

**Boletín del  
Colegio Mexicano de Urología**

**Volumen**  
*Volume* **19**

**Número**  
*Number* **1**

**Enero-Diciembre**  
*January-December* **2004**

*Artículo:*




**Outpatient ureteroscopy in ureteral  
calculi: Comparison of 4 different  
lithotriptors**

Derechos reservados, Copyright © 2004:  
Colegio Mexicano de Urología, A.C.

**Otras secciones de  
este sitio:**

-  **Índice de este número**
-  **Más revistas**
-  **Búsqueda**

***Others sections in  
this web site:***

-  ***Contents of this number***
-  ***More journals***
-  ***Search***



**Medigraphic.com**



## **Outpatient ureteroscopy in ureteral calculi: Comparison of 4 different lithotriptors**

Jorge Moreno Aranda,\* Guillermo Montoya Martínez,\*\* Juan Francisco Lizárraga Salas,\*\* Ricardo Agustín Leal Marroquín\*\*

\* Professor and President of Colegio Mexicano de Urología.

\*\* Urology Doctors From the Department of Urology, Hospital de Especialidades del Centro Médico Nacional Siglo XXI, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, Mexico City, Mexico.

**Mailing Address:**

Jorge Moreno Aranda M.D.  
Camino a Sta Teresa # 1055 - 880  
Col. Héroes de Padierna, Zip Code 10700  
Mexico, D. F.  
Telephone 52 (55) 5568-7851 / 5568-5156  
Fax 52 (55) 5135-4981  
e-mail: molok@hotmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

Although ureteroscopy has become a routine procedure in most urologic centers it is still mainly done as an inpatient procedure. Since 1992 we have done our ureteroscopies as an outpatient procedure. We report 186 consecutive cases of patients treated endoscopically for ureteral calculi using an 8.5 Fr rigid ureteroscope and separated into four groups according to the fragmentation device: 1) alexandrite laser, 2) electrohydraulic, 3) ultrasonic and 4) pneumatic lithotriptors. The overall success rate was 85.5%, 91.6% for distal and mid ureteral calculi and 76.9% for upper ureteral calculi. Laser lithotripsy was the most effective in distal and mid ureter and pneumatic was the most effective in upper ureteral stones. The overall complication rate was 8.1%. Only 4 patients (2.15%) required hospitalization. Our results support the concept of ureteroscopy for the treatment of ureteral calculi as a safe outpatient procedure. Hospitalization should only be reserved for patients with preexisting medical problems or complications arising during ureteroscopy.

**Key words:** *Ureteroscopy, ureteral calculi, outpatient procedure, laser lithotripsy.*

### **RESUMEN**

Aunque la ureteroscopia ha llegado a ser un procedimiento de rutina en la mayoría de los centros urológicos, se sigue realizando principalmente como procedimiento no ambulatorio. Desde 1992 hemos realizado las ureteroscopías como procedimiento ambulatorio. Reportamos 186 casos consecutivos de pacientes tratados endoscópicamente por cálculos ureterales usando un ureteroscopio rígido 8.5 Fr y divididos en 4 grupos de acuerdo al equipo de fragmentación: 1) láser de alexandrita, 2) electrohidráulico, 3) ultrasonico, 4) litotriptores neumáticos. La tasa de éxito global, fue de 85.5% y 91.6% para litos en uréter distal y medio; y 76.9% para superior. La litotripsia láser fue la más efectiva en uréter distal y medio y la neumática en uréter superior, la tasa de complicaciones global fue 8.1%. Sólo 4 pacientes (2.15%) requirieron hospitalización. Nuestros resultados avalan el concepto de la ureteroscopia para el tratamiento de litos ureterales como un procedimiento ambulatorio seguro, la hospitalización se debe reservar sólo para pacientes con problemas médicos preexistentes o complicaciones que surgen durante la ureteroscopia.

**Palabras clave:** Ureteroscopia, cálculos ureterales, procedimiento ambulatorio, litotripsia láser.

## INTRODUCTION

Ureteroscopy has become a routine procedure in most urological centers<sup>1-5</sup> since the introduction of the technique by Pérez-Castro and Martínez-Pineiro in 1980.<sup>6</sup> The complications reported in the first series,<sup>2,7,8</sup> are less frequent now,<sup>9,10</sup> mainly because of the increased experience in this technique and also by the development of smaller ureteroscopes.<sup>11</sup> Although ureteroscopy is still done in some centers as an inpatient procedure, with a reported hospital stay between 2.9 and 4.9 days,<sup>1,4</sup> there have been some reports showing the feasibility of outpatient ureteroscopy. Wills and Burns reported their experience with 176 ureteroscopies, 76.1% done as an outpatient procedure,<sup>12</sup> Bolin and Belis reported 90% of 248 ureteroscopies as outpatient with only 3% requiring hospitalization.<sup>13</sup> The reported complications related to this procedure are: 1) intraoperative: mucosal abrasion, false passage, ureteral perforation, urine extravasation, ureteral avulsion, thermal injury, intussusception, equipment malfunction, difficult access; 2) early postoperative: infection, clot retention, steinstrasse, edema, urinary retention; and 3) late postoperative: vesicoureteral reflux, stricture and avascular ureteral necrosis.<sup>9</sup> Due to the limited number of bed in our hospital and to the increasing cost of medical care in our country we have done all of our ureteroscopies as outpatient procedures. In this study we evaluated 186 patients with ureteral calculi treated as outpatient ureteroscopy, comparing the effectiveness of four lithotriptors including alexandrite laser, electrohydraulic, ultrasonic and pneumatic lithotriptors. All of them have proved their efficacy alone or compared to any other devices<sup>1,14-18</sup> but as far as we know no reports have been done comparing four different stone fragmentation devices. Our purpose is to demonstrate that ureteroscopy can be carried out safely as an outpatient procedure and to compare in a randomized manner the efficacy of four different lithotriptors.

## PATIENTS AND METHODS

One hundred eighty six patients from our hospital, 115 men and 71 women, 21 to 77 years old (mean age 42 years) with a total of 186 ureteral calculi were randomi-

zed for rigid ureteroscopic treatment in an outpatient manner into four groups according to the type of calculi fragmentation device. Group 1: alexandrite laser (Dornier Laser Lithotriptor Impact 60mHz); group 2: ultrasonic (R. Wolf 2120 and 2167.001 Ultraschal/lithotriptor); group 3: electrohydraulic (R. Wolf 2137.01 Riwoloth) and group 4: pneumatic (Swiss Lithoclast) lithotriptors. In all procedures we used an 8.5 Fr semirigid ureteroscope. Stone location and size were assessed by intravenous urogram, and plain abdominal X-ray. Upper stones were considered those above the superior border of the sacroiliac joint, distal stones were those below its inferior border and mid ureteral calculi were those within the borders of the sacroiliac joint. We analyzed distal and mid ureteral stones together and separate from those in the upper ureter. The procedures were performed by the authors under intravenous sedation or under regional anesthesia. Preoperative intravenous antibiotic were administered (cephalosporine or quinolone) and continued for seven days after discharge by oral intake. An ureteral guide wire was installed with cystoscopy and under fluoroscopic control in all patients. Intramural ureteral dilation was performed only for the upper ureteral calculi using a balloon dilator (Cook urological, Indiana USA) with a maximum inflation pressure of 25 PSI. Double-pigtail stent were placed according to the surgeon judgment.<sup>20</sup> Patients were discharged the same day of the procedure after total recuperation of anesthesia. We considered a procedure successful if the stone was fragmented into pieces smaller than 2 mm and did not required any other procedure. Those calculi pushed back into the kidney and those that couldn't be fragmented were considered as failures. The statistic analysis was performed using chi-square and the fisher exact test with  $p < 0.05$  considered significant.

## RESULTS

A total of 186 ureteral calculi were treated, 108 located at distal and mid ureter (58.1%) and 78 at the upper ureter (41.9%) (*Table I*). The four groups were comparative with only significant statistical differences between upper and mid-distal ureteral calculi. The mean calculi diameter was

Table 1. Location of stones in relation to treatment modality.

Stone location	Group 1 alexandrite laser	Group 2 electrohydraulic	Group 3 ultrasonic	Group 4 pneumatic	Total
Distal and mid ureter	21	20	40	27	108 (58.1%)*
Upper ureter	23	23	9	23	78 (41.9%)*
Total	44	43	49	50	186 (100%)

\*  $p = 0.009$

Table II. Success rate in relation to treatment modality.

Stone location	Group 1 alexandrite laser	Group 2 electrohydraulic	Group 3 ultrasonic	Group 4 pneumatic	Total
Distal and mid ureter	21/21 (100%)	17/20 (85%)	37/40 (92%)	24/27 (88.9%)	99/108 (91.6%)
Upper ureter	19/23 (82.6%)	13/23 (56.5%)	7/9 (77.7%)	21/23 (91.3%)	60/78 (76.9%)
Total	40/44 (90.9%)	30/43 (69.7%)	44/49 (89.7%)	45/50 (90%)	159/186 (85.5%)

11 mm (range 4 to 34 mm) with no statistical difference between the groups. The total success rate for all groups was 85.5%; 91.6% for the distal and mid ureter and 76.9% for upper ureter. For distal and mid ureter the alexandrite laser obtained the higher success rate (100%), but no significant statistical difference was found between the four groups. For upper ureteral calculi the pneumatic device obtained the highest success rate (91.3%) and the electrohydraulic showed the lowest (56.5%)  $p = 0.018$  (Table II). In sixty one patients a double-pigtail stent was placed (32.8%) and it was removed within one week under local anesthesia. Our overall, complication rate was 8.1% (15 patients), with only 1.6% of major events (Table III). Of the 186 patients, only 4 (2.15%) required hospitalization. Two because of upper ureteral perforation, one related to electrohydraulic lithotripsy requiring a 24-hour hospitalization and a double-pigtail stent for three weeks with no further complications. The second patient suffered an ureteral perforation with the ultrasonic probe that required open ureterolithotomy, repair of the lesion and a double-pigtail stent that remained for four weeks. Both patients had upper ureteral stones. The third patient was hospitalized for 24 hours because of fever and bacteremia requiring intravenous antibiotics. The fourth patient was an elderly woman with ischemic heart disease hospitalized only for surveillance.

## DISCUSSION

Earlier disadvantages of ureteroscopy were poor optics, large diameter instruments, difficult ureteral dilation, lack of adequate irrigation and the unavailability of instruments small enough for manipulative purposes. Keating reported their initial experience with rigid ureteroscopy treating 55 ureteral stones with an over-all success rate of 69%, 48% for upper stones and 84% for distal stones with an 18% complication rate.<sup>8</sup> Other authors' reports show similar results in their earlier experience. Fortunately technological advances have led to increase the success rates and to decrease the complications related to this technique.<sup>20</sup> The dramatic development of technology in ureteroscopy including a variety of lithotriptors as well as a greater number of urologists performing this procedure, have made it a safe surgery with high success rates and low morbidity.<sup>23,24</sup> However we found that in some centers ureteroscopy is

Table III. Complications.

N = 186 patients

- 4 Patients (2.15%) required hospitalization
  - 2 Ureteral perforation:
    - 1 electrohydraulic lithotripsy required JJ stent
    - 1 ultrasonic probe required open ureterolithotomy and JJ stent
  - 1 Patients-hospitalized 24 hours because bacteremia
  - 1 Patient-woman with ischemic heart disease for surveillance

Total: 4 patients

still done as an inpatient procedure, with hospital stays between 2.9 and 4.9 days.<sup>1,4,26</sup> Our overall success rate is similar to previous literature,<sup>13-18</sup> being 85.5%; 76.9% for upper and 91.6% for the mid and lower ureteral calculi. When comparing the success rates of the four lithotriptors in middle and lower ureter no statistical difference was found. In upper ureteral calculi pneumatic lithotriptor was the most effective with a success rate of 91.3% and the electrohydraulic device showed the lowest success rate (56.5%) with statistical significant difference. We report 15 complications (8.1%), also similar to the previously reported in the literature,<sup>25</sup> the two major events were ureteral perforations due to ultrasonic and electrohydraulic lithotripsy in upper ureteral calculi. We made most of our ureteroscopies as an outpatient procedure, with only 4 patients (2.15%) requiring hospitalization, even lower to the previously reported in the literature and supporting that ureteroscopy can be safely done as an outpatient procedure.<sup>13</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Ureteral calculi can be managed safely in an outpatient manner, with the consequent reduction in hospital costs. Any patient who requires ureteroscopy, should be scheduled on an outpatient basis. Our data reveals that any of the four lithotriptors can be useful in the treatment of lower and mid ureteral calculi, but when treating an upper ureteral calculi we suggest to keep in mind the possibility of failure and ureteral damage with the electrohydraulic and ultrasonic devices.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Blute LM, Segura JW, Patterson DE. Ureteroscopy. *J Urol* 1988; 139: 510.
2. Daniels GF, Gamett JE Jr, Carter MF. Ureteroscopic results and complications: Experience with 130 cases. *J Urol* 1988; 139: 710.
3. Seeger AR, Rjittenberg MH, Bagley D. Ureteroscopic removal of ureteral calculi. *J Urol* 1988; 139: 1180.
4. Lingeman JE, Sonda LP, Kahnoski RJ et al. Ureteral stone management: Emerging concepts. *J Urol* 1988; 135: 1172.
5. Politis G, Griffith D. Ureteroscopy in Management of Ureteral Calculi. *Urol* 1987; 30: 39.
6. Pérez-Castro EE, Martínez-Pineiro JA. Transurethral ureteroscopy: a current urological procedure. *Arch Exp Urol* 1980; 33: 445.
7. Sosa RE, Vaughan ED Jr. *Complications of ureteroscopy*. AUA update series 1988; 7: 35.
8. Keating MA, Heney NM, Young HH et al. Ureteroscopy: The initial experience. *J Urol* 1986; 135: 689.
9. Schuster TG, Hollenbeck BK, Faerber GJ et al. Complications of ureteroscopy: Analysis of predictive factors. *J Urol* 2001; 166: 538.
10. Harmon WJ, Sershon PD, Blute ML et al. Ureteroscopy: Current practice and long-term complications. *J Urol* 1997; 157: 28.
11. Wei Zheng W, Denstedt JD. Intracorporeal lithotripsy: Update on technology. *Urol Clin North Am* 2000; 27: 2.
12. Wills TE, Burns JR. Ureteroscopy: An outpatient procedure? *J Urol* 1994; 151: 1185.
13. Boline GB, Belis JA. Outpatient fragmentation of ureteral calculi with mini-ureteroscopes and laser lithotripsy. *J Endourol* 1994; 8: 341.
14. Sun Y, Wang L, Liao G et al. Pneumatic lithotripsy versus laser lithotripsy in the endoscopic treatment of ureteral calculi. *J Endourol* 2001; 15(6): 587.
15. Huang S, Patel H, Bellman GC. Cost effectiveness of electrohydraulic lithotripsy versus Candela pulsed-dye laser in management of the distal ureteral stone. *J Endourol* 1998; 12(3): 237.
16. Jung P, Wolff JM, Mattelaer P et al: Role of lasertripsy in the management of ureteral calculi: experience with alexandrite laser system in 232 patients. *J Endourol* 1996; 10(4): 345.
17. Pearle MS, Sech SM, Cobb CG et al. Safety and efficacy of the alexandrite laser for the treatment of renal and ureteral calculi. *Urol* 1998; 51(1): 33.
18. Willscher MK, Conway JF Jr, Babayan RK et al. Safety and efficacy of electrohydraulic lithotripsy by ureteroscopy. *J Urol* 1988; 140: 957.
19. Rodríguez-Netto N Jr, Ikonomidis J, Zillo C. Routine ureteral stenting after ureteroscopy for ureteral lithiasis: Is it really necessary? *J Urol* 2001; 166: 1252.
20. Begun FP, Jacobs SC, Lawson RK. Use of a prototype 3 F electrohydraulic electrode with ureteroscopy for treatment of ureteral calculous disease. *J Urol* 1988; 139: 1188.
21. Abdel-Razzak OM, Bagley DH. Clinical experience with flexible ureteropyeloscopy. *J Urol* 1992; 148: 1788.
22. Bagley MD. Removal of upper urinary tract calculi with flexible ureteropyeloscopy. *Urol* 1990; 35: 412.
23. Grasso M, Loisesides P, Beaghtler M et al. The case for primary endoscopic management of upper urinary tract calculi: A critical review of 121 extracorporeal shock-wave lithotripsy failures. *Urol* 1995; 45: 363.
24. Grasso M, Bagley DH. A 7.5/8.2 F Actively Deflatable, Flexible Ureteroscope: A new device for both diagnostic and therapeutic upper urinary tract endoscopy. *Urol* 1994; 43: 435.
25. Assimos DG, Patterson LC, Taylor CL. Changing incidence and etiology of iatrogenic ureteral injuries. *J Urol* 1994; 152: 2240.
26. Grasso M, Beaghtler M, Loisesides P. The case for primary endoscopic management of upper urinary tract calculi: II. Cost and outcome assessment of 112 primary ureteral calculi. *Urol* 1995; A5: 372.
27. Abdel-Razzak OM, Bagley DH. The 6.9 F Semirigid Ureteroscope in Clinical Use. *Urol* 1993; 41: 45.