

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**Total anatomical reconstruction during robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: focus on urinary continence recovery and related complications after 1000 procedures**

**This is the author's manuscript**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1711047> since 2019-09-03T15:36:16Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1111/bju.14716

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1  
2  
3 **ADVANTAGES OF TOTAL ANATOMICAL RECONSTRUCTION DURING ROBOT**  
4 **ASSISTED RADICAL PROSTATECTOMY: FOCUS ON URINARY CONTINENCE**  
5 **RECOVERY AND RELATED COMPLICATIONS AFTER 1000 PROCEDURES**  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 **Matteo Manfredi<sup>a</sup>, Cristian Fiori<sup>a</sup>, Enrico Checcucci<sup>a</sup>, Diletta Garrou<sup>a</sup>, Roberta Aimar<sup>a</sup>, Daniele Amparore<sup>a</sup>,**  
11 **Stefano De Luca<sup>a</sup>, Sabrina Bombaci<sup>a</sup>, Ilaria Stura<sup>b</sup>, Giuseppe Migliaretti<sup>b</sup>, Francesco Porpiglia<sup>a</sup>**  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 <sup>a</sup>Division of Urology - Department of Oncology, San Luigi Gonzaga Hospital, Orbassano (Turin), Italy  
17

18 <sup>b</sup>Department of Public Health and Pediatric Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Turin, Italy  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **Corresponding author:**

24  
25 M. Manfredi, MD  
26

27 Division of Urology,  
28

29  
30 Department of Oncology, University of Turin  
31

32 San Luigi Gonzaga Hospital,  
33

34 Regione Gonzole 10, 10043 Orbassano (Turin) - Italy  
35

36  
37 Phone number: +390119026485  
38

39 Fax number: +390119026244  
40

41  
42 matteo.manfredi85@gmail.com  
43  
44  
45

46 **KEY-WORDS:** radical prostatectomy, prostate cancer, anatomical reconstruction, continence  
47 recovery, nomogram, robot-assisted surgery  
48

49 **Paper word count:** 4184  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

### Objectives

- To present the functional and oncological outcomes after one-year minimum follow-up, after an experience of more than 1000 robot-assisted radical prostatectomies (RARP) with our standardized total anatomic reconstruction (TAR) technique.
- To evaluate which factor could influence the postoperative continence recovery in order to obtain a nomogram to predict the risk of post-operative incontinence.

**Materials and methods** The enrolment phase began in June 2013 and ended in May 2017. Patients were prospectively included in the study with the following inclusion criteria: (1) localized PCa (clinical stages cT1-3, cN0, cM0); (2) indication for radical prostatectomy; (3) preoperative multiparametric prostate magnetic resonance imaging. All patients underwent RARP with a TAR technique done at the end of the demolitive phase. The continence rates were assessed at 24 h, and 1, 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after catheter removal. Patients were defined as continent if they answered “zero pad” or “one safety pad” per day. A logistic regression model was performed to evaluate the potential impact of some pre- and intra-operative factors on the postoperative urinary continence recovery. Model discrimination was assessed using an area under (AUC) the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. A nomogram to predict the risk of post-operative incontinence after RARP with TAR technique was generated based on the logistic model.

**Results** 1008 patients were enrolled in our study. At 24 h, and 1, 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after catheter removal, 621 (61.61%), 594 (58.93%), 803 (79.66%), 912 (90.48%), 950 (94.25%) and 956 (94.84%) patients were continent, respectively. In the logistic regression model, the variables analysed had a higher impact on continence recovery at 4 and 12 weeks. At 4 weeks, the post-operative odds of urinary continence recovery increased with the absence of diabetes (OR 2.76, 95% CI 1.41-5.41) and D’Amico low v. high risk (OR 2.01, 95% CI 1.01-3.99). At 12 weeks, increased with the absence of diabetes (OR 3.01, 95% CI 1.23-7.35), D’Amico low v. high risk (OR 4.04, 95% CI 1.56-10.47), and D’Amico intermediate v. high risk (OR 3.33, 95% CI 1.66-6.70). ROC curves were drawn and an AUC value of 61.9% (95% CI 57.49 – 66.36) at 4 weeks and 63.8% (95% CI 58.03 – 69.65) at 12 weeks were computed. Based on these parameters, two nomograms (at 4 and 12 post-operative weeks) were generated.

**Conclusion** The TAR technique confirmed excellent results in the early recovery of urinary continence. Two nomograms were created, to predict pre-operatively the post-operative odds of

1  
2  
3 urinary continence recovery at 4 and 12 weeks after RARP by integrating the presence of diabetes  
4 and the D'Amico risk classification.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## INTRODUCTION

Prostate cancer continues to be the most common solid organ malignancy in men in Western countries [1]. The incidence is expected to rise as the population ages and longevity increases. Over 90% of cases are organ confined at diagnosis [2], and radical prostatectomy (RP) is the gold standard among radical treatments in eligible patients. Nowadays, robot assisted RP (RARP) is the most common treatment offered in western countries [3].

The goal of surgery is to achieve complete cancer control while preserving functional outcomes in terms of urinary and sexual faculties [4], and, to date, the advantages of robotics in achieving both objectives are widely recognized [5-9]. Urinary incontinence is a particularly feared side effect of RP because it can significantly compromise patients' quality of life. The proportion of continent patients at 12 months after surgery ranges in the literature from 69% to 96% [5]. The wide range is probably due to various definitions of continence and measurement methods. A number of factors have been identified for post prostatectomy incontinence, including patient characteristics, surgeon experience, and surgical precision [10].

Concerning the surgical procedure, many authors have proposed different techniques to obtain the best early continence recovery rate [3, 11]. In 2016 our group proposed and published the Total Anatomical Reconstruction (TAR) technique during anterograde RARP [12], a "tension-free" anastomosis technique that aimed to restore the anterior and posterior supports to the sphincter.

The primary end-point of this study was to present the continence recovery outcomes and technique-related complications after one-year minimum follow-up, after an experience of more than 1000 RARP with our standardized TAR technique. The secondary end-points were to evaluate factors influencing the postoperative continence recovery, in order to obtain a nomogram to predict the risk of post-operative incontinence, as well as potency, quality of life and oncologic outcomes.

## MATERIALS & METHODS

### Study design

The enrolment phase began in June 2013 and ended in May 2017; the follow-up period was formally closed in June 2018. The study was approved by the local ethics committee of San Luigi Gonzaga Hospital in Orbassano, Italy. Patients were prospectively included in the study with the following inclusion criteria: (1) localized PCa (clinical stages cT1-3, cN0, cM0); (2) indication for radical prostatectomy; (3) preoperative multiparametric prostate magnetic resonance imaging (mp-MRI).

The exclusion criteria were: (1) contraindications for undergoing RARP; (2) neo-adjuvant hormone therapy; (3) anterior tumors with suspected large extracapsular extension on mp-MRI.

All patients underwent RARP performed with the transperitoneal anterograde approach [14]. Two laparoscopic and robotic surgeons performed all of the prostate apical dissections and TARs. When indicated, unilateral or bilateral neurovascular bundle preservation (nerve-sparing [NS] procedure) and extended pelvic lymph-node dissection (ePLND) were performed.

### Surgical technique

Total anatomic reconstruction has been previously described [12]. The most important details of the surgical technique are briefly reported below. Anteriorly, the endopelvic fascia is incised while preserving the pubo-prostatic ligaments. The visceral layer of the endopelvic fascia is sliced cranially, and the bladder neck dissection then begins with the intention to spare the anatomy of the involved structures. After the posterior Denonvilliers' fascia incision, the prostate apex is anatomically dissected, and the urethra is incised at the level of the genital ridge, to preserve the maximum urethral length. After the demolitive phase, the deep venous complex is selectively sutured using a continuous 3/0 barbed suture, only in case of severe venous bleeding. The posterior reconstruction is performed in a triple layer by using a 3/0 barbed suture. The first layer involves the previously sectioned Denonvilliers' fascia and the median raphe, the second the retrotrigonal fascia and the median raphe, and the third the bladder neck (excluding the mucosa of the bladder) and the posterior aspect of the rhabdosphincter. The urethro-vesical anastomosis is performed by using two 3/0 barbed hemi-running sutures, involving the full thickness of either the bladder or the urethra. Finally, the anterior reconstruction consists of two layers of 3/0 barbed running sutures. The first layer involves the muscular fibers of the bladder and the previously dissected peri-urethral tissue, which is located between the urethra and the deep venous complex. The second involves the vesical apron and the portion of the endopelvic fascia that covers the deep venous complex while involving the pubo-prostatic ligaments. At the end of the surgery, an independent drainage is placed through a suprapubic

1  
2  
3 incision. The peritoneum is sutured using a 3/0 barbed running suture. In case of ePLND, an  
4 independent drainage is inserted through the port for the fourth robotic arm. In this way, the closure  
5 of the peritoneum causes the retropubic space not to communicate with the intraperitoneal cavity.  
6  
7

8  
9 Concerning postoperative care, the intraperitoneal drainage was removed on postoperative day (POD)  
10 2, and the extraperitoneal drainage on POD 3. The catheterization time was established by the first  
11 surgeon on the basis of the quality of the anastomosis. The quality was classified as: (1) “excellent”,  
12 when an end-to-end anastomosis was performed; (2) “very good”, when a single stitch was required  
13 to reinforce the end-to-end anastomosis; or (3) “good” (when more than a single stitch was required  
14 to reinforce the end-to-end anastomosis or in cases of more complex bladder neck reconstruction).  
15 The catheter was removed after pelvic US in POD <5 if the quality of anastomosis was rated as  
16 “excellent”, in POD 5-7 in case of “very good” quality, and in POD >7 in case of “good” quality. If  
17 there was evidence of urine leakage in the drainage sac (confirmed with a creatinine measure on the  
18 drained liquid) or in case of suspected leakage at US, a retrograde and voiding cystourethrogram (RV-  
19 CU) was performed before catheter removal. A pelvic US was repeated at 4 weeks after surgery, to  
20 rule out the presence of tardive urine leakages or asymptomatic retropubic hematomas. At 12 weeks,  
21 all continent patients underwent uroflowmetry to exclude stenosis of the anastomosis. In case of  
22 Qmax <15ml/s and normal voided volume, patients underwent RV-CU and flexible cystoscopy.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **Demographic and perioperative data**

35  
36 Collected data included: (1) preoperative variables: age, serum PSA at diagnosis, BMI, American  
37 Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score, DRE, biopsy Gleason Score (GS), D’Amico risk  
38 stratification, prostate volume, presence of extracapsular extension (ECE) on mp-MRI; (2)  
39 intraoperative variables: estimated blood loss, skin-to-skin operative time (since the insertion of the  
40 Veress needle to the suture of surgical wounds), time to complete the anastomosis and time to  
41 complete the posterior and the anterior reconstruction, ePLND rate, number of full v. partial v.  
42 minimal NS procedures (according to the Pasadena classification [13]); (3) postoperative variables:  
43 catheterization and hospitalization time, complications; (4) and pathological variables: prostate  
44 volume, tumor volume, percentage of cancer on the whole prostate, pathologic stage (according to  
45 TNM), pathology GS, and positive surgical margin rate.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 **Functional data**

55  
56 Continence evaluation: Preoperative urinary continence was assessed by validated questionnaires,  
57 namely the International Continence Society (ICS) male and the International Prostatic Symptoms  
58 Score (IPSS) with Urinary Incontinence Quality of Life Scale questionnaires.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The continence rates were assessed at 24 h, and 1, 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after catheter removal.  
4 After surgery, all patients were instructed to undergo proper pelvic-floor rehabilitation, which started  
5 at the time of catheter removal and was performed daily with a gradual increase in training load for a  
6 period of 8 weeks. Post-operative continence was evaluated using the Expanded Prostate Cancer  
7 Index Composite (EPIC) survey question number 12: “How many pads or adult diapers per day did  
8 you usually use to control leakage during the last 4 weeks?” To measure continence at catheter  
9 removal and 1 week after removal, the question was modified. Patients were defined as continent if  
10 they answered “zero pad” or “one safety pad” per day. In order to evaluate the impact of  
11 incontinence on patient’s quality of life, a further re-classification of continence was performed  
12 retrospectively, according to a recent paper published by Menon et al. [14]. Total continence was  
13 defined by the use of no pads or no urinary leakage within a 24-hour period, while social continence  
14 was defined by the use of  $\leq 1$  pad within a 24-hour period. At week 4, week 12, week 24 and week 48  
15 after catheter removal, all patients were reviewed with the IPSS questionnaire and Urinary  
16 Incontinence Quality of Life Scale.

17  
18 Patients who were still incontinent at weeks 12 and 24 filled voiding diaries for 3-7 days.  
19 Furthermore, they were instructed to perform both the 24-h pad weight test for seven days and the  
20 standard 1-h pad test. At the week 24 they underwent urodynamics in order to establish the  
21 incontinence type. Further treatments for urinary incontinence were recorded.

22  
23 For evaluation of the secondary end-point a multivariate regression model was performed. The results  
24 were used to obtain a nomogram to predict the risk of post-operative incontinence after a RARP with  
25 TAR technique.

26  
27 Potency evaluation: Preoperative erectile function was evaluated by a validated questionnaire, namely  
28 the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF)-5. For patients who underwent NS surgery,  
29 potency was defined as the ability to achieve an erection sufficient for intercourse or masturbation  
30 with or without the use of a phosphodiesterase type 5 enzyme inhibitor (score  $>2$  at question thirty-  
31 two of the EPIC questionnaire: “How would you describe the usual quality of your erections during  
32 the last 4 weeks?”). Sexual potency was assessed at 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after surgery.

### 33 **Oncologic data**

34  
35 Serum PSA levels were measured at 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after RARP. Patients who received  
36 adjuvant therapies during the follow-up period, such as radiotherapy (RT), hormonal treatment (HT),  
37 or chemotherapy (CT), were recorded. Biochemical relapse (BCR) was denoted as (1) any  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 postoperative cancer treatment; or (2) PSA >0.2 ng/mL with a single repeated measurement for  
4 confirmation [15].  
5

### 6 7 **Complications and other surgical interventions** 8

9  
10 For the purpose of the study only postoperative complications related to the TAR technique were  
11 reported. Indeed, the presence of two non-communicating spaces (the retropubic space and the  
12 intraperitoneal cavity) at the end of the surgery, drained separately, allowed us to focus on the  
13 complications related to the anastomosis and reconstruction technique. Namely, we considered the  
14 following complications: acute urinary retention and catheter removal, urine leakage, retropubic  
15 drained hematomas, and anastomosis strictures. Any further intervention after radical prostatectomy  
16 performed during follow-up were recorded. Patients who underwent surgery for incontinence were  
17 considered as incontinent for functional analysis.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 24 **Patient satisfaction and health status** 25

26 Questions 1 and 46 of the EPIC questionnaire (“In general, would you say your health is”; “Overall,  
27 how satisfied are you with the treatment you received for your prostate cancer?”, respectively) were  
28 administered during the last follow-up visit with the aim of assessing patient satisfaction after surgical  
29 intervention and general health status as subjectively perceived by the patient.  
30  
31  
32

### 33 34 **Statistical Analysis** 35

36 Patient characteristics were tested using Fisher’s exact test for categorical variables and the Mann-  
37 Whitney test for continuous ones. All results for continuous variables were expressed as medians  
38 (range) and the frequencies and proportions were reported as percentages.  
39

40 For the evaluation of the secondary end-point a logistic regression model was performed to evaluate  
41 the potential impact of some pre and intra-operative factors on the postoperative urinary continence  
42 recovery. The results were shown in terms of Odds Ratio (OR) with their 95% Confidence Interval  
43 (95% CI). Model discrimination was assessed using an area under (AUC) the receiver operating  
44 characteristic (ROC) curve. A nomogram to predict the risk of post-operative incontinence after  
45 RARP with TAR technique was generated based on the logistic model. All the analyses were  
46 performed with SAS® Statistics Software.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RESULTS

One-thousand-eight patients were enrolled in our study. The mean PSA at diagnosis was 10.31 ( $\pm$  11.61) mg/dL, 280 (27.78%) patients had a positive DRE and the median GS was 7 (6-7).

According to the D'Amico classification, 264 (27.33%), 537 (55.59%) and 165 (17.08%) patients had low, intermediate, and high risk respectively. The demographics variables are summarized in Table 1.

Peri-operative data are reported in Table 2. Median catheter removal was 3.5 (3-6) days, and median hospital stay was 6 (4-8) days.

### Functional outcomes

#### *Continence outcomes*

The number of continent patients according to our definition, and the number of social continent patients according to Menon were reported in Fig. 1. At 24 h, and 1, 4, 12, 24 and 48 weeks after catheter removal, 621 (61.61%), 594 (58.93%), 803 (79.66%), 912 (90.48%), 950 (94.25%) and 956 (94.84%) patients were continent, respectively. The mean time to continence recovery was 4.05 ( $\pm$ 7.36) weeks after the catheter removal.

Patients who were still incontinent at 12 and 24 weeks after surgery filled the 24h pad test. The mean pad weight after the test was 257 g and 156 g respectively. At 24 weeks, 58 (5.75%) patients were incontinent, 57 with low or mild incontinence, whilst one had severe incontinence, according to the International Continence Society. All the patients underwent urodynamics, which resulted in 3 cases of urge urinary incontinence and in 55 cases of a stress urinary incontinence. During the first year of follow-up, 10 (0.99%) patients underwent surgical treatment for incontinence. Nine patients with a low or mild incontinence underwent a trans-obturator sling application; one patient with severe incontinence required the application of an artificial urinary sphincter. In all the cases, after surgery for incontinence, patients were continent.

The results of a logistic regression model at different catheter removal time points are reported in Figure 2. The analysed variables had a higher impact on continence recovery at 4 and 12 weeks. At 4 weeks, the post-operative odds of urinary continence recovery increased with the absence of diabetes (OR 2.76, 95% CI 1.41-5.41) and D'Amico low v. high risk (OR 2.01, 95% CI 1.01-3.99). At 12 weeks, increased with the absence of diabetes (OR 3.01, 95% CI 1.23-7.35), D'Amico low v. high risk (OR 4.04, 95% CI 1.56-10.47), and D'Amico intermediate v. high risk (OR 3.33, 95% CI 1.66-6.70). ROC curves were drawn and an AUC value of 61.9% (95% CI 57.49-66.36) at 4 weeks and 63.8% (95% CI 58.03-69.65) at 12 weeks were computed (Fig. 3a-b). The best cut-off values

1  
2  
3 were 40 at 4 weeks and 60 at 12 weeks. Based on these parameters, two nomograms (at 4 and 12  
4 post-operative weeks) were generated (Fig. 4a-b).

### 6 7 *Potency outcomes*

8  
9 Eighteen (2.56%) patients reported an andrological drop out and were excluded from the analysis  
10 on potency recovery. Considering only patient who underwent a bilateral full NS procedure, the  
11 potency recovery rate was 24.82%, 38.20%, 58.10%, 67.74%, and 74.90% at 1, 3, 6, and 12  
12 months, respectively. The mean time for potency recovery was 3.32 ( $\pm$ 3.16) months after the  
13 surgery.  
14  
15  
16  
17

### 18 19 **Pathological findings and oncological outcomes**

20  
21 Pathological findings are reported in Table 3. 22.87% apical positive surgical margins were  
22 recorded. During the follow-up period, 78 (8.32%) patients experienced a BCR. The mean time to  
23 recurrence was 10.2 ( $\pm$ 11,82) months after the surgery. One-hundred-twenty-seven (13.86%)  
24 patients underwent RT, 89 (70.08%) adjuvant and 38 (29.92%) salvage RT; 95 (10.57%) patients  
25 underwent post-operative HT.  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 31 **Complications and other surgical interventions**

32  
33 An acute urinary retention was recorded in 37 patients, all of them treated with corticosteroids and  
34 re-catheterization for a total of 5 days.  
35

36  
37 Urine leak was diagnosed in 25 cases, leading to catheter maintenance or to re-catheterization. The  
38 catheter was maintained for a minimum of 7 days, after which patients underwent pelvic US and  
39 cystography to schedule its removal. In one case the leakage was accompanied by fever.  
40  
41

42  
43 Symptomatic and/or large retropubic hematomas ( $\geq$ 10 cm) were recorded in 22 cases. All of them  
44 were treated with a small suprapubic incision and surgical drainage within 24 hours to prevent the  
45 accumulation of blood in an enclosed space and therefore damage to the anastomosis due to an  
46 increased tension. In two cases, a blood transfusion was necessary. In three cases the hematoma was  
47 accompanied by fever.  
48  
49

50  
51  
52 Finally, 5 stenosis of the anastomosis were diagnosed within six months from the surgery. Four  
53 patients with a sub-stenosis were treated with a urethral dilatation under direct vision during a  
54 flexible cystoscopy, whilst one patient underwent a laser urethral incision, without stenosis relapse  
55 during the follow-up.  
56  
57  
58

### 59 60 **Quality of life outcomes**

1  
2  
3 At one year follow-up 96% of patients were “completely satisfied” or “satisfied” after the surgery  
4 for prostate cancer, and 98% of patients rated their own health status as “excellent”, “very good”, or  
5 “good”.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## DISCUSSION

Our results of more than 1000 RARP with TAR at one-year minimum follow-up confirmed the preliminarily published data on continence rates [12], and the excellent safety profile of the technique.

The impact of urinary incontinence after radical prostatectomy on patient's quality of life has driven the development of more refined surgical techniques [16]. It is well known that the preservation of a pelvic normal anatomy is of utmost importance to maintain a good postoperative urinary continence [17], together with the application of some reconstructive techniques which could influence early postoperative continence recovery [18].

Focusing on the reconstruction phase, with the evolution of the surgical techniques many authors combined an anterior with a posterior reconstruction, demonstrating improvements in functional outcomes [19]. Nevertheless, the results of some randomized controlled trials showed opposite results. On one side, some authors like Sammon et al. [20] and Menon et al. [21] found no differences in terms of early or late continence recovery when adding anterior and posterior reconstruction to conventional anastomosis; on the other side, authors like Koliakos et al. [22] and Hurtes et al. [23] found better and earlier continence recovery applying reconstructive techniques. More recently, two total vesico-urethral anastomosis reconstruction techniques were described. The first one was published in 2008 by Tewari et al [24] and was composed by a reattachment of the arcus tendineus to the lateral aspect of the bladder neck and a refixation of the puboprostatic ligaments to the anterior aspect of the anastomosis. The second one, the TAR technique, was published by our group in 2016 [12]. Both techniques showed an early recovery of urinary continence. According to these results, in a recent meta-analysis investigating the comparison of total v. non-total reconstruction techniques in recovery of continence, Wu et al. demonstrated the superiority of total reconstruction techniques in terms of shorter recovery of continence after radical prostatectomy at every time point [25]. Concerning early recovery of continence, the outcomes were statistically in favor of the total reconstruction techniques at 1 week (OR 2.76, 95% CI 1.58-4.84,  $p < 0.001$ ), 2 weeks (OR 2.57, 95% CI 1.74-3.80,  $p < 0.001$ ), 4 weeks (OR 2.61, 95% CI 1.56-4.38,  $p < 0.001$ ), and 12 weeks (OR 4.33, 95% CI 2.01-9.33,  $p < 0.001$ ) after surgery.

In 2010, the introduction of robotic surgery favored the development of a new approach to performing an RARP, the so-called "Retzius-sparing" or "posterior approach" prostatectomy [26]. The technique consisted of performing the prostatectomy through a posterior plane going directly through the Douglas space and avoiding any dissection of the anterior compartment, demonstrating excellent results in terms of continence and potency recovery. Once the posterior approach was

1  
2  
3 introduced, one randomized comparative study with the standard anterior approach was made.  
4 Dalela et al. compared the short-term urinary continence rates of patients with low and  
5 intermediate-risk localised prostate cancer, randomized to receive either posterior (n=60) or anterior  
6 (n=60) RARP [27]. The urinary continence (defined as 0 pads/one security pad per day) at one  
7 week, 4, 8, and 12 weeks after catheter removal was reached by 71%, 83%, 88%, and 95% of men  
8 undergoing the posterior approach v. 48%, 67%, 72%, and 86% undergoing the anterior approach,  
9 respectively ( $p = 0.02$ ).

10  
11 Even if the RCT provided a high evidence to support early return to continence with posterior  
12 RARP, those functional results must be weighted against some caveats [28]. First is the higher rate  
13 of positive surgical margins (25% v. 13% for posterior v. anterior RARP), with a not significant p-  
14 value mostly due to the small sample size and considering that the primary outcome was  
15 continence. Second is the selection of patients with low or favorable intermediate risk disease.  
16 Third is the steep learning curve.

17  
18 In this scenario, the TAR technique can be considered an excellent compromise between an  
19 anterograde prostatectomy with a partial reconstruction and a posterior prostatectomy, allowing the  
20 achievement of an excellent early recovery of continence with a negligible rate of related  
21 complications and a satisfactory positive margins rate, as demonstrated in a consecutive series of  
22 patients with any risk PCa. The early recovery of continence reported (90.48% at 12 weeks) was  
23 possible because of the standardized technique based on two cornerstones which allowed for  
24 tension-free anastomosis: the anatomical dissection of the prostatic apex; and the protection of the  
25 anastomosis by reconstructing three posterior layers and two anterior layers. Moreover, three other  
26 aspects derived from the surgical technique are to be highlighted. First was the short catheterization  
27 time (median of 3.5 days). Second was the low rate of related complications to the technique. Both  
28 of them derived from the meticulous tension-free urethro-vesical anastomosis and reconstruction of  
29 the peri-urethral structures. Third was the relatively low rate of apical margins (22.87%), which  
30 confirmed the safety of a meticulous apical dissection.

31  
32 Regarding continence outcomes of our study more deeply, we developed two preoperative  
33 nomograms predicting urinary continence recovery after RARP with TAR including three  
34 significant variables: age, D'Amico risk classification and presence of diabetes. At 1 week, patients  
35 without diabetes and with a D'Amico risk low or intermediate were significantly more continent. At  
36 4 weeks, absence of diabetes was still important, while the D'Amico score became insignificant,  
37 though at the limits. On the contrary, age <66 years old was now significant. At 12 weeks, absence  
38 of diabetes, D'Amico risk low or intermediate and age <66 years old were significant in order to  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 recover continence. At 24 and 48 months, only a D'Amico risk low or intermediate remained  
4 significant. In order to know the nomograms reliability, ROC curves were performed. As we  
5 expected, the nomogram at 4 weeks was less performing than the 12 weeks one, because the  
6 D'Amico score at 4 weeks was less significant. However, the AUC was good in both cases (61.9%  
7 at 4 weeks and 63.8% at 12 weeks). The absence of any variable directly related to the surgical  
8 approach (e.g., the grade of NS) was probably due to the precise standardization of the TAR  
9 technique from the beginning of the study, which led to reach a plateau phase early in the learning  
10 curve of the first surgeon. Moreover, it permits administration of the nomogram before the surgery,  
11 to predict which patients will not recover continence after surgery, making this tool a useful adjunct  
12 for pre-operative counselling.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Concerning the literature, as reported by a recent systematic review by O'Callaghan et al., seven  
22 nomograms on the prediction of urinary incontinence in patients who had undergone radical  
23 prostatectomy were externally validated [29]. Among them, only two tools were reported to have a  
24 c-index >70% (e.g., good accuracy). Matsushita et al. studied 2849 patients who underwent robot-  
25 assisted or open radical prostatectomy. Authors reported an AUC value of 72.9% and 70.9% at 6 and  
26 12 months, respectively, for the prediction of social continence [30]. The second study was conducted  
27 by Jeong et al., including 1168 men treated with robot-assisted or open radical prostatectomy. The  
28 accuracy for the prediction of continence was reported as 71.1% [31]. In both studies, the cohort was  
29 split to achieve an external validation of the model. A more recent model was published by Tienza et  
30 al. in 2018, including age, prior prostate surgery, membranous urethral length and urethral wall  
31 thickness as risk factors for urinary incontinence after radical prostatectomy in 746 men. The  
32 predictive accuracy and the AUC value of the model were 78.7% and 71.7%, respectively. The main  
33 limitation of the study was the non-systematic surgical approach [32].  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 In the near future, the intra-operative use of bioengineering materials aimed at neuro-regeneration  
45 to improve urinary continence recovery may allow us to start treating post-operative incontinence  
46 "during surgery", while also implementing the results of future nomograms [33-35].  
47

48 The strengths of the study are the large series considered in a limited period of time, the use of a  
49 standardized and reproducible surgical technique that permitted the obtaining of successful results  
50 on post-operative continence from the beginning of the study, and the meticulous study of the post-  
51 operative incontinence with a clear description of the type and treatment of incontinence type.  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Nevertheless, the study is not free of limitations. First of all is the lack of randomization, even if it  
57 was performed in a prospective fashion and was based on a consecutive series of patients.  
58  
59

60 Moreover, the study lacks a comparison with other techniques to compare functional outcomes. The

1  
2  
3 predictive models created were based on a population from a single tertiary hospital treated by a  
4 single experienced surgeon, which thus may limit their widespread use, even if it permitted  
5 standardization of the procedure. For the same reasons, our nomogram requires external validation  
6 in a multicentre study to verify its applicability in a general context and to consider it for routine  
7 clinical implementation.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 In conclusion, the TAR technique confirmed excellent results in the early recovery of urinary  
16 continence, as well as a low catheterization time, and a low rate of related complications, even if at  
17 a short-term follow-up, the oncologic results were not affected. Two nomograms were created, to  
18 predict pre-operatively the post-operative odds of urinary continence recovery at 4 and 12 weeks  
19 after RARP by integrating the presence of diabetes and the D'Amico risk classification.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Conflict of interest – All the Authors certify that they have nothing to disclose.

For Peer Review

**REFERENCES**

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2016;66: 7–30
2. Hamdy FC, Donovan JL, Lane JA, et al. 10-year outcomes after monitoring, surgery, or radiotherapy for localized prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med*. Oct. 2016;375(15): 1415–24
3. Sridhar AN, Abozaid M, Rajan P, et al. Surgical Techniques to Optimize Early Urinary Continence Recovery Post Robot Assisted Radical Prostatectomy for Prostate Cancer. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2017 Sep;18(9):71
4. Jazayeri SB, Weissman B, Samadi DB. Outcomes following robotic-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy: Pentafecta and Trifecta achievements. *Minerva Urol Nefrol*. 2018 Feb;70(1):66-73.
5. Ficarra V, Novara G, Rosen RC, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting urinary continence recovery after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol*. 2012 Sep;62(3):405-17.
6. Ficarra V, Novara G, Ahlering TE, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting potency rates after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol*. 2012 Sep;62(3):418-30
7. Novara G, Ficarra V, Mocellin S, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of studies reporting oncologic outcome after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Eur Urol*. 2012 Sep;62(3):382-404
8. Porpiglia F, Fiori C, Bertolo R, et al. Five-year Outcomes for a Prospective Randomised Controlled Trial Comparing Laparoscopic and Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy. *Eur Urol Focus*. 2018 Jan;4(1):80-86.
9. O'Neil B, Koyama T, Alvarez J, et al. The Comparative Harms of Open and Robotic Prostatectomy in Population Based Samples. *J Urol*. 2016 Feb;195(2):321-9.
10. Lavigne-Blouin H, Noriega AC, Valdivieso R, et al. Predictors of early continence following robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Can Urol Assoc J*. 2015 Jan-Feb;9(1-2): e93-7.
11. Manfredi M, Fiori C, Amparore D, Checcucci E, Porpiglia F. Technical details to achieve perfect early continence after radical prostatectomy. *Minerva Chir*. 2018 Jul 23. [Epub ahead of print]
12. Porpiglia F, Bertolo R, Manfredi M, et al. Total Anatomical Reconstruction During Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy: Implications on Early Recovery of Urinary Continence. *Eur Urol*. 2016 Mar;69(3):485-95.
13. Montorsi F, Wilson TG, Rosen RC, et al; Pasadena Consensus Panel. Best practices in robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: recommendations of the Pasadena Consensus Panel. *Eur Urol*. 2012 Sep;62(3):368-81.
14. Menon M, Dalela D, Jamil M, et al. Functional Recovery, Oncologic Outcomes and Postoperative Complications after Robot-Assisted Radical Prostatectomy: An Evidence-Based Analysis Comparing the Retzius Sparing and Standard Approaches. *J Urol*. 2018 May;199(5):1210-1217.
15. Cookson MS, Aus G, Burnett AL, et al. Variation in the definition of biochemical recurrence in patients treated for localized prostate cancer: the American Urological Association prostate

- 1  
2  
3 guidelines for localized prostate cancer update panel report and recommendations for a standard in  
4 the reporting of surgical outcomes. *J Urol* 2007;177:540.  
5  
6 16. Rossanese M, Crestani A, Palumbo V, et al. Time of catheterization as an independent predictor of  
7 early urinary continence recovery after radical prostatectomy. *Minerva Urol Nefrol* 2018  
8 August;70(4):401-7.  
9  
10 17. Yanagida T, Koguchi T, Hata J, et al. Current techniques to improve outcomes for early return of  
11 urinary continence following robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. *Fukushima J Med Sci* 2014;60:1-  
12 13.  
13  
14 18. Porreca A, D'agostino D, Dandrea M, et al. Bidirectional barbed suture for posterior musculofascial  
15 reconstruction and knotless vesicourethral anastomosis during robot-assisted radical prostatectomy.  
16 *Minerva Urol Nefrol*. 2018 Jun;70(3):319-325.  
17  
18 19. Tan G, Srivastava A, Grover S, et al. Optimizing vesicourethral anastomosis healing after robot-  
19 assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy: lessons learned from three techniques in 1900 patients. *J*  
20 *Endourol* 2010; 24:1975–83.  
21  
22 20. Sammon JD, Muhletaler F, Peabody JO, et al. Long-term functional urinary outcomes comparing  
23 single- vs double-layer urethrovesical anastomosis: two year follow-up of a two-group parallel  
24 randomized controlled trial. *Urology* 2010;76:1102–7.  
25  
26 21. Menon M, Muhletaler F, Campos M, Peabody JO. Assessment of early continence after  
27 reconstruction of the periprostatic tissues in patients undergoing computer assisted (robotic)  
28 prostatectomy: results of a 2 group parallel randomized controlled trial. *J Urol* 2008;180:1018–23.  
29  
30 22. Koliakos N, Mottrie A, Buffi N, De Naeyer G, Willemsen P, Fonteyne E. Posterior and anterior  
31 fixation of the urethra during robotic prostatectomy improves early continence rates. *Scand J Urol*  
32 *Nephrol* 2010;44:5-10.  
33  
34 23. Hurtes X, Rouprêt M, Vaessen C, et al. Anterior suspension combined with posterior reconstruction  
35 during robot-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy improves early return of UC: a prospective  
36 randomized multicentre trial. *BJU Int* 2012;110:875-83.  
37  
38 24. Tewari A, Jhaveri J, Rao S, et al. Total reconstruction of the vesico-urethral junction. *BJU Int*  
39 2008;101:871-7  
40  
41 25. Wu YP, Xu N, Wang ST, et al. The efficacy and feasibility of total reconstruction versus nontotal  
42 reconstruction of the pelvic floor on short-term and long-term urinary continence rates after radical  
43 prostatectomy: a meta-analysis. *World J Surg Oncol* 2017;15:228.  
44  
45 26. Galfano A, Ascione A, Grimaldi S, Petralia G, Strada E, Bocciardi AM. A new anatomic approach  
46 for robot-assisted laparoscopic prostatectomy: a feasibility study for completely intrafascial surgery.  
47 *Eur Urol*. 2010;58:457-61.  
48  
49 27. Dalela D, Jeong W, Prasad MA, Sood A, Abdollah F, Diaz M et al. A Pragmatic Randomized  
50 Controlled Trial Examining the Impact of the Retzius-sparing Approach on Early Urinary  
51 Continence Recovery After Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy. *Eur Urol* 2017;72:677-85.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 28. Stonier T, Simson N, Davis J, Challacombe B. Retzius-sparing robot-assisted radical prostatectomy  
4 (RS-RARP) vs standard RARP: it's time for critical appraisal. *BJU Int.* 2019 Jan;123(1):5-7.
- 5  
6 29. O'Callaghan ME, Raymond E, Campbell J, et al. Tools for predicting patient-reported outcomes  
7 in prostate cancer patients undergoing radical prostatectomy: a systematic review of prognostic  
8 accuracy and validity. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis.* 2017 Dec;20(4):378-388.
- 9  
10 30. Matsushita K, Kent MT, Vickers AJ, et al. Preoperative predictive model of recovery of urinary  
11 continence after radical prostatectomy. *BJU Int* 2015; 116: 577–583.
- 12  
13 31. Jeong SJ, Yeon JS, Lee JK, et al. Development and validation of nomograms to predict the recovery  
14 of urinary continence after radical prostatectomy: comparisons between immediate, early, and late  
15 continence. *World J Urol* 2014; 32: 437–444.
- 16  
17 32. Tienza A, Hevia M, Benito A, Pascual JI, Zudaire JJ, Robles JE. MRI factors to predict urinary  
18 incontinence after retropubic/laparoscopic radical prostatectomy. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2015; 47: 1343–  
19 1349.
- 20  
21 33. Porpiglia F, Bertolo R, Fiori C, Manfredi M, De Cillis S, Geuna S. Chitosan membranes applied on  
22 the prostatic neurovascular bundles after nerve-sparing robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: a phase  
23 II study. *BJU Int.* 2018 Mar;121(3):472-478.
- 24  
25 34. Porpiglia F, Manfredi M, Checcucci E, et al. Use of chitosan membranes after nerve-sparing radical  
26 prostatectomy improves early recovery of sexual potency: results of a comparative study. *BJU Int.*  
27 2018 Oct 10. [Epub ahead of print]
- 28  
29 35. Geuna S, Muratori L, Fregnan F, Manfredi M, Bertolo R, Porpiglia F. Strategies to improve nerve  
30 regeneration after radical prostatectomy: a narrative review. *Minerva Urol Nefrol.* 2018 Jul 23.  
31 [Epub ahead of print]
- 32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## FIGURE LEGENDS

**Fig. 1.** Post-operative continence recovery rate according to our definition and the Menon definition.

**Fig. 2.** Logistic regression models were performed to evaluate the potential impact of perioperative factors on the postoperative urinary continence recovery; results were showed as OR and relative 95% CI. OR of the main variables (dots) with their 95% CI (horizontal bars) are shown at 1 week (a), 4 weeks (b), 12 weeks (c), 24 weeks (d) and 48 weeks (e). BCR = biochemical recurrence; CI = confidence interval; ECE = extracapsular extension; HT = hormonal therapy; NS = nerve sparing; OR = odds ratio; pT = pathologic stage T; RT = radiotherapy.

**Fig. 3.** ROC curves of the two models at 4 (a) and 12 (b) weeks were performed. The blue line represents the relationship between 1-Specificity (x axis) and Sensitivity (y axis). The AUC shows the reliability of the model. The bisector represents an AUC of 50%. AUC = Area Under the Curve; ROC = Receiver Operating Characteristic.

**Fig. 4.** Nomograms at 4 (a) and 12 (b) weeks were performed. The total score is calculated by summing the partial scores.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3




Fig. 4

<b>Table 1.</b>	
<b>Number of patients</b>	1008
<b>Age, years; mean (SD)</b>	64.84 (6.76)
<b>BMI; mean (SD)</b>	26.47 (3.11)
<b>Diabetes; number (%)</b>	71 (7.04)
<b>Smoke; number (%)</b>	268 (26.59)
<b>Hypertension; number (%)</b>	443 (43.95)
<b>Cardiopathy; number (%)</b>	138 (13.69)
<b>PSA, ng/ml; mean (SD)</b>	10.31 (11.61)
<b>Positive DRE; number (%)</b>	280 (27.78)
<b>Prostate volume (TRUS), ml; mean (SD)</b>	49.47 (21.74)
<b>Biopsy GS; median (IQR)</b>	7 (6-7)
<b>ASA score; median (IQR)</b>	2 (2-2)
<b>IPSS score (pre-operatively); median (IQR)</b>	7 (5-11)
<b>IIEF-5 score (pre-operatively); median (IQR)</b>	18 (15-21)
<b>D'Amico classification; number (%)</b>	
• <b>Low-risk PCa</b>	264 (27.33)
• <b>Intermediate-risk PCa</b>	537 (55.59)
• <b>High-risk PCa</b>	165 (17.08)

Table 1. Preoperative variables. ASA score = American Society of Anesthesiologist score; BMI = body mass index; DRE = digital rectal exploration; GS = Gleason score; IIEF = International Index of Erectile Function; IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Score; IQR = interquartile range; PSA = prostate specific antigen; SD = standard deviation; TRUS = transrectal ultrasound.



<b>Table 2.</b>	
<b>Operative time, min; mean (SD)</b>	117.28 (26.05)
<b>Lymphadenectomy; number (%)</b>	583 (57.8)
<b>Nerve sparing approach; number (%)</b>	
• Full NS	102 (10.12)
• Partial NS	408 (40.48)
• Minimal NS/not performed	498 (49.4)
<b>Blood losses, ml; mean (SD)</b>	250.75 (64.44)
<b>Catheterization time, days; median (IQR)</b>	3.5 (3-6)
<b>Hospital stay, days; median (IQR)</b>	6 (4-8)
<b>Transfusions; number (%)</b>	18 (1.78)
<b>TAR-related post-operative complications; number (%)</b>	
• Acute urinary retention	37 (3.67)
• Urine leak	25 (2.48)
• Retropubic drained hematomas	22 (2.18)
• Stenosis of anastomosis	5 (0.49)

Table 2. Perioperative variables. IQR = interquartile range; NS = nerve sparing; SD = standard deviation.

<b>Table 3.</b>	
<b>Positive margins; number (%)</b>	
• Total	241 (23.91)
• pT2	90/549 (16.58)
• pT3	151/458 (32.97)
• pT4	1/1 (100)
• Apical	75/328 (22.87)
• Equatorial	97/400 (24.25)
• Basal	64/280 (22.86)
<b>Prostate volume, ml; mean (SD)</b>	44.16 (12.14)
<b>Tumor volume, ml; mean (SD)</b>	24.20 (2.06)
<b>% tumor; mean (SD)</b>	15.78 (5.51)
<b>Stage; number (%)</b>	
• pT2	549 (54.46)
• pT3	458 (45.44)
• pT4	1 (0.1)
<b>Pathology GS; number (%)</b>	
• ≤6	97 (9.66)
• 7 (3+4)	452 (44.89)
• 7 (4+3)	310 (30.75)
• 8-10	148 (14.7)

Table 3. Histopathological data. GS = Gleason Score; pT = pathologic stage T; SD = standard deviation.