

SAFETY AND EFFICACY OF RETROGRADE INTRARENAL SURGERY IN PEDIATRIC STONE DISEASE

Bülent Altay¹ 

¹ MD, Department of Urology, Istanbul Medipol University, Istanbul, TURKEY

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PNL) has been considered a well established first-line therapy which may present some problems in preschool-age population for larger stones or in SWL-refractory cases. We reviewed 44 preschool-age children with kidney stones treated with flexible ureteroscopy.

Method: We retrospectively reviewed the records of all children with kidney stones younger than 7 years who underwent flexible ureteroscopy (FURS) at our institution between January 2004 and March 2012.

Results: The mean patient age was 4.8 ± 1.6 years (range 6 months to 7 years). Twenty-four patients had renal pelvic calculi, 20 patients had polar calculi (9 upper pole, 7 lower pole, 4 midpolar). Ten (22.7%) patients were previously treated for the same stone, including 6 (13.6%) patients with SWL, 2 (4.5%) patients with PNL, whereas 2 (4.5%) patients had only stent placement. There were no significant intraoperative complications. At the first (2 week) evaluation visit 7 (15.9%) patients (4 males and 3 females) has residual fragments of 3-5 mm detected by ultrasonography or KUB/non-contrast CT if needed. The overall stone-free rate after a single procedure at 3rd month was found 93.1% (41 patients). No major complications occurred. Postoperative complications were recorded in 10 (22.7%) patients, including urinary tract infection (UTI) in 6 (13.6%) (5 females, 1 male), hematuria in 1 (2.2%) male patient and acute urinary retention (AUR) in 3 (6.8%) male patients, respectively.

Discussion: Retrograde intrarenal surgery seems to be an important tool in the pediatric urologic armamentarium for treating kidney stones. FURS offers low morbidity of SWL but the potential stone-free rates approaching those of PNL in pediatric patients. To our knowledge, this is the largest series data reported revealed that FURS is very effective and safe in the management of pre-school age pediatric population with kidney stones with a few minor complications. We believe FURS can become a first-line therapy for these patients.

Keywords: Renal Stone, Intrarenal Surgery, Children

Cite this article as: Altay B. Safety and efficacy of retrograde intrarenal surgery in pediatric stone disease. Medical Research Reports 2018;1(1):4-7

INTRODUCTION

Renal stone disease remains a significant health problem in the adult population with the incidence of urolithiasis estimated to be as high as 12% [1]. While the exact incidence of kidney stone disease in children is unknown, in the United States stones are the reason for 1 out of every 1000-7500 pediatric hospital admissions [2,3]. Extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy (SWL) has traditionally been the first-line option for most of the upper urinary tract stones smaller than 10 mm in diameter. However for larger stones or in SWL-refractory cases percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PNL) has been considered a well established first-line therapy which may present some problems in preschool-age population. Recent series show that with the advancement and miniaturization of flexible ureteroscopes, retrograd intrarenal

surgery (RIRS) has also becoming an important treatment modality in pediatric stone disease [4]. We reviewed our experience with flexible ureteroscopy in treating 44 preschool-age children with kidney stones.

METHODS

We retrospectively reviewed the records of all children with kidney stones younger than 7 years who underwent flexible ureteroscopy (FURS) at our institution between January 2004 and March 2012. The patients' hospital records were comprehensively reviewed to obtain patient demographics, presence of associated anatomic or metabolic abnormalities, stone size and location, operative technique, use of ureteral access sheath, operation time, type of endoscopic equipment used, surgical outcomes, preoperative and postoperative complications.

Inclusion criteria were patients with kidney stones larger than 10 mm diameter or kidney stones that failed SWL or PNL. Patients with bleeding disorders, previous urogenital surgery, intradiverticular stones, anatomic abnormalities such as horseshoe kidney or pelvic kidney were excluded.

The preoperative imaging scans (plain abdominal radiograph (KUB), intravenous urogram, and ultrasound) were reviewed to estimate the stone size and location and for evidence of obstruction. Non-contrast enhanced computerized tomography (CT) was performed for radio-lucent stones (4 males and 3 females). Stone size was defined as the longest diameter, as measured on a KUB or CT with regard to the initial diagnostic imaging tool. When multiple stones were present in the kidney, stone size was reported as the sum of the diameters of each stone. The location was recorded for the largest stone. Preoperative evaluation also included, urine culture, urine analysis, serum creatinin and uric acid levels with a detailed medical history and clinical examination.

The mean patient age was 4.8 ± 1.6 years (range 6 months to 7 years). Twenty-four patients had renal pelvic calculi, 20 patients had polar calculi (9 upper pole, 7 lower pole, 4 midpolar). Mean stone size was 12 ± 2.1 mm (range 8 to 25). Calculi were single in 41 (93.1%) patients and multiple in 3 (6.9%) patients. Ten (22.7%) patients were previously treated for the same stone, including 6 (13.6%) patients with SWL, 2 (4.5%) patients with PNL, whereas 2 (4.5%) patients had only stent placement. Preoperative baseline patient characteristics were listed in Table 1. All patients were treated with a second-generation cephalosporin antibiotic before and after the procedure. All procedures were performed under general endotracheal anesthesia. Success was defined as stone-free status or fragments < 2 mm.

All procedures were performed by a single urologist (B.E) using a single type of active flexible ureteroscope (7.5F Storz & 8.5F Olympus). The patient was positioned in a modified lithotomy position and in a slight Trendelenburg position on an endoscopy table with fluoroscopic imaging capability. After draping cystoscopy (9F Wolf) was introduced to visualize the ureteral orifice and a 0.035/0.038-inch floppy-tipped guide wire was initially placed into the renal pelvis under fluoroscopic guidance to maintain access and remain in place as a safety guide wire in each case. The ureteral orifice dilatation was not performed in any patient. Ureteral access sheath (9.5F Cook) was introduced in 27 (61.3%) patients (14 boys and 13 girls). In the rest of the patients the flexible ureteroscope was passed into the ureter over a guide wire with replacement of a second safety wire. In all cases the holmium:yttrium-aluminum-garnet (Ho:YAG) laser was used as lithotripter. The holmium laser fiber size

(200 μ m and/or 273 μ m) was chosen according to the stone location. Mostly the 273 μ fiber was used however 200- μ m fiber was used in case of lower pole stones which required more deflection. The laser frequency was mostly set at 6 Hz and the energy pulse at 0.6 J initially. Higher energy settings up to 1.4 J were required to treat harder calculi in 8 (18.1%) patients. Fragments less than 2 mm were left to pass. We prefer "fragment and left" technique while stone removal by using any retrieval devices was not used in any cases. Endoscopic inspection of both renal pelvis and ureter was routinely performed at the end of the procedure to rule out any trauma or residual calculi > 2 mm. A suitable size and length double-J stent without string was placed in all cases ranged from 14 to 50 days (mean 16 ± 1.2 days). Foley catheter was not placed in any cases. All patients were advised to force fluids to facilitate the spontaneous passage of the small fragments.

First evaluation visit was 2 weeks after the procedure and all patients were evaluated by urine analysis, urine culture, KUB and either renal ultrasonography or noncontrast CT if needed. After the removal of double-j catheter, patients were seen every 3 months by urine analysis and ultrasonography for the first year and every 6 months thereafter. Mean follow-up period was 11.8 months (range 3 to 22 months).

Statistical analysis performed by using the calculating program SPSS version 11.5.1 for Windows. The data were expressed as the mean \pm standard deviation.

RESULTS

A total of 48 stones were treated in 44 patients (29 males and 15 females). Of the 44 patients, 41 had one stone, 2 had two stones, and 1 had three stones treated. None of the patients had bilateral stones. All patients underwent screening for the presence of metabolic risk factors postoperatively after the removal of double-j catheter and 18 patients (40.9%) were identified with metabolic abnormalities (Table 2).

The average operating time per patient was found 51 ± 12 minutes (range 22 to 92). The operative time was calculated from the time of cystoscope insertion to the placement of the double-j catheter. In 3 (6.8%) male patients both placement of ureteral access sheath and introduction of flexible ureteroscope through the ureteral orifice was unsuccessful. Therefore double-j ureteral stent was placed and successful re-intervention was performed after 2 weeks in these 3 patients. The mean hospital stay was 1.8 days (range, 1-3 days). Surgical outcomes and complications were listed in Table 3. There were no significant intraoperative complications. At the first (2 week) evaluation visit 7 (15.9%) patients (4 males and 3 females) has residual fragments of 3-5 mm detected by ultrasonography or KUB/non-contrast CT if needed. The overall stone-free rate after a single procedure at 3rd month was found 93.1% (41 patients). Three patients (6.9%) with residual calculi < 5 mm (2 males and 1 female) became stone-free within first 6 month of surgery. A secondary treatment (SWL, PNL or re-FURS) was not required in any patients.

No major complications occurred. Postoperative complications were recorded in 10 (22.7%) patients, including urinary tract infection (UTI) in 6 (13.6%) (5 females, 1 male), hematuria in 1 (2.2%) male patient and acute urinary retention (AUR) in 3 (6.8%) male patients, respectively. One patient (2.2%) presented with acute

Table 1: Preoperative baseline patient characteristics

Mean Age (years)	4.8 ± 1.6 (0.5 - 7)
Gender	29 male/15 female
Stone Size (mm)	12 ± 2.1 mm (8-25)
Stone Side	13 left, 31 right
Stone Status	41 single, 3 multiple
Stone Location	24 renal pelvis, 9 upper pole, 4 midpolar, 7 lower pole
Previous SWL	6 (13.6%)
Previous PNL	2 (4.5%)
Preoperative DJ Stent	2 (4.5%)

pyelonephritis and required rehospitalization 3 days after being discharged. Patients with UTI treated with conservatively with antibiotics. Prolonged double-j stenting up to 6 weeks was performed to the patient with persistent hematuria. The patients with AUR were managed with a Foley catheter for 24 hours.

Table 2: Metabolic Abnormalities

Metabolic Abnormality	N
Hyperoxaluria	5(11,3%)
Hypercalciuria	3(6,8%)
Hypocitraturia	7(15,9%)
Cystinuria	2(4,5%)
Hyperuricemia	1(2,2%)
None	26(59%)

DISCUSSION

The standard procedures to treat kidney stones in pediatric population do not differ from those used for adults: SWL, PNL (mini-PNL or mini-Perc), RIRS, and in selected cases laparoscopic surgery. Open surgery is reserved for selected cases, especially those with the need for anatomical correction of the urinary tract.

SWL was introduced as a minimally invasive treatment for nephrolithiasis first in 1980 and the first successful use in the pediatric population was reported by Newman in 1986 [5]. SWL has been the most preferred option as the first-line treatment for minimally invasive management of pediatric stone disease of the upper urinary tract [6]. In several pediatric series, SWL has been demonstrated to be successful in treating large stones (15-30 mm), with a 95% stone-free rate [7], staghorn calculi with a 73% stone-free rate [8] and lower-pole calculi with a stone-free rate between 61% and 92% [9]. Thus, the efficacy of SWL for renal stones in the pediatric population is well established. In a review of 22 pediatric SWL series, the stone-free rates were reported at least 70% at 3 months, although many of these series included results after multiple ESWL sessions that are known to improve the stone-free rate [10]. Whereas single-session stone-free rates may be as low as 44% [6]. In pre-school age pediatric population, multiple SWL sessions means multiple hospitalization, additional anesthesia and stress to both patients and parents. Thus single session treatment modalities are essential. While the efficacy of SWL is clearly established, there remains debate over the safety of this procedure, particularly in the very young patient with growing kidneys. Even though SWL can cause minor early complications, including hematuria, bruising, renal colic and perirenal hematoma it is important to be aware that long term complications were unclear. In 2006, Kramcheck et al. reported on a 19-year follow-up of adult patients treated with SWL, raising concerns of long-term effects, namely an increased risk of developing hypertension and diabetes [11].

Since Woodside et al. reported the first series of pediatric PNL, it becomes the standard treatment option for the pediatric kidney stone cases requiring surgical intervention such as cases with failure of SWL or larger stone burden [12]. Although PNL has significantly high stone-free rates (86-100%) compared with SWL [13], the concerns on radiation hazards and effects on renal function are significant considerations for the pediatric population. It is associated with greater morbidity than either

SWL or FURS which has been reported in up to 83% of cases [14]. Serious complications arise mainly from the percutaneous puncture, associated with persistent bleeding requiring transfusion secondary to parenchymal damage and adjacent structures injuries, such as colon (0.8%) and pleura (3.1%) causing urosepsis (4.7%) [14]. In cases with multiple caliceal stones, multiple access tracts may necessitate, which may increase the complication rates and discomfort [15]. However flexible ureteroscopy offers an endoscopic technique that can access the entire intrarenal collecting system in a single session. Refinements in endoscopic technology, combined with advances in intracorporeal lithotripsy, currently allow ureteroscopic management of calculi along the entire course of the upper urinary tract. Recently developed actively deflectable flexible ureteroscopes are smaller in diameter (7.5F) and they can be passed up the ureter without ureteral dilatation even in pediatric population. Recently a few centers have reported their experience of flexible ureteroscopy in pediatric patients; however, most of these published studies have included both kidney and upper ureteral stones. A significant number of older adolescents were also included in these studies [16-20]. Unsal et al. recently reported the first series of RIRS procedure in the treatment of kidney stones in children <7 years with an overall complication rate of 5.8% and a success rate of 88% after a single session FURS [4]. A review of series of pediatric ureteroscopy revealed a stone-free rate after one procedure of between 77% and 100%. Most of these patients' stones were located in the upper ureter. Our stone-free and complication results are comparable to those previously published studies. In our series, 44 children underwent 44 RIRS procedures with a success rate of 93.1% at 3rd month after a single treatment.

The practice of routine ureteral orifice dilatation before performing an ureteroscopic procedure in children remains controversial. In children, it has been suggested that dilatating the ureteral opening may predispose to both vesicoureteral reflux and ureteral stricture. However, balloon dilatation may allow safer passage of the ureteroscope, with less potential for ureteral perforation, as well as the ability to remove larger intact fragments. Perforation at the ureterovesical junction after balloon dilatation was reported in 1 of 5 preschool age patients by Unsal et al. [4]. In published studies to date, no convincing evidence has shown that dilating the ureteral orifice predisposes to either long-term reflux or stricture formation [21]. In our series, ureteral orifice dilation was not performed in any cases and no difficulties of ureteral access sheath placement was observed. The safety and efficacy of ureteral access sheath in pediatric patients was studied in 8 children and a 100% stone-free rate and no postoperative ureteral strictures after a short follow-up of 10 months were reported [22]. In our series, we used ureteral access sheath in 27 (61.3%) patients and no ureteral stricture was observed within 12 months. Although some investigators have stated that children are able to pass stone fragments easier than adults [23], Van Savage and coworkers found that of 33 children presenting with distal ureteral calculi, no child spontaneously passed a fragment larger than 4 mm [1]. We would suggest that stent insertion should also be considered in patients with larger stone burden to avoid the problems of severe colic, ureteric obstruction or urinary sepsis while they are returning home.

Table 3: Surgical Outcomes and Complications

Failure of initial ureteral access	3(6,8%)
Urinary Tract Infection	6(13,6%)
Acute Pyelonephritis	1(2,2%)
Hematuria	1(2,2%)
Acute Urinary Retention	3(6,8%)
Stone Free - 2 Week	37(84%)
Stone Free - 12 Week	41(93,1%)
Stone Free - 24 Week	44(100%)

CONCLUSION

RIRS seems to be an important tool in the pediatric urologic armamentarium for treating kidney stones. FURS offers low morbidity of SWL but the potential

stone-free rates approaching those of PNL in pediatric patients. To our knowledge, this is the largest series data reported, and our results suggest that FURS is very effective and safe in the management of pre-school age pediatric population with kidney stones; it has shown a high success rate with a few minor complications. We believe FURS can become a first-line therapy for these patients

Acknowledgement: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

REFERENCES

- Seftel A, Resnick MI. Metabolic evaluation of urolithiasis. *Urol Clin North Am* 1990;17:159-69.
- Walther PC, Lamm D, Kaplan GW. Pediatric urolithiasis: a ten-year review. *Pediatrics*. 1980;65:1068-72.
- Millner DS, Murphy ME. Urolithiasis in pediatric patients. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 1993;68:241-8.
- Unsal A, Resorlu B. Retrograde intrarenal surgery in infants and preschool-age children. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2011 Nov;46(11):2195-9.
- Newman DM, Coury T, Lingeman JE, Mertz JH, Mosbaugh PG, Steele RE, et al. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy experience in children. *J Urol* 1986;136:238-40.
- Musulmanoglu AY, Tefekli A, Sarilar O, Binbay M, Altunrende F, Ozkuvanci U. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy as first line treatment alternative for urinary tract stones in children: A large scale retrospective analysis. *J Urol* 2003;170:2405-8.
- Ather MH, Noor MA. Does size and site matter for renal stones up to 30-mm in size in children treated by extracorporeal lithotripsy? *Urology* 2003;61:212-5.
- Orsola A, Diaz I, Caffaratti J, Izquierdo F, Alberola J, Garat JM. Staghorn calculi in children: Treatment with monotherapy extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy. *J Urol* 1999;162:1229-33.
- Demirkesen O, Onal B, Tansu N, Altıntaş R, Yalçın V, Oner A. Efficacy of extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy for isolated lower caliceal stones in children compared with stones in other renal locations. *Urology* 2006;67:170-4.
- D'Addessi A, Bongiovanni L, Sasso F, Gulino G, Falabella R, Bassi P. Reviews in Endourology: Extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy in pediatrics. *J Endourol* 2008;22:1-11.
- Krambeck AE, Gettman MT, Rohlinger AL, Lohse CM, Patterson DE, Segura JW. Diabetes mellitus and hypertension associated with shock wave lithotripsy of renal and proximal ureteral stones at 19 years of followup. *J Urol* 2006;75:1742-7.
- Woodside JR, Stevens GF, Stark GL, Borden TA, Ball WS. Percutaneous stone removal in children. *J Urol* 1985;134:1166-7.
- Galvin DJ, Pearle MS. The contemporary management of renal and ureteric calculi. *BJU Int* 2006;98:1283-1288.
- Michel MS, Trojan L, Rassweiler JJ. Complications in percutaneous nephrolithotomy. *Eur Urol* 2007;51:899-906.
- Marguet CG, Springhart W, Tan YH, et al. Simultaneous combined use of flexible ureteroscopy and percutaneous nephrolithotomy to reduce the number of Access tracts in the management of complex renal calculi. *BJU Int* 2005;96:1097-1100.
- Smaldone MC, Cannon GM, His-Yang W, et al. Is ureteroscopy first line treatment for pediatric stone disease? *J Urol* 2007;178: 2128-31.
- Cannon GM, Smaldone MC, Wu HY, et al. Ureteroscopic management of lower-pole stones in a pediatric population. *J Endourol* 2007; 21:1179-82.
- Minevich E, Defoor W, Reddy P, et al. Ureteroscopy is safe and effective in prepubertal children. *J Urol* 2005;174:276-9.
- Tan AH, Al-Omar M, Denstedt JD, et al. Ureteroscopy for pediatric urolithiasis: an evolving first-line therapy. *Urology* 2005;65:153-6.
- Schuester TG, Russell KY, Bloom DA, et al: Ureteroscopy for the treatment of urolithiasis in children. *J Urol* 167: 1813-1816, 2002.
- Jayanthi VR, Arnold PM, and Koff SA: Strategies for managing upper tract calculi in young children. *J Urol* 162(3 Pt 2): 1234-1237, 1999.
- Singh A, Shah G, Young J, et al. Ureteral access sheath for the management of pediatric renal and ureteral stones: a single center experience. *J Urol* 2006;175:1080-2.
- Landau E, Gofrit O, Shapiro A, et al: Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy is highly effective for ureteral calculi in children. *J Urol* 165(6 Pt 2): 2316-2319, 2001.
- Van Savage JG, Palanca LG, Andersen RD, et al: Treatment of ureteral stones in children: similarities of the American Urological Association guidelines in adults. *J Urol* 164 (3 Pt 2): 1089-1093, 2000.