ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Effectiveness of Full Length and Cut Percutaneus Nephrostomy in Pediatrics Population

TARIQ AHMAD¹, SOHAIL SHABBIR², MUHAMMAD ASIF AMMAR³, FAZAL MANAN⁴, MUHAMMAD RASHID JAMAL⁵, ZARMAST KHAN⁶ ¹Assiatant Professor Paediatric Urology Institute of Kidney Diseases Hayat abad Medical Complex, Peshwar

²Honorary SHO Urology, Shaikh Zayed Hospital, Lahore

³Assistant Professor Urology, CMH Kharian Medical College, Kharian Cantt

⁴Registrar Institute of Kidney Diseases Hayat abad Medical Complex, Peshwar

⁵FCPS Urology, Doctors hospital, D.G Khan

⁶Associate Professor Pediatrics, Niazi Medical and Dental College, Sargodha

Corresponding author: Fazal Manan, Email: Fazalmanan500@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Purpose of the study is to evaluate the safety and efficacy of full length Percutaneous (PCN) versus cut PCN in pediatric population. PCN is performed to establish temporary drainage of obstructed or dilated renal system till definitive management. PCN is well established procedure which is performed under deep sedation, local anesthesia or general anesthesia ultrasound guided or fluoroscopic guided.

Methodology: Randomized controlled study carried out in 200 children in the department of urology, Institute of Kidney Disease, Hayatabad Peshawar Pakistan from Jan 2020 to Apr 2022 and analysis was done by using SPSS version 20 to know the efficacy of the cut versus full length PCN in children.

Results: This study was carried out over 200 children using cut and full length percutaneous nephrostomy tube, 100 in each group. This study includes 119 males and 81 females of mean age 5.49+3.127 years. The cause of obstruction was 61% PUJ obstruction, 55% VUR, 47% obstructed stone and other causes in 37% patients. Effective decompression of hydronephrosis were noted in 89% in cut length vs 82% in full end PCN (p<0.1%). Skin inflammation of 100% with cut end PCN and 20% with full length, 96% of PCN didn't show any inflammation (p<0.001%). Dislodgment of PCN was noted multiple time in 54%, two times in 38% and 7% in full length PCN where as it is noted two times in 47% and one times in 45% in cut PCN(p<0.001%). PCN exchange was needed multiple times in 51% patients and two times in 39% patients in full length PCN where it was needed two times in 41% and one time in 50% patients in CUT PCN arm (0.001%).

Conclusion: This study concludes that cut end PCN is more effective in term of PCN exchange and dislodgement but having more skin inflammation as compared to full length PCN

INTRODUCTION

PCN placement is done for the relief of urinary obstruction and urinary bypass. It is also done to access urinary tract for endoscopic procedures and for diagnostic tests [1]. Renal stone disease is epidemic in developing countries. Recurrence after surgery is higher in children than adults. [2]. In children due to access difficulties, open surgery was only available treatment in recent decades. Several open surgeries were commonly associated with comorbidities [3]. Both in adults and children PCN is commonly placed to relive urinary tract obstruction.

PCN is temporarily placed to maintain new parenchyma and hence to minimize renal deterioration. It is also done to control infection and sepsis until definite procedure. [4,5].

In pediatric patients, PCN is used as a temporary drainage tube for urinary tract obstruction and as a bypass surgery prior to definitive corrective surgery [6]. Obstruction of the ureter-pelvic junction is the most common cause of significant dilatation of the renal collecting system in the fetus [7,8,9]. Kidney stone disease in children has become an epidemic in developing countries. Nephrostomy catheters are associated with prolonged hospital stay, urine leakage, and obvious postoperative pain and discomfort [10].

METHODOLOGY

Study Setting: Institute of kidney diseases, Peshawar Pakistan Study Design: Randomized controlled study

Duration of Study: 2 years study conducted on pediatrics population from Jan 2020 to Apr 2022

Inclusion Criteria: Children with diagnosed case of hydronephrosis

Exclusion Criteria

- Bleeding disorders
- Anemia
- Thalassemia
- Age above 9 years

Placement of Percutaneus Nephrostomy Tube

RESULTS

This study was carried out 200 children using cut and full length percutaneous nephrostomy tube 100 in each group. This study includes 119 males and 81 females of mean age 5.49+3.127 years. The cause of obstruction was 61% PUJ obstruction, 55% VUR, 47% obstructive uropathy stone and 37% were having other anatomical cause. The result shows effective decompression of hydronephrosis 89% in full length PCN and 82% in cut end PCN (table_1), skin inflammation of 100% with cut end PCN and 20% with full length, 96% of PCN didn't show any inflammation (table-2). Dislodgment of PCN was noted multiple time in 54%, two times in 38% and 7% in full length PCN where as it is noted two times in 47% and one times in 45% in cut PCN(p<0.001%).

PCN exchange was needed multiple times in 51% patients and two times in 39% patients in full length PCN where it was needed two times in 41% and one time in 50% patients in CUT PCN arm (0.001%).(table- 4)

| Type of PCN | effective | decompression | Total | |
|-----------------|-----------|---------------|-------|--|
| | yes | no | | |
| Cut PCN | 89 | 11 | 100 | |
| Full length PCN | 82 | 18 | 100 | |
| Total | 171 | 29 | 200 | |

Table 2: skin inflammation Type of PCN Cross tabulation

| | | Type of PCN | | Total | |
|----------------------|-----|-----------------|---------|-------|--|
| | | Full length PCN | Cut PCN | | |
| skin inflammation | yes | 20% | 100% | 120 | |
| no | | 80 | 0 | 80 | |
| Total | | 100 | 100 | 200 | |

Table 3: Type of PCN * PCN dislodgment Cross tabulation

| Type of | PCN dislodgment | | | | Total | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|-------|--|
| PCN | dislodged | dislodged | dislodged | no | | |
| | 1 time | 2 times | multiple times | dislodgment | | |
| Full length PCN | 7 | 38 | 54 | 1 | 100 | |

| Cut PCN | 45 | 47 | 5 | 3 | 100 | |
|---------|----|----|----|---|-----|--|
| Total | 52 | 85 | 59 | 4 | 200 | |

Table 4: Type of PCN * exchanged Cross tabulation

| Type of PCN | Type of PCN Exchange of PCN | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----|
| | 1 time | 2 times | multiple times | |
| | exchanged | exchanged | exchanged | |
| Full length PCN | 10 | 39 | 51 | 100 |
| Cut PCN | 50 | 41 | 9 | 100 |
| Total | 60 | 80 | 60 | 200 |

DISCUSSION

This randomized controlled study was carried out on children presented to the department of

Urology with hydronephrosis. Percutaneous nephrostomy was first described in 1955 by Goodwin et al. It is used to relieve blocked kidneys and became a widely accepted operation in children in the 1980's[11,12]. PCN is mainly used to treat obstructed renal

system secondary to urinary stones, urinary tract infections, acute renal failure and urinary tract obstruction [13-15].

In our study PCN dislodgement was mainly with full length PCN i.e 54% dislodged multiple times, 38% dislodges 2 times and 7% dislodges 1 time while in cut end PCN 45% dislodges 1 times, 47% dislodges 2 times and 5% dislodges 1 time while study conducted in Yavascan pediatric nephrology in Infants and young children are concerned about catheter damage and displacement because these patients cannot properly care for the catheter [16]. While a study conducted in Evangelismos hospital in Greece shows that stent displaced in 3.5% of the patients [17].

A small catheter passed through the needle and X-rays were taken for drainage and renal localization. The percutaneous route to establish multiples has been shown to be safer, faster, easier and cheaper than surgery in repeated studies [18]. Percutaneous catheter drainage of the urinary tract is most often used for obstruction. It can also provide access for renal stones treatment, stenting, and other manipulative techniques [19,20].

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that cut end PCN is more effective in term of PCN exchange and dislodgement but having more skin inflammation as compared to full length PCN

REFERENCES

- Lang EK, Allaei A, Robinson L, Reid J, Zinn H. Minimally invasive radiologic techniques in the treatment of uretero-enteric fistulas. Diagnostic and interventional imaging. 2015 Nov 1;96(11):1153-60.
- SOOMRO AU, AZAD MM, KHALID F. Safety and Efficacy of Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy (PCNL) in Pediatric Patients with Deranged Renal Functions.
- Kane CJ, Bolton DM, Stoller ML. Current indications for open stone surgery in an endourology center. Urology. 1995 Feb 1;45(2):218-21
- Sancaktutar AA, Bozkurt Y, Tüfek A, Söylemez H, Önder H, Atar M, Penbegül N, Bodakçı MN, Hatipoğlu NK, Oktar T. Radiation-free percutaneous nephrostomy performed on neonates, infants, and

preschool-age children. Journal of pediatric urology. 2013 Aug 1;9(4):464-71.

- Dagli M, Ramchandani P. Percutaneous nephrostomy: technical aspects and indications. InSeminars in interventional radiology 2011 Dec (Vol. 28, No. 04, pp. 424-437). © Thieme Medical Publishers
- Herdem N, Kahriman G, Dogan A, Hosgecin C, Turan C, Oz Gergin O. Fluoroscopy-guided percutaneous antegrade approach for ureteral stent placement in children: a single-center experience. Acta Radiologica. 2021 Jul 14:02841851211030782.
- Chowdhury MM, Zaman R, Rasul MA, Hossain AS, Chowdhury SA, Rahman MM. Outcome of Percutaneous Nephrostomy in Children With Ureteropelvic Junction Obstruction. Bangladesh Journal of Urology. 2017;20(2):61-4.
- Whitaker RH. Some observations and theories on the wide ureter and hydronephrosis. Br J Urol. 1975Aug;47(4):377-85.
- Koff SA, Hayden LJ, Cirulli C. Shore. Pathophysiology of ureteropelvic junction obstruction: experimental and clinical observations. RJ Urol. 1986 Jul;136(1 Pt 2):336-8.
- Chung HS, Jung SI, Yu HS, Hwang EC, Oh KJ, Kwon DD, Park K. Modified totally tubeless percutaneous nephrolithotomy: Is it an effective and safe treatment option for renal and upper ureteral stones?. Videosurgery and Other Miniinvasive Techniques. 2016 Dec;11(4):240.
- Ozayar A, Friedlander JI, Shakir NA, Gahan JC, Cadeddu JA, Morgan MS. Equivocal ureteropelvic junction obstruction on diuretic renogram—should minimally invasive pyeloplasty be offered to symptomatic patients? J Urol. 2015 Apr;193(4):1278-82.
- Pode D, Shapiro A, Gordon R, Lebensart P. Percutaneous nephrostomy for assessment of functional recovery of obstructed kidneys. Urology 1982;19:482–5.
- Dyer RB, Regan JD, Kavanagh PV, Khatod EG, Chen MY, Zagoria RJ. Percutaneous nephrostomy with extensions of the technique: step by step. Radiographics. 2002; 22:503–525.
- Hausegger KA, Portugaller HR. Percutaneous nephrostomy and antegrade ureteral stenting: technique-indications-complications. Eur Radiol. 2006; 16:2016–2030.
- Avritscher R, Madoff DC, Ramirez PT, Wallace MJ, Ahrar K, Morello FA Jr, et al. Fistulas of the lower urinary tract: percutaneous approaches for the management of a difficult clinical entity. Radiographics. 2004; 24:Suppl 1. S217–S236.
- Yavascan O, Aksu N, Erdogan H, Aydin Y, Kara OD, Kangin M, Kanik A. Percutaneous nephrostomy in children: diagnostic and therapeutic importance. Pediatric Nephrology. 2005 Jun;20(6):768-72.
- Kaskarelis IS, Papadaki MG, Malliaraki NE, Robotis ED, Malagari KS, Piperopoulos PN. Complications of percutaneous nephrostomy, percutaneous insertion of ureteral endoprosthesis, and replacement procedures. Cardiovascular and interventional radiology. 2001 Jul;24(4):224-8.
- Kaskarelis IS, Papadaki MG, Malliaraki NE, Robotis ED, Malagari KS, Piperopoulos PN. Complications of percutaneous nephrostomy, percutaneous insertion of ureteral endoprosthesis, and replacement procedures. Cardiovascular and interventional radiology. 2001 Jul;24(4):224-8.
- Pfister RC, Newhouse JH. Percutaneous nephrostomy: types of catheters for drainage, occlusion, dilatation and fiberoptics for endoscopy. Interventional Radiology. Philadelphia: WB Saunders. 1982:467-96.
- Stables OP, Ginsberg NJ, Johnson ML. Percutaneous nephrostomy: a series and review of the literature. AJR 1978;1 30: 75- 82
- 21. Pollack HM, Banner MP. Percutaneous nephrostomy and related pyeloureteral manipulative techniques. Urol Radiol 1981 ;2 : 147-1 54