**Robot Assisted Repair of Rectovesical Fistula**

INTRODUCTION

Enterovesical fistulas result from pathological communication between the intestine and the bladder. Fistulas are subdivided into colovesical, rectovesical, ileovesical and appendicovesical, according to the intestinal segment involved. Among these, colovesical fistulas are the most common (95%) and occur in about 1 surgical hospitalization in 3000 with an incidence of 0.5 / 10,000 cases (1). This condition is more frequent in male than female with a ratio of 3: 1. (2)

The leading causes of colovesical fistulas are diverticulitis in 65% -79% of cases and Crohn’s disease. In 10-15% of cases, the fistula is consequence of colorectal carcinoma or bladder cancer. Other causes are represented by surgery, such as enlargement cystoplasty, prostatectomy or rectal resections, and chemotherapy or radiotherapy. (3)

Urologically speaking, the urinary fistulas might be consequence of prostate surgery, mainly after radical prostatectomy. Indeed, the incidence of rectal injuries during radical prostatectomy ranges from 1 to 11% . (4)

Despite intestinal involvement, the most common symptoms of colovesical fistulas are urological, such as pneumaturia and fecaluria. Other symptoms are bladder irritability and usually a change in bowel habits. Diagnosis could be difficult, and digital rectal examination might lead to it. Diagnostic insights such as CT, MRI, Cystourethroscopy, colonoscopy, and retrograde urethrography can aid in diagnosis and operative planning. (1)

These conditions are surgically treated in 97% of cases. Open approach is adopted in 63.3% of cases, whereas in 35.1% laparoscopy is the preferred one. Only 1.6% are addressed to the robotic treatment. (2)

Despite the well-known advantages of the laparoscopic approach in terms of length of stay, earlier bowel mobility and less morbidity, this approach could translate either in higher complications or conversion rate because of the local inflammation. (5) (6)

Moreover, laparoscopy is a challenging technique, especially during the dissection of the fistula and the intracorporeal suture.

The advent of robotics led to overcome the laparoscopic issues allowing fatigue-free ergonomic maneuverability of the instruments, accuracy, and magnified three-dimensional vision. In addition, it helped to limit the need for extensive dissection, tissue manipulation and placement of suprapubic cystostomy, even in cases of recurrent fistulas surgery. (7) Nevertheless, this approach is still underused.

Aim of this study is to describe a case of robot-assisted rectovesical fistula repair describing the technique and the postoperative outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present case is of a non-smoker 76-year-old man, with a BMI of 22.

The patient underwent laparoscopic radical prostatectomy for prostate adenocarcinoma 2009 with follow-up negative for recurrence of disease.

In February 2020 the patient underwent laparoscopic rectal resection for adenocarcinoma (pT3b N1M0). The postoperative course was complicated by dehiscence of the anastomosis and abdominal abscess requiring exploratory laparoscopy and colostomy placement. Thereafter the patient complained the appearance of urinary leakage from the anus. He underwent rectosigmoidoscopy, with detection of recto-vesical fistula and placement of clip type Ovesco. The cystography and fistulography highlighted opacification of the rectum-sigma through the bladder due to the presence of rectovesical fistula.

RESULTS

The patient underwent robot assisted closure of rectovesical fistula following laparoscopic rectal resection, using the Xi Da Vinci System. An endoscopic approach by placing a clip was firstly attempted, but it immediately failed.

Therefore, a standard transperitoneal robotic approach was planned in order to correct the rectovesical fistula. The first step was a longitudinal median cystotomy. The opening of the fistulous tract and the dissection between the bladder and the rectum allowed to identify both the fistula site and the clips previously applied The fistulous tract and the surrounding inflammatory tissue were then excised. Three individual layers urothelium, anterior rectal muscle wall, and rectal mucosa were identified and dissected free to be carried out to permit a water-tight, tension-free closure. The rectal mucosa was first closed and then the anterior rectal wall was closed with a running, 2-0 absorbable suture. A bubble test at the end of the first layer of the rectal suture showed a water-tight closure. The interposition of the omentum was performed to prevent the fistula recurrence. The urothelium was closed with a running, 3-0 absorbable suture in a similar fashion. The operative time was 203 minutes. The hospital stay was 4 days. The urethral catheter was kept indwelling for 30 days, then the patient remained free of urinary leakage from the anus. In February 2021 the colostomy was closed and intestinal re-anastomosis was performed by general surgeons.

At 2-year follow-up, the patient remains free of fistula recurrence.

DISCUSSION

As mentioned above, surgeons rarely use the robot for correcting rectovesical fistulas: approximately, robotic surgery represents only 1.6% of corrective interventions compared to endoscopic and open surgery. Herein we report our experience with a single case of robot-assisted recto vesical fistula repair which demonstrate the procedure to be feasible and safe. The few cases reported in literature of robotic surgery use to repair this type of fistula demonstrates this data. Sotelo et al. presented a iatrogenic robotic fistula repair in a patient who underwent ischemic colitis and Hartmann's surgery. They reported a fistula adequately treated without medium and long-term operative complications. (9) Oderda et al. reported a similar case of our with a iatrogenic rectal bladder fistula following radical prostatectomy (8). They found the robotic correction to be safe and effective, like in our case. (7)

The few available works describing the robotic technique to treat this condition underlined some common denominators.

The robot allows an excellent view of the anatomical planes to be dissected; the magnification of the anatomical details in this type of surgery is not to be underestimated. If not consequent to previous surgery, fistulas, could have inflammatory and or infectious etiopathogenesis. The primary conditions that determine the rectovesical fistulas, therefore, lead to an operating field that is difficult to interpret, hampered by inflamed or fibrotic tissues, with numerous adhesions. The visual inspection of the dissection planes of tissues that have undergone previous phenomena of inflammation and fibrosis is therefore not trivial. In these cases, robotic surgery is advantageous for the vision of the anatomical planes it offers the surgeon. (10). In addition, the sutures that can be performed are performed in small spaces, in complicated pelvic anatomy, obstacles that with the movements performed by the robot allow a technical execution of excellent quality compared to other surgical techniques. The limits of robotic surgery remain the high costs of purchasing and managing the robot, costs that will, in any case, be reduced more and more in the future with the spread of these surgical devices.

In our case, we underline that the patient is fine. Even at the post-operative checks, the fistula is corrected and repaired without signs of recurrence.

CONCLUSION

Our technique of robotic RVF repair was safe and effective.

1. Scozzari, G., Arezzo, A., & Morino, M. (2010). Enterovesical fistulas: Diagnosis and management. In *Techniques in Coloproctology* (Vol. 14, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10151-010-0602-3>

2)Cochetti, G., del Zingaro, M., Boni, A., Cocca, D., Panciarola, M., Tiezzi, A., Gaudio, G., Balzarini, F., Ursi, P., & Mearini, E. (2018). Colovesical fistula: Review on conservative management, surgical techniques and minimally invasive approaches. In *Giornale di Chirurgia* (Vol. 39, Issue 4). <https://doi.org/10.11138/gchir/2018.39.4.195>

3)Golabek, T., Szymanska, A., Szopinski, T., Bukowczan, J., Furmanek, M., Powroznik, J., & Chlosta, P. (2013). Enterovesical fistulae: Aetiology, imaging, and management. In *Gastroenterology Research and Practice* (Vol. 2013). https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/617967

4)Harpster, L. E., Rommel, F. M., Sieber, P. R., Breslin, J. A., Agusta, V. E., Huffnagle, H. W., & Pohl, C. E. (1995). Incidence and Management of Rectal Injury Associated With Radical Prostatectomy in a Community Based Urology Practice. *The Journal of Urology*, *154*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5347(01)66885-X

5)Kitaguchi, D., Enomoto, T., Ohara, Y., Owada, Y., Hisakura, K., Akashi, Y., Takahashi, K., Ogawa, K., Shimomura, O., & Oda, T. (2020). Laparoscopic surgery for diverticular colovesical fistula: Single-center experience of 11 cases. *BMC Research Notes*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-020-05022-4

6)Martinolich, J., Croasdale, D. R., Bhakta, A. S., Ata, A., Chismark, A. D., Valerian, B. T., Canete, J. J., & Lee, E. C. (2019). Laparoscopic Surgery for Diverticular Fistulas: Outcomes of 111 Consecutive Cases at a Single Institution. *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, *23*(5). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11605-018-3950-3

7) )Delto, J. C., Hemal, A. K., & Bhandari, A. (2018). Robotic repair of urinary fistulae. In *Robotics in Genitourinary Surgery, Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20645-5_65>

8) Oderda, M., Bonet, X., Campobasso, D., & Gaston, R. (2014). Robotic rectovesical fistula repair: A successful approach. *Journal of Laparoendoscopic and Advanced Surgical Techniques*, *24*(8). https://doi.org/10.1089/lap.2014.0002

9)Sotelo, R., Medina, L. G., Husain, F. Z., Khazaeli, M., Nikkhou, K., Cacciamani, G. E., Landsberger, H., Winter, M., Hernandez, A., Kaiser, A. M., & Gill, I. (2019). Robotic-assisted laparoscopic repair of rectovesical fistula after Hartmann’s reversal procedure. *Journal of Robotic Surgery*, *13*(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11701-018-0854-x>

10)Antonelli A, Veccia A, Morena T, Furlan M, Peroni A, Simeone C. Robot-assisted vesico-vaginal fistula repair: technical nuances. Int Braz J Urol. 2021 Mar-Apr;47(2):684-685. doi: 10.1590/S1677-5538.IBJU.2020.0749. PMID: 33621026; PMCID: PMC7993969.