

Dear Author,

Here are the final proofs of your article. Please check the proofs carefully.

Please note that at this stage you should only be checking for errors introduced during the production process. Please pay particular attention to the following when checking the proof:

- Author names. Check that each author name is spelled correctly, and that names appear in the correct order of first name followed by family name. This will ensure that the names will be indexed correctly (for example if the author's name is 'Patel, J. ', she will be cited as ' Jane Patel ').
- Affiliations. Check that all authors are cited with the correct affiliations, that the author who will receive correspondence has been identified with an asterisk (\*), and that all equal contributors have been identified with a well sign (#).
- Ensure that the main text is complete.
- Check that figures, tables and their legends are included and in the correct order.
- Look to see that queries that were raised during copy-editing or typesetting have been resolved.
- Confirm that all web links are correct and working.
- Ensure that special characters and equations are displaying correctly.
- Check that additional or supplementary files can be opened and are correct.

Changes in scientific content cannot be made at this stage unless the request has already been approved. This includes changes to title or authorship, new results, or corrected values.

### **How to return your corrections**

Returning your corrections via email:

- Annotate the proof PDF with your corrections.
- Remember to include the journal title, manuscript number, and your name when sending your response via email.

After you have submitted your corrections, you will receive email notification from our production team that your article has been published in the final version. All changes at this stage are final. We will not be able to make any further changes after publication.

Kind regards,

# Robot-assisted pyeloplasty and pyelolithotomy in patient with osteogenesis imperfecta

Marco Rinaldi<sup>a,\*</sup>, Carmine Franzese<sup>a</sup>, Jeanlou Collavino<sup>a</sup>, Maria Abbinante<sup>a</sup>, Sekulovic Sekulovic<sup>a</sup>, Gioacchino De Giorgi<sup>a</sup>, Fabio Traunero<sup>a</sup>, Gianluca Giannarini<sup>a</sup>, Alessandro Crestani<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Urology, Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Friuli Centrale, Udine, Italy.

This article belongs to the Special Issue: [Nightmare and complex cases in Urology](#)

## Abstract

Robot-assisted pyeloplasty is currently the technique of choice for cases of pyelo-ureteral junction obstruction (UPJO). It may be accompanied by pyelolithotomy in cases of associated lithiasis. The presence of body abnormalities, as in the rare case of osteogenesis imperfecta, can complicate the procedure, starting from a different way of positioning the robotic ports and the number of them. Therefore, we present a case report with an accompanying video that can serve as a guide for similar cases.

**Keywords:** Robotic-assisted pyeloplasty, pyelolithotomy, osteogenesis imperfecta

## Introduction

The pyelo-ureteral junction obstruction is a condition that includes several anomalies that cause hydronephrosis due to a defect in the passage of urine at the junction between the renal pelvis and the ureter [1]. Urinary stone formation is a common complication [2]. Indications for surgery include decreased split renal function, poor voiding function after furosemide administration, increased anteroposterior diameter on ultrasound, and grade III and IV dilatation.

The advantages of conventional laparoscopy over open surgery are shorter hospital stay, better aesthetics, less postoperative pain, and faster recovery [3]. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic pyeloplasty has the same advantages as laparoscopic pyeloplasty, but it is also easier to perform, resulting in shorter operating times [4].

Osteogenesis imperfecta is a condition consisting of bone fragility and malformations accompanied by short height [5]. We present the case of a patient with osteogenesis imperfecta and pyeloureteral junction obstruction com-

plicated by urinary stone formation who was successfully treated with robotic-assisted pyeloplasty and pyelolithotomy.

## Case presentation

The patient was 42 years old, 110 cm tall, and weighed 34 kg. He had a form of osteogenesis imperfecta with pronounced kyphoscoliosis and barrel chest. After right-sided abdominal pain and ultrasound findings of consensual hydronephrosis, he underwent abdominal CT urography, which revealed hydronephrosis and multiple lithiasis of the renal pelvis ([Supplemental Video](#)). Because of the suspicion of pyelo-ureteral junction obstruction, he underwent a MAG3 renogram scan, which showed a defect in the emptying of the right renal pelvis even after diuretic stimulation, but preserved right renal function.

A DJ stent was placed due to the presence of stones and flank pain. As several months had passed since the placement of the stent, it was necessary to replace it with a new analog device. After an unsuccessful attempt to replace the DJ stent, probably due to the presence of stones, a percutaneous nephrostomy was performed.

After approximately 3 months, the patient underwent robotic pyeloplasty and pyelolithotomy as described below: Patient in lateral decubitus position on the left side. Suprumbilical incision in the right pararectal, open access to the peritoneal cavity, insertion of a trocar for air seal and induction of pneumoperitoneum at 12 mmHg;

\* Corresponding author: Marco Rinaldi

Mailing address: Department of Urology, Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Friuli Centrale, Udine, Italy.

Email: [marrin91@yahoo.it](mailto:marrin91@yahoo.it)

Received: 03 June 2024 / Revised: 20 June 2024

Accepted: 28 June 2024 / Published: XX September 2024

placement of only three 8 mm robotic ports in the right pararectal line at a distance of 5-6 cm between them for anatomical deformities and small abdomen; placement of two 5 mm service accessory ports in the pararectal line at the suprumbilical and subxiphoid level; docking of the DaVinci system. Incision of the right parietocolic junction, medialization of the colon and duodenum; placement of a grasper anchored to the abdominal wall to lift the liver; identification of the ureter and isolation of the ureter in the subjunctional portion; isolation of the right renal pelvis, which appears very dilated; Dissection of the stenotic junction tract of the ureter, which is placed in the endobag together with about 10 stones (about 4-5 mm diameter each) removed from the renal pelvis; placement of a ureteral stent 16 cm × 6 ch on a guidewire; pyeloplasty suture with detached monofilament 3-0 tips; control of the anastomotic seal with injection of saline from the nephrostomy; a laminar drainage was placed in the anterior seat through the most caudal robotic port ([Supplemental Video](#)).

The duration of surgery was 130 minutes. With the exception of hyperpyrexia, which was successfully treated with antibiotic therapy, the clinical postoperative course was normal. The patient was discharged after removal of the nephrostomy tube. The ureteral stent was removed approximately 1 month after surgery. At 6 months after surgery, the patient was in good condition, without flank pain, with normal renal function and urinalysis.

## Discussion

Robot-assisted pyeloplasty is the surgical management of uretero-pelvic junction (UPJ) syndrome and may be simultaneous accompanied by pyelolithotomy in cases of stone formation [6].

The robotic surgical approach typically involves the use of multiple robotic ports. In general, when using the Da Vinci system, the robotic ports should be positioned approximately 8 cm apart, but in this case, the anatomical abnormalities led us to reduce this distance and the number of ports due to lack of sufficient abdominal space. In addition, when performing the right UPJ pyeloplasty, the presence of the liver can make the procedure more difficult, so you can facilitate the surgery by using a laparoscopic grasper clamp positioned under the liver, which can pull the liver upward away from the kidney [7]. This was the case in our procedure where it was necessary to use this clamp to avoid using one of the only two robotic arms. Robot-assisted laparoscopic pyeloplasty is the procedure of choice because of its better safety profile than open surgery [8].

We have also been able to perform simultaneous treatment of kidney stones, reducing the morbidity associated with double surgical treatment. The anatomical abnormalities associated with osteogenesis imperfecta are such that the use of standard approaches and surgical findings are difficult [5, 9]. The feasibility of this procedure even in a patient with these anatomical abnormalities allows it to be

a first choice approach even in these conditions.

## Conclusions

No similar cases have been reported in patients with osteogenesis imperfecta treated as described above. We recommend that similar surgical cases be performed by surgeons experienced in treating the UPJO with robotic surgical systems using a reduced number of robotic ports (three in this case) and therefore a reduced number of robotic instruments to avoid conflict between the EndoWrist instruments. We recommend a minimum distance of 5 cm and a maximum distance of 7 cm between the robotic ports. As shown previously, the specific robotic technique was adapted to the patient's case due to his anatomical deformities. As described and shown in the video, this case is a good model for robotic surgical management.

## Declarations

**Availability of data and materials:** The data used during the current study available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

**Financial support and sponsorship:** None.

**Conflict of interest:** Not applicable.

**Ethical Approval and Informed consent:** The patient has provided an informed consent for publication of images and information in this study.

**Consent for publication:** Not applicable.

## References

- Bumbu GA, Berechet MC, Nacer K, Bumbu G, Maghiar OA, Bratu OG, *et al.* Clinical, surgical and morphological assessment of the pyeloureteral syndrome. *Rom J Morphol Embryol*, 2018, 59(4): 1173-1177.
- Boujnah H, el Kamel R, Tissaoui K, & Zmerli S. Disease of the pyelo-ureteral junction in adults. 215 cases in 194 patients. *J Urol (Paris)*, 1989, 95(4): 217-220.
- Reddy MN, & Nerli RB. The laparoscopic pyeloplasty: is there a role in the age of robotics? *Urol Clin North Am*, 2015, 42(1): 43-52. [[Crossref](#)]
- Cundy TP, Harling L, Hughes-Hallett A, Mayer EK, Najmaldin AS, Athanasiou T, *et al.* Meta-analysis of robot-assisted vs conventional laparoscopic and open pyeloplasty in children. *BJU Int*, 2014, 114(4): 582-594. [[Crossref](#)]
- Deguchi M, Tsuji S, Katsura D, Kasahara K, Kimura F, & Murakami T. Current overview of osteogenesis imperfecta. *Medicina (Kaunas)*, 2021, 57(5): 464-474. [[Crossref](#)]
- Jensen PH, Berg KD, & Azawi NH. Robot-assisted pyeloplasty and pyelolithotomy in patients with ureteropelvic junction stenosis. *Scand J Urol*, 2017, 51(4): 323-328. [[Crossref](#)]

7. Mirbagheri A, & Farahmand F. Design and analysis of an actuated endoscopic grasper for manipulation of large body organs. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*, 2010, 2010: 1230-1233. [[Crossref](#)]
8. Beale R, Sicilila S, Riestra P, & Albala DM. Are robots the future? A case for robotic pyeloplasty as the gold standard treatment in ureteropelvic junction obstruction. *Curr Opin Urol*, 2022, 32(1): 109-115. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Marom R, Rabenhorst BM, & Morello R. Osteogenesis imperfecta: an update on clinical features and therapies. *Eur J Endocrinol*, 2020, 183(4): R95-R106. [[Crossref](#)]

**Cite this article as:** Rinaldi M, Franzese C, Collavino J, Abbinante M, Sekulovic S, De Giorgi G, *et al.* Robot-assisted pyeloplasty and pyelolithotomy in patient with osteogenesis imperfecta. *Uro-Technology Journal*, 2024, 8(3): XX-XX. doi: 10.31491/UTJ.2024.09.XXX

## Author Query Form

Dear Author,

During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose.

Please refer to the query reference call out numbers in the page proofs and respond to each by marking the necessary comments using the PDF annotation tools.

Please remember illegible or unclear comments and corrections may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

QueryReference	Query	Remark
Q1	Please check that all author information is correct?	
Q2	Please confirm that the <b>corresponding author's address</b> is correct?	
Q3	Please confirm whether there are any content and spelling errors in the full text?	
Q4	Please check if the <b>References</b> are correct?	