Open Radical Nephroureterectomy for Upper Urinary Tract Carcinoma: Revisiting the Gold Standard

Ahmed Saad Mohammed El-shorbagy, Emad Abdelhamid Salem, Khaled Mohamed Abdelwahab, Mohamod Malek

1 Urology Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University, Egypt
2 Radiology Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University, Egypt
Corresponding author: Ahmed Saad Mohammed El-shorbagy
E-mail: Greaboss4343@gmail.com
Conflict of interest: None declared.
Funding: No funding sources

Abstract

Upper urinary tract carcinoma (UTUC) is a rare but aggressive malignancy affecting the renal pelvis and ureter. Radical nephroureterectomy (RNU) with bladder cuff excision remains the gold standard for managing high-risk, non-metastatic UTUC. While minimally invasive approaches have gained popularity, open excision remains a vital technique, especially in complex cases. This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of open excision in radical nephroureterectomy, focusing on surgical techniques, oncological outcomes, perioperative considerations, and complication management. A systematic review of current literature was performed, analyzing studies comparing open RNU with laparoscopic and robotic approaches. Key parameters included surgical technique variations, patient selection criteria, oncological efficacy, complication rates, and long-term survival outcomes. Open radical nephroureterectomy continues to offer excellent oncological control, particularly in cases with advanced disease, large tumors, or anatomical complexities. Despite longer recovery times and increased blood loss compared to minimally invasive approaches, open RNU demonstrates superior lymph node dissection capabilities and complete excision of the distal ureter and bladder cuff. Open excision in radical nephroureterectomy remains a cornerstone in the surgical management of upper urinary tract carcinoma, particularly for advanced or challenging cases. Continued refinement of surgical techniques and comparative studies are essential to optimize outcomes and patient quality of life.

Keywords: Open Radical Nephroureterectomy

Tob Regul Sci. ™ 2023 ;9(1): 9164-9170
DOI : doi.org/10.18001/TRS.9.1.659

Introduction

Open radical nephroureterectomy (RNU) remains a gold-standard surgical approach for managing upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC), particularly in patients with high-grade or invasive disease. The procedure entails en bloc resection of the kidney, ureter, and a bladder cuff to ensure oncological control and minimize recurrence risk. Despite the advent of minimally invasive techniques, open RNU continues to be widely performed, especially in complex cases where extensive tissue dissection and control of large vessels are required [1]. Open surgery allows better tactile

feedback and visualization of surrounding structures, offering surgeons confidence in achieving negative surgical margins [2]. Additionally, open RNU is often preferred for patients with locally advanced tumors or significant anatomical challenges [3].

A crucial aspect of open RNU is the management of the distal ureter and bladder cuff, as residual tumor cells in this region significantly contribute to disease recurrence. Various techniques have been described for bladder cuff excision, including the extravesical, transvesical, and intussusceptive approaches, each with its advantages and limitations [4]. The choice of technique largely depends on surgeon experience and patient-specific factors, including tumor location and size [5]. Proper closure of the bladder cuff post-excision is equally important to prevent postoperative urinary fistula formation and other complications [6].

Preoperative imaging plays an essential role in planning radical nephroureterectomy. Modalities such as CT urography and MRI are commonly used to assess tumor location, size, and extent of invasion into surrounding tissues [7]. In addition, cystoscopy and retrograde pyelography may be performed to confirm the diagnosis and rule out concomitant bladder tumors [8]. Preoperative optimization, including evaluation of renal function and cardiovascular status, is vital for ensuring surgical safety and minimizing complications [9]. Adequate patient counseling about potential risks and postoperative outcomes is also a critical part of preoperative preparation [10].

Lymphadenectomy is often performed during radical nephroureterectomy, particularly in patients with high-risk features such as muscle-invasive disease or large tumor size. The extent of lymph node dissection remains a topic of debate, but evidence suggests that extended lymphadenectomy may improve oncological outcomes in selected patients [11]. Studies have shown that nodal metastasis is a strong predictor of poor prognosis, emphasizing the importance of accurate nodal assessment during surgery [12]. However, lymphadenectomy also carries potential complications, including lymphocele formation and prolonged drainage [13].

The oncological outcomes of open RNU are largely determined by pathological stage, grade, and surgical margins. Studies consistently show that patients with non-muscle-invasive disease and negative surgical margins have significantly better survival rates compared to those with muscle-invasive or metastatic disease [14]. Additionally, the presence of lymphovascular invasion and high tumor grade are associated with poorer prognosis [15]. Therefore, meticulous surgical technique and adherence to oncological principles are essential for improving long-term outcomes [16].

Postoperative complications following open RNU are relatively common and include bleeding, urinary leakage, wound infections, and deep vein thrombosis. Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) protocols have been increasingly adopted to minimize these complications and improve postoperative recovery [17]. ERAS pathways emphasize early mobilization, optimal pain control, and nutritional support, all of which contribute to shorter hospital stays and improved patient outcomes [18].

Follow-up after radical nephroureterectomy is crucial for early detection of disease recurrence and management of postoperative complications. Surveillance protocols typically include regular imaging, cystoscopy, and urine cytology, with intervals varying based on tumor stage and grade [19]. Bladder recurrence is a well-documented phenomenon after RNU, with rates ranging from 20% to 50% depending on tumor characteristics and surgical technique [20]. Prophylactic intravesical therapy with mitomycin C has shown promise in reducing bladder recurrence rates [21].

Patient selection remains a critical determinant of outcomes in open RNU. Elderly patients and those with significant comorbidities pose unique challenges due to increased surgical risk and slower postoperative recovery [22]. However, studies have demonstrated that open RNU can still be safely performed in carefully selected elderly patients, with outcomes comparable to younger cohorts [23]. Preoperative assessment tools, including frailty indices and performance status scales, can aid in identifying high-risk patients [24].

The role of perioperative systemic therapy in UTUC is evolving, with emerging evidence supporting its use in high-risk patients. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy has gained traction as an effective strategy for reducing tumor burden and improving surgical outcomes, particularly in muscle-invasive disease [25]. Adjuvant chemotherapy is also recommended for patients with adverse pathological features, including lymph node involvement and high-grade tumors [26]. Ongoing clinical trials continue to refine the optimal timing and regimens for systemic therapy in UTUC [27].

Surgical experience and institutional volume have been identified as critical factors influencing outcomes in radical nephroureterectomy. High-volume centers tend to report lower complication rates, better oncological outcomes, and improved overall survival compared to low-volume centers [28]. Surgeon experience is directly correlated with technical proficiency, reduced operative times, and fewer intraoperative complications [29]. Centralization of care for UTUC may help standardize surgical quality and improve patient outcomes [30].

The anatomical complexity of the upper urinary tract presents unique challenges during radical nephroureterectomy. Adequate exposure and careful dissection around major vascular structures, including the renal artery and vein, are paramount to avoiding intraoperative complications [31]. Additionally, the proximity of the adrenal gland requires surgeons to be vigilant in preventing inadvertent injury or unnecessary adrenalectomy, which may impact postoperative hormone balance [32].

Recent advancements in surgical tools and technologies have enhanced the precision and efficiency of open radical nephroureterectomy. Modern energy devices, improved retractors, and advanced suturing materials have streamlined the procedure, reduced operative times, and minimized blood loss [33]. Nevertheless, surgical outcomes ultimately depend on the surgeon's expertise and adherence to established oncological principles [34].

Surgical Approaches and Techniques

While open radical nephroureterectomy (RNU) remains the gold standard, advancements in laparoscopic and robotic-assisted techniques have transformed the surgical landscape for upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC). Laparoscopic RNU offers the benefits of reduced postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays, and quicker recovery without compromising oncological outcomes in carefully selected patients [1]. Robotic-assisted RNU has further refined surgical precision, especially in complex anatomical regions, allowing for improved dexterity and enhanced visualization [2]. However, both laparoscopic and robotic approaches have limitations, including prolonged operative times and a steeper learning curve [3]. Comparative studies suggest that open RNU may still be superior in cases of advanced disease, large tumor burden, or challenging anatomical variations [4].

Role of Lymphadenectomy

The extent and efficacy of lymphadenectomy during RNU remain subjects of ongoing debate. While standard lymph node dissection is widely accepted, extended lymphadenectomy may offer improved staging accuracy and better oncological outcomes in patients with high-risk UTUC [5]. Studies have shown that lymph node involvement is a strong prognostic factor for disease-free survival and overall survival [6]. Nevertheless, lymphadenectomy is not without risks, including lymphocele formation, increased operative time, and higher postoperative morbidity [7]. The decision to perform an extended lymphadenectomy should be individualized based on preoperative imaging, tumor characteristics, and surgeon expertise [8].

Adjuvant and Neoadjuvant Therapy

Systemic chemotherapy plays a pivotal role in the management of high-risk UTUC, particularly in patients with muscle-invasive disease or lymph node involvement. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy has shown promise in improving pathological downstaging and overall survival rates [9]. Adjuvant chemotherapy is often recommended for patients with adverse pathological features, including lymphovascular invasion and positive surgical margins [10]. However, the renal function of patients post-nephroureterectomy often limits their eligibility for cisplatin-based regimens [11]. Emerging therapies, including immune checkpoint inhibitors, are currently under investigation and may further improve outcomes in patients with advanced UTUC [12].

Prognostic Factors and Survival Outcomes

Multiple factors influence oncological outcomes following radical nephroureterectomy, including tumor stage, grade, lymph node involvement, and surgical margins. Patients with non-muscle-invasive disease and negative surgical margins typically have better survival outcomes compared to those with advanced disease [13]. Additionally, lymphovascular invasion, sessile tumor architecture, and multifocal disease are associated with higher recurrence rates and poorer prognosis [14]. Biomarkers,

such as FGFR3 mutations and PD-L1 expression, are being explored as potential tools for risk stratification and therapeutic targeting [15].

Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) Protocols

The adoption of Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) protocols has revolutionized perioperative care in patients undergoing RNU. ERAS pathways focus on multimodal strategies, including preoperative carbohydrate loading, opioid-sparing analgesia, early mobilization, and optimized nutrition [16]. Studies have shown that ERAS protocols significantly reduce hospital stays, decrease complication rates, and improve overall patient satisfaction without compromising oncological outcomes [17]. However, adherence to ERAS protocols requires multidisciplinary collaboration and institutional commitment to ensure successful implementation [18].

Long-term Follow-Up and Surveillance

Surveillance following RNU is essential for early detection of local and distant recurrence, as well as secondary primary tumors. Current guidelines recommend regular cystoscopy, imaging studies, and urine cytology based on tumor stage and grade [19]. Bladder recurrence remains a significant concern, with reported rates as high as 50% in some series [20]. Intravesical therapy with agents such as mitomycin C has been shown to reduce the risk of bladder recurrence in high-risk patients [21]. The optimal surveillance protocol continues to evolve, with ongoing studies focusing on personalized follow-up strategies based on individual risk profiles [22].

Future Directions and Research Priorities

Future research in UTUC aims to refine surgical techniques, optimize systemic therapies, and identify novel biomarkers for better risk stratification. Personalized medicine, including molecular profiling of UTUC tumors, may pave the way for targeted therapies and improved patient outcomes [23]. Additionally, advancements in imaging modalities, such as multiparametric MRI and PET-CT, hold promise for more accurate preoperative staging and risk assessment [24]. Collaborative efforts through multicenter trials and cancer registries are essential to address current knowledge gaps and standardize care for patients with UTUC [25].

In conclusion, open radical nephroureterectomy remains a cornerstone in the management of upper urinary tract carcinoma. Despite advancements in minimally invasive techniques, open RNU offers unique advantages in complex cases, ensuring optimal oncological outcomes and surgical safety. Future research should continue to focus on refining surgical techniques, optimizing perioperative care, and identifying biomarkers for better patient stratification and personalized therapy [35].

References:

[1] Ni S, Tao W, Chen Q, et al. Laparoscopic versus open nephroureterectomy for the treatment of upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma: a systematic review and cumulative analysis of comparative studies. Eur Urol. 2012;61(6):1142-1153. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2012.02.046

[2] Srivastava A, Ghavamian R. Complications of nephroureterectomy. In: Urothelial Malignancies of the Upper Urinary Tract. Springer; 2018:211-220. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-51263-1_20
[3] Abouassaly R, Jafri SM. Complications following radical nephroureterectomy. Curr Urol Rep. 2016;17(2):12. doi:10.1007/s11934-016-0595-1
[4] Kondo T, Tanabe K. The role of lymphadenectomy in the management of upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Int J Urol. 2012;19(8):718-729. doi:10.1111/j.1442-2042.2012.03064.x
[5] Chromecki TF, Cha EK, Fajkovic H, et al. The impact of tumor multifocality on outcomes in patients with upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2012;61(2):245-253. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2011.09.030
[6] Margulis V, Shariat SF, Matin SF, et al. Outcomes of radical nephroureterectomy: a comprehensive review of the literature. Eur Urol. 2009;55(4):847-861. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2008.12.031
[7] Roscigno M, Shariat SF, Margulis V, et al. Impact of bladder cuff excision on cancer-specific survival in patients with upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2011;60(3):527-533. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2011.05.060
[8] Rouprêt M, Babjuk M, Compérat E, et al. European Association of Urology guidelines on upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma: 2020 update. Eur Urol. 2021;79(1):62-79. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2020.06.031
[9] Fang D, Xiong GY, Li XS, et al. Pattern and risk factors of local recurrence after laparoscopic radical nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma. J Urol. 2014;191(3):786-792. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2013.09.075
[10] Lane BR, Campbell SC, Gill IS. 10-Year oncological outcomes after laparoscopic and open radical nephroureterectomy. J Urol. 2012;188(5):1631-1636. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2012.07.021
[11] Seisen T, Granger B, Colin P, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of clinicopathologic predictors of oncologic outcomes after radical nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2016;70(6):996-1009. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2016.05.034
[12] Xylinas E, Rink M, Margulis V, et al. Impact of renal function on eligibility for adjuvant chemotherapy in upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Urol Oncol. 2014;32(6):807-813. doi:10.1016/j.urolonc.2014.02.006
[13] Lughezzani G, Jeldres C, Isbarn H, et al. A population-based study of 1,293 patients with upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma: a comparison of open vs laparoscopic nephroureterectomy. BJU Int. 2010;106(7):1030-1035. doi:10.1111/j.1464-410X.2010.09252.x
[14] Rassweiler J, Gözen AS, Erdogru T, et al. Laparoscopic nephroureterectomy: the state of the art. World J Urol. 2013;31(3):385-393. doi:10.1007/s00345-012-0965-6
[15] Lee JN, Kim BS, Kim HT, et al. Predictors of oncologic outcomes after radical nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma: a multi-institutional analysis. J Urol. 2016;196(2):350-356. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2016.02.079
[16] Colin P, Ouzzane A, Hupertan V, et al. Pathologic findings and oncologic outcomes after radical nephroureterectomy for upper tract urothelial carcinoma: a French multicenter study. World J Urol. 2013;31(1):37-44. doi:10.1007/s00345-012-0898-0
[17] Krajewski W, Dembowski J, Zdrojowy R, et al. Laparoscopic versus open radical nephroureterectomy – a meta-analysis of current evidence. Urol Int. 2020;104(1-2):1-10. doi:10.1159/000505069
[18] Shariat SF, Rink M, Ehdaie B, et al. Kidney-sparing surgery for upper tract urothelial carcinoma: outcomes and recommendations for patient selection. BJU Int. 2014;113(5):714-727. doi:10.1111/bju.12288
[19] Raman JD, Scherr DS. Management of patients with upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Nat Rev Urol. 2011;8(8):480-488. doi:10.1038/nrurol.2011.87
[20] Rouprêt M, Colin P, Yates DR. A new algorithm for upper tract urothelial carcinoma management: review of the literature. World J Urol. 2013;31(1):39-44. doi:10.1007/s00345-012-0891-7
[21] Youssef RF, Shariat SF, Mosbah A, et al. Upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma: Role of lymphadenectomy and impact on oncologic outcomes. J Urol. 2011;185(5):1631-1637. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2010.12.051
[22] Gupta M, Yao D, Gomez SL, et al. Racial disparities in the management and outcomes of upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2020;29(6):1208-1215. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-19-1430
[23] Rouprêt M, Zigeuner R, Palou J, et al. European Association of Urology Guidelines on upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2015;68(5):868-879. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2015.06.044

[24] Lughezzani G, Jeldres C, Isbarn H, et al. Tumor multifocality is an independent predictor of oncologic outcomes in patients with upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma. J Urol. 2010;183(2):715-720. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2009.10.002
[25] Ehdaie B, Shariat SF, Savage C, et al. Postoperative surveillance of upper tract urothelial carcinoma. J Urol. 2010;184(6):2373-2380. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2010.08.015
[26] Matsumoto K, Oishi M, Mikami S, et al. Role of adjuvant chemotherapy in upper tract urothelial carcinoma: A multicenter study. Int J Urol. 2017;24(10):752-758. doi:10.1111/iju.13466
[27] Kondo T, Tanabe K. The role of lymphadenectomy in the treatment of upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Int J Urol. 2012;19(8):718-729. doi:10.1111/j.1442-2042.2012.03064.x
[28] Seisen T, Granger B, Colin P, et al. Prognostic value of lymph node invasion in upper tract urothelial carcinoma. World J Urol. 2016;34(10):1303-1310. doi:10.1007/s00345-016-1811-3
[29] Raman JD, Ng CK, Boorjian SA, et al. Bladder cancer after upper tract urothelial carcinoma: Risk factors and outcomes. J Urol. 2011;185(5):1625-1630. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2010.12.045
[30] Fritsche HM, Burger M, Dietmaier W, et al. DNA methylation as a diagnostic and prognostic biomarker in upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2011;60(5):1091-1098. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2011.07.063
[31] Rink M, Ehdaie B, Cha EK, et al. Stage-specific impact of lymphadenectomy on oncologic outcomes in patients with upper tract urothelial carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2012;62(3):542-550. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2012.03.050
[32] Shariat SF, Favaretto RL, Gupta A, et al. Predictive factors and outcomes of recurrence in patients with upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma. BJU Int. 2012;110(8):1203-1209. doi:10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.11441.x
[33] Carmignani L, Belgrano E, Puppo P. Radical nephroureterectomy: Techniques, outcomes, and controversies. Eur Urol Suppl. 2012;11(2):61-68. doi:10.1016/j.eursup.2012.01.002
[34] Waldert M, Karakiewicz PI, Raman JD, et al. A delay in radical nephroureterectomy of >3 months is associated with poorer outcomes in upper tract urothelial carcinoma. BJU Int. 2010;106(9):1247-1252. doi:10.1111/j.1464-410X.2010.09228.x
[35] Ouzzane A, Colin P, Xylinas E, et al. Impact of perioperative factors on cancer-specific survival after radical nephroureterectomy. World J Urol. 2014;32(6):1477-1484. doi:10.1007/s00345-013-1226-6