio N, Segal M. Corticosteroid regulation of synaptic plasticity in the hippocampus. *ScientificWorldJournal*. 2010;10:462–9. <https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2010.48>.

27. Malmgren K, Thom M. Hippocampal sclerosis—origins and imaging. *Epilepsia*. 2012;53(Suppl 4):19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2012.03610.x>.
28. Sheppard PAS, Choleris E, Galea LAM. Structural plasticity of the hippocampus in response to estrogens in female rodents. *Mol Brain*. 2019;12:22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13041-019-0442-7>.
29. Sun JH, Tan LY, JT. Post-stroke cognitive impairment: epidemiology, mechanisms and management. *Ann Transl Med*. 2014;2:80. <https://doi.org/10.3978/j.issn.2305-5839.2014.08.05>.
30. Kazda T, Jancalcek R, Pospisil P, Sevela O, Prochazka T, Vrzal M, et al. Why and how to spare the hippocampus during brain radiotherapy: the developing role of hippocampal avoidance in cranial radiotherapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2014;9:139. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-717X-9-139>.
31. Stupp R, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, Weller M, Fisher B, Taphoorn MJ, et al. Radiotherapy plus concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide for glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352:987–96. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa043330>.
32. Chera BS, Amdur RJ, Patel P, Mendenhall WM. A radiation oncologist's guide to contouring the hippocampus. *Am J Clin Oncol*. 2009;32:20–2. <https://doi.org/10.1097/COC.0b013e318178e4e8>.
33. Urbach H, Huppertz HJ, Schwarzwald R, Becker AJ, Wagner J, Bahri MD, et al. Is the type and extent of hippocampal sclerosis measurable on high-resolution MRI? *Neuroradiology*. 2014;56:731–5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00234-014-1397-0>.
34. Seibert TM, Karunamuni R, Bartsch H, Kaifi S, Krishnan AP, Dalia Y, et al. Radiation dose-dependent hippocampal atrophy detected with longitudinal volumetric magnetic resonance imaging. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2017;97:263–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2016.10.035>.
35. Riggs L, Bouffet E, Laughlin S, Laperriere N, Liu F, Skocic J, et al. Changes to memory structures in children treated for posterior fossa tumors. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2014;20:168–80. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S15561771300129X>.
36. Olsson E, Eckerstrom C, Berg G, Borga M, Ekholm S, Johannsson G, et al. Hippocampal volumes in patients exposed to low-dose radiation to the basal brain. A case-control study in long-term survivors from cancer in the head and neck region. *Radiat Oncol*. 2012;7:202. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-717X-7-202>.
37. Nagel BJ, Palmer SL, Reddick WE, Glass JO, Helton KJ, Wu S, et al. Abnormal hippocampal development in children with medulloblastoma treated with risk-adapted irradiation. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2004;25:1575–82.
38. Chincarini A, Sensi F, Rei L, Gemme G, Squarcia S, Longo R, et al. Integrating longitudinal information in hippocampal volume measurements for the early detection of Alzheimer's disease. *Neuroimage*. 2016;125:834–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.10.065>.
39. Prust MJ, Jafari-Khouzani K, Kalpathy-Cramer J, Polaskova P, Batchelor TT, Gerstner ER, et al. Standard chemoradiation for glioblastoma results in progressive brain volume loss. *Neurology*. 2015;85:683–91. <https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0000000000001861>.
40. Kim EJ, Pellman B, Kim JJ. Stress effects on the hippocampus: a critical review. *Learn Mem*. 2015;22:411–6. <https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.037291.114>.
41. Kutlu MG, Gould TJ. Effects of drugs of abuse on hippocampal plasticity and hippocampus-dependent learning and memory: contributions to development and maintenance of addiction. *Learn Mem*. 2016;23:515–33. <https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.042192.116>.
42. Hellstrom NA, Björk-Eriksson T, Blomgren K, Kuhn HG. Differential recovery of neural stem cells in the subventricular zone and dentate gyrus after ionizing radiation. *Stem Cells*. 2009;27:634–41. <https://doi.org/10.1634/stemcells.2008-0732>.
43. Fukuda A, Fukuda H, Swanpalmer J, Hertzman S, Lannering B, Marky I, et al. Age-dependent sensitivity of the developing brain to irradiation is correlated with the number and vulnerability of progenitor cells. *J Neurochem*. 2005;92:569–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-4159.2004.02894.x>.
44. Monje ML, Vogel H, Masek M, Ligon KL, Fisher PG, Palmer TD. Impaired human hippocampal neurogenesis after treatment for central nervous system malignancies. *Ann Neurol*. 2007;62:515–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ana.21214>.
45. Monje M. Cranial radiation therapy and damage to hippocampal neurogenesis. *Dev Disabil Res Rev*. 2008;14:238–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ddrr.26>.
46. Connor M, Karunamuni R, McDonald C, White N, Pettersson N, Moiseenko V, et al. Dose-dependent white matter damage after brain radiotherapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2016;12:1:209–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2016.10.003>.
47. Huynh-Le MP, Karunamuni R, Moiseenko V, Farid N, McDonald CR, Hattangadi-Gluth JA, et al. Dose-dependent atrophy of the amygdala after radiotherapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2019;13:6:44–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2019.03.024>.
48. Tibbs MD, Huynh-Le MP, Karunamuni R, Reyes A, Macari AC, Tringale KR, et al. Microstructural injury to left-sided perisylvian white matter predicts language decline after brain radiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2020.07.032>.
49. McEvoy LK, Holland D, Hagler DJ, Jr., Fennema-Notestine C., Brewer J. B., Dale A. M., et al. Mild cognitive impairment: baseline and longitudinal structural MR imaging measures improve predictive prognosis. *Radiology*. 2011;259:834–43. <https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.11101975>.
50. Erickson KI, Voss MW, Prakash RS, Basak C, Szabo A, Chaddock L, et al. Exercise training increases size of hippocampus and improves memory. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011;108:3017–22. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015950108>.
51. Haldbo-Classen L, Amidi A, Lukacova S, Wu LM, Oettingen GV, Lassen-Ramshad Y, et al. Cognitive impairment following radiation to hippocampus and other brain structures in adults with primary brain tumours. *Radiat Oncol*. 2020;14:8:1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2020.03.023>.
52. Okoukoni C, McTyre ER, Ayala Peacock DN, Peiffer AM, Strowd R, Cramer C, et al. Hippocampal dose volume histogram predicts hopkins verbal learning test scores after brain irradiation. *Adv Radiat Oncol*. 2017;2:624–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adro.2017.08.013>.
53. Connor M, Karunamuni R, McDonald C, Seibert T, White N, Moiseenko V, et al. Regional susceptibility to dose-dependent white matter damage after brain radiotherapy. *Radiat Oncol*. 2017;12:3:209–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2017.04.006>.
54. Boehling NS, Grosshans DR, Bluett JB, Palmer MT, Song X, Amos RA, et al. Dosimetric comparison of three-dimensional conformal proton radiotherapy, intensity-modulated proton therapy, and intensity-modulated radiotherapy for treatment of pediatric craniopharyngiomas. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2012;82:643–52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2010.11.027>.
55. Bodensohn R, Corradini S, Ganswindt U, Hofmaier J, Schnell O, Belka C, et al. A prospective study on neurocognitive effects after primary radiotherapy in high-grade glioma patients. *Int J Clin Oncol*. 2016;21:642–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10147-015-0941-1>.
56. Durand T, Jacob S, Lebouil L, Douzane H, Lestaevael P, Rahimian A, et al. EpiBrainRad: an epidemiologic study of the neurotoxicity induced by radiotherapy in high grade glioma patients. *BMC Neurol*. 2015;15:261. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-015-0519-6>.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.