

Thomas Jefferson University Jefferson Digital Commons

Department of Urology Faculty Posters

Department of Urology

5-14-2022

Overcoming the Learning Curve: A Single Institution Review of HoLEP Complications and How to Manage Them

Cassra Clark

Thomas Jefferson University, casssra.clark@jefferson.edu

Jared Raikin
Thomas Jefferson University

Anthony Tokarski Thomas Jefferson University

Abhay Singh Thomas Jefferson University

Patrick J. Shenot Thomas Jefferson University

Belove this aged additional calabors that should be shou

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Clark, Cassra; Raikin, Jared; Tokarski, Anthony; Singh, Abhay; Shenot, Patrick J.; and Das, Akhil K., "Overcoming the Learning Curve: A Single Institution Review of HoLEP Complications and How to Manage Them" (2022). *Department of Urology Faculty Posters*. 3.

https://jdc.jefferson.edu/urologyfposters/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Urology Faculty Posters by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu.

thors ssra Clark, Jared Raikin, Anthony Tokarski, Abhay Singh, Patrick J. Shenot, and Akhil K. Das				



MP29-13 OVERCOMING THE LEARNING CURVE: A SINGLE INSTITUTION REVIEW OF HOLEP COMPLICATIONS AND HOW TO MANAGE THEM

Cassra B. Clark, Jared Raikin, Anthony Tokarski, Abhay Singh, Patrick J. Shenot, Akhil K. Das

Department of Urology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

1. Introduction and Objective

- HoLEP has emerged as a size-independent endoscopic gold standard for the treatment of BPH.
- Despite its advantages, it requires a steep learning curve and its practice is often limited to academic medical centers.
- We believe a review of common HoLEP complications and their management may further its adoption.

2. Methods/Materials

- We performed a comprehensive retrospective chart review of patients who underwent HoLEP, primarily by a single surgeon, between 2013 and 2020 at our institution.
- We assessed for 16 complications related to HoLEP and Clavien-Dindo classification grade II and above.

HoLEP has a low incidence of complications, most are low grade and managed easily. Our review offers realistic expectations of pertinent complications that may arise.

AUA-2022 § Service AUA-2022 § Service of the Control of the Contro

3. Results (cont.)

- 820 patients included
- The procedure was completed in 99% of patients
- The average length of follow up was 1.7 years.
- 13.2% of patients had prior outlet surgery.
- The most common complication was infection (4.8%). There was a transfusion rate of 2.8%. Stricture rates were 1.5% for meatal stenosis, 4.3% for urethral stricture, and 0.9% for bladder neck contracture.
- Stress urinary incontinence (SUI) immediately following surgery was common, but transient in most patients.
- Persistent SUI, defined as lasting greater than 1 year, was 1.3%.
- 2.1% of patients required ICU admission (over half of which were due to fluid overload and/or associated electrolyte imbalances) and almost all of whom were transferred out of the ICU within 24 hours.
- Clavien-Dindo complication rates were 1.8% for grade II, 2.0% for grade III, and 2.1% for grade IVa. There were no patient deaths.

4. Conclusion

- There is an overall low incidence of complications associated with HoLEP and most are low grade and managed easily.
- As a high-volume referral center for HoLEP, the patients we operate on represent the full range of surgical complexity and our review offers realistic expectations of pertinent complications that may arise.
- With this knowledge, we hope there may be a shift in the urology community towards further implementing this effective and safe surgery for patients.

3. Results

Variable	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Age	71 (8)
ВМІ	27.9 (4.9)
Duration of HoLEP	139.6 minutes (91.6)
Preoperative Gland Size	107.5 mL (62.9)
Weight of Prostate Enucleated	64.6 g (49.8)

Table 1: Patient Demographic Data

	Category of Complication	Number of Patients	Percentage
1	Conversion to Open Surgery	19	2.3%
2	Capsular Perforation	5	0.6%
3	Undermining of Bladder Neck	13	1.6%
4	Seminal Vesicle Injury	1	0.1%
5	Ureteral Orifice Injury, Bladder Perforation, or Rectal Injury	0	0.0%
6	Blood Transfusion	23	2.8%
7	Operative Intervention for Bleeding (e.g., Clot Evacuation/Fulguration)	19	2.3%
8	Non-operative Intervention for Bleeding	8	1.0%
9	Meatal Stenosis	12	1.5%
10	Urethral Stricture	35	4.3%
11	Bladder Neck Contracture	7	0.9%
12	Persistent Stress Urinary Incontinence	11	1.3%
13	Un-evacuated Adenoma	11	1.3%
14	Infection/Urinary Tract Infection	39	4.8%
15	Persistent Retention	6	0.7%
16	ICU Admission	17	2.1%

Table 2: Complications and Rates

Grades	Definition	Number of Patients	Percentage
ı	Any deviation from the normal postoperative course without the need for pharmacological treatment or surgical, endoscopic and radiological interventions. Allowed therapeutic regimens are: drugs as antiemetics, antipyretics, analgesics, diuretics, electrolytes, and physiotherapy. This grade also includes wound infections opened at the bedside.	N/A	N/A
II	Requiring pharmacological treatment with drugs other than such allowed for grade I complications. Blood transfusions and total parenteral nutrition are also included.	15	1.8%
Ш	Requiring surgical, endoscopic, or radiological intervention	16	2.0%
IV	Life-threatening complication (including CNS complications) requiring IC/ICU-management	-	-
IVa	Single organ dysfunction (including dialysis)	17	2.1%
IVb	Multi-organ dysfunction	0	0.0%
V	Death of a patient	0	0.0%

Table 3: Clavien-Dindo Complications and Rates