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Recto-Urinary Fistula (RUF) treated by Transanal Endoscopic Microsurgery (TEM).
Review of the literature and surgical technique

AIM: Recto-Urinary Fistula (RUF) is a rare complication of pelvic surgery. Different approaches are reported in literature but no gold standard treatment has yet been achieved. Transanal Endoscopic Microsurgery (TEM) is a minimally invasive approach with well-known advantages as magnification, 3D view and lighting of the operative field. Aim of the present review is to report the current evidence in literature about technique and results of RUF treatment by TEM and to suggest some key points for its correct management.

MATERIALS OF STUDY: After a medline in Pubmed and Scopus databases, seven papers were eligible for the present study. Data were reviewed on the basis of the cases reported, patient’s characteristics, surgical techniques and results.

RESULTS: Eighteen cases have been reported in the literature from 1996 to 2005. The healing success rate was 77.8%. Fecal and urinary diversion were performed before TEM-assisted procedure in the 83% and 94% of cases, respectively. Recurrence was observed in four patients (22%).

DISCUSSION: A gold standard treatment of RUF should ensure the complete removal of scar tissue around the fistula, in order to perform a tension-free suture on healthy margins with an adequate vascularization. Preoperative stoma improves the healing of the fistula, reducing local inflammation and infections.

CONCLUSIONS: There is no common view of this topic in literature and clarify which could be the best treatment is a key condition due to high failure rate of the surgical proposed techniques. Recurrences treatment has a lower cure rate if compared to primary lesions; nevertheless more studies are required to confirm this data.
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Introduction

Recto-Urinary Fistula (RUF) is a rare complication of prostatic and rectal cancer surgery. This condition affects physically and psychologically patients’ Quality of Life (QoL) and conservative approaches are rarely successful. Consequently most patients still require surgery. RUF is associated with procedures as prostatectomy (laparoscopic, robotic, retropubic or perineal), Trans-Urethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP), rectal surgery, pelvic external beam irradiation, cryotherapy, brachytherapy, High Intensity Focused Ultrasound (HIFU) and Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IBD). Fecaluria, pneumaturia, rectal urine drainage are the most common symptoms and complications like local infection or sepsis could be a life risk factor. Spontaneous healing is achieved in 10% of patients by fecal and/or urinary diversion, antibiotics therapy, silk line placement. In 2.4% no treatment is performed.
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Due to this data, surgery remains the best treatment option to achieve definitive healing. In literature different invasive surgical approaches have been described for the treatment of RUF: trans-perineal, trans-sphincteric, transanal and trans-abdominal1,2,7,8 (Table I). Tissue flap interposition as graciloplasty or omental flap are the most employed techniques. These procedures performed by a trans-abdominal, trans-sphincteric or trans-perineal approach are often very invasive and need extended and very painful incisions that influence hospitalization and can affect the complications rate1,2,8,9.

Techniques as gracile muscle interposition flap, rectal wall advancement flap and direct suture, performed by transanal approach1,10-12 are not frequently used (5.9%)1. Though they offer advantage of being less invasive improving patient’s QoL13,14.

In 1983 Buess proposed Transanal Endoscopic Microsurgery (TEM) for the treatment of benign lesions and T1 rectal cancer15,16. TEM has emerged recently as an alternative to traditional surgery also for the treatment of T2-3 N0 rectal tumors after neoadjuvant radiochemotherapy (n-RCT)15. Main advantages of TEM are the magnification, 3D view and lighting that allow a precise removal of sclerotic tissue9,18. As well as adenocarcinomas and adenomas, by TEM is possible to treat very different rectal diseases as neuroendocrine tumors, pelvic abscess, benign rectal stenosis, gastrointestinal stromal tumors (GIST), endorectal condylomata acuminata, rectal prolapse, repair of traumatic and iatrogenic perforations of the rectum19. In the treatment of RUF by TEM perineal or abdominal incisions are not necessary, reducing blood loss, hospitalization, postoperative pain and complications, unlike more invasive techniques as graciloplasty or tissue flap interposition1,2,7,8,9,18,20.

Aim of the present review is to report the current evidence in literature about technique and results of the treatment of RUF by TEM and to suggest the key points for its correct management.

Materials and Methods

A medline was made searching in Pubmed and Scopus databases under the following key terms: 1) "rectovesical fistula transanal endoscopic microsurgery"; 2) "rectovesical fistula TEM"; 3) "rectourethral fistula transanal endoscopic microsurgery"; 4) "rectourethral fistula TEM". Papers eligible for this study were in English language and about the treatment of RUF by TEM. Other papers about use of TEM or other surgical techniques were excluded. The research was completed through the inclusion of related papers. Eight papers were found: two were excluded because the topic regards TEM procedure for rectal cancer or adenomas and one paper was excluded because about atypical use of TEM. Other two papers were extrapolated from the references of the read studies. The authors have also verified that have not been used other devices for transanal surgery alternative to TEM. The research resulted in seven studies, which were finally included in the present review, and data were extrapolated on the basis of the cases reported, patients’ characteristics, surgical technique and results21-27 (Fig. 1).

TEM instruments include a rigid operative rectoscope, a rigid faceplate with three working inserts for the appropriate instrumentation, a binocular endoscope (for 3D view), a light source, a camera and inserts for insufflation and suction. The set is completed by a special articulated arm (Martin’s Arm) which links the rectoscope to the operative table in the right position.

Review of the Literature

From 1996 to 2015 a TEM-assisted repair for recto-urinary fistula was performed in 18 male patients with a mean age of 67.2 years (range 55-76)21-27. At the time of procedure, fifteen patients (83.3%) had fecal diversion and 17 patients (94.5%) had an indwelling bladder catheter for urinary diversion19-25. TEM was the first surgical attempt in eight patient (44.4%), the second one
in six (33.3%), the third one in two (11.1%) and in other two patients it was performed as fourth attempt 21-27 (Table II).

The first study was reported in 1996 from Wilbert et al., about two patients with recto-urethral fistula after radical prostatectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy, treated by the excision of the scar tissue around the fistula, followed by endoscopic suture and simultaneous trans-urethral fulguration and fibrin application 21. This resulted in closure of the fistula in both patients with no postoperative complications and no evidence of clinical symptoms or recurrences 18 months after surgery 21.

In 2005 Quinlan et al. managed a recto-urethral fistula by TEM in a 71-years-old man who underwent radical prostatectomy 22. The fistula scar tissue was excided and was raised a full-thickness rectal wall flap before suturing and repairing the defect 22. After nine months of follow up the fistula was closed 22.

Bochove-Overgaauw et al. performed fistula repair in two patients who underwent previous laparoscopic radical prostatectomy 23. A full-thickness excision of the rectal wall was made 1 cm around the fistula and the defect was sutured on the urethral and rectal wall. The authors reported one failure in a patient previously treated by a failed graciloplasty 23.

Pigalarga et al. in 2011 described a successful repair of iatrogenic recto-urethral fistula after radical prostatectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy by TEM-assisted rectal advancement flap and urethral stent placement 24.

In the same year another case was reported by Andrews et al. of a 62-years-old man who experienced a recto-urethral fistula two week after HIFU for prostatic cancer 25. The fistula was closed by the excision of the sclerotic margins, a full-thickness rectal wall flap by TEM and closure of the urethral wall with a single Z-suture. Endoscopy one year after surgery showed a well-healed scar 25.

From 2004 to 2013, Kanehira et al. report the largest series in literature using TEM for the treatment of 10 patients affected by recto-vesical fistula 26. The procedure was performed by the resection of the scar tissue around the defect and it was extended until the bladder mucosa 26. Bladder and rectal wall were then repaired with absorbable monofilament suture 26. A success rate of 70% was reported due to three cases of recurrence observed in patients with a history of repeated surgery, irradiation and HIFU 24. No postoperative complications were observed 26.

Finally, in 2015 D’Ambrosio et al. treated a 62-years-old patient with recto-vesical fistula occurred during laparoscopic prostatectomy after n-RCT, 4 cm from the anal verge, detected on postoperative day six by gastrografin enema and methylene blue injection 27. The fistula was closed by a failed graciloplasty 23. Bochove-Overgaauw et al. performed fistula repair in two patients who underwent previous laparoscopic radical prostatectomy 23. A full-thickness excision of the rectal wall was made 1 cm around the fistula and the defect was sutured on the urethral and rectal wall. The authors reported one failure in a patient previously treated by a failed graciloplasty 23.

Pigalarga et al. in 2011 described a successful repair of iatrogenic recto-urethral fistula in a 56-years old man who underwent radical retropubic prostatectomy and TEM-assisted rectal advancement flap and urethral stent placement 24.

In the same year another case was reported by Andrews et al. of a 68-years-old man who experienced a recto-urethral fistula two week after HIFU for prostatic cancer 25. The fistula was closed by the excision of the sclerotic margins, a full-thickness rectal wall flap by TEM and closure of the urethral wall with a single Z-suture. Endoscopy one year after surgery showed a well-healed scar 25.

From 2004 to 2013, Kanehira et al. report the largest series in literature using TEM for the treatment of 10 patients affected by recto-vesical fistula 26. The procedure was performed by the resection of the scar tissue around the defect and it was extended until the bladder mucosa 26. Bladder and rectal wall were then repaired with absorbable monofilament suture 26. A success rate of 70% was reported due to three cases of recurrence observed in patients with a history of repeated surgery, irradiation and HIFU 24. No postoperative complications were observed 26.

Finally, in 2015 D’Ambrosio et al. treated a 62-years-old patient with recto-vesical fistula occurred during laparoscopic prostatectomy after n-RCT, 4 cm from the anal verge, detected on postoperative day six by gastrografin enema and methylene blue injection 27. The first step was to perform an ileostomy and the placement of an indwelling bladder catheter 27. On the operative table, cystoscopy was performed in order to identify the bladder side orifice and to introduce a small catheter through the fistula 27. By TEM, scar tissue was removed by a full-thickness excision in order to achieve the wall bladder and visualize the defect, then the communication was repaired by a double semi-continuous suture with PDS 2.0 either on the bladder and rectal wall 27. Patient was discharged with the ileostomy and the indwelling
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Table II - Cases characteristics of RUF treated by TEM reported in literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Case series</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Recurrence</th>
<th>Oostomy</th>
<th>Urinay Diversion</th>
<th>Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilbert 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bochove-Overgaauw 23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigalarga 24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanehira 26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>67,2</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>83,30%</td>
<td>94,50%</td>
<td>77,80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recurrences: surgical procedures before treatment by TEM. n.a.: not available
catheter on postoperative day ten. Three months after surgery, based on negative endoscopy and cystoscopy, patient underwent ileostomy closure and bladder catheter was removed. In 19 years, 18 cases of treatment of recto-urinary fistula by TEM have been reported in the literature with a success rate of 77.8% (14 patients). Fecal diversion was performed before the procedure in 83% of cases (15 patients) and 17 patients (94%) had urinary diversion with indwelling catheter (for one patient data was missed). Recurrence was observed in 4 patients: two had three previous attempts to repair, presenting at the surgery an extremely tough tissue due to a severe fibrosis; one had history of repeated irradiation and HIFU as adjuvant therapy for prostatic cancer and two surgical attempts of repair; the fourth patient underwent one previous surgical attempt by graciloplasty. All patients had previous fecal and urine diversion with temporary ileostomy and indwelling catheter positioning. Two recurrent patients refused any additional surgical treatment. One was treated with gracilis muscle interposition by perineal approach with the subsequent healing of the fistula and the last one healed after a gracilis muscle interposition using a Kraske trans-coccygeal approach.

In these 18 reported cases the surgical technique is very similar between the different authors, with few differences. In fact, the fistula was always treated by removal of the tissue around the defect, followed by a tension free suture on healthy margins. Only Wilbert et al. used fibrin glue apposition for protecting the healing suture line. In Quinlan et al. did not perform fecal diversion before the procedure. In Table II are reported the studies in literature.

**Discussion**

Based on wide authors’ experience with TEM, achieved by 491 rectal cancer and 569 adenomas Endoluminal Loco-Regional Resections. Authors employed TEM to treat Recto-Vaginal Fistula (RVF) in 13 women from 2001. Nine patients were previously treated elsewhere with trans-perineal direct suture of vagina and rectal wall and four patients had two or three previous surgical attempts by trans-abdominal, trans-perineal approach or both. One recurrence was observed (7%) 30 days after surgery. The recurrence was treated again by TEM, and a re-recurrence was observed 40 days after surgery. Patient, who had an ileostomy, refused to undergo further surgical treatments. Finally in 2015 authors employed TEM for treatment of RUF.

Forty per cent of patients with RUF had an history of radiation therapy (17.8% pelvic irradiation, 29.6% brachytherapy, 42% combination therapy); in 60% RUF is a complication after major surgery (65%) (prostatectomy 85%, traumatic fistulas 22%, and IBD 6%). Only 10% of patients experience spontaneous healing without surgery. Nowadays there are many different approaches and techniques for fistula repairing but a definitive treatment is still missing and the choice of treatment is therefore based on the surgeon’s experience. Each procedure differs from the others and the choice ranges not only between different techniques, but also between different approaches: trans-perineal, trans-sphinteric, trans-anal, trans-abdominal with an overall success rate of 87.5%. The most frequently used surgical technique is the tissue flap interposition (graciloplasty, rectal or omental flap). Such procedures, despite the good rate of efficiency, are often very invasive and debilitating, burdened with considerable postoperative morbidity. The ideal treatment should ensure correct hemostasis and provide the removal of the fistula in order to carry out the sutures on healthy tissue with an adequate vascularization. It is also important to obtain a tension free suture line in split level in order to avoid postoperative leakage. The stoma creation allows to protect the healing fistula, reducing local inflammation and preventing infections, but it impacts considerably on patients’ QoL. However it seems to be useful to perform a stoma as a first step to increase the success rate. Nevertheless three of the patients analyzed (16.7%) underwent TEM without stoma. In Wilbert series the use of fibrin glue allows to exploit its known qualities as hemostatic, adhesive and sealant, promoting healing and preventing leakage of stute. The traditional transanal approach has a lower success rate (59%) compared with other approaches as trans-perineal (90%), trans-sphinteric (90%) or trans-abdominal (87%). TEM is not frequently used in the treatment of RUF and there is not a standardized technique, but anyway there are slight differences reported in literature. After reviewing the literature authors have focused some key points for the success of the procedure, that are important to emphasize in order to increase the healing success rate by TEM (Table III). The most important point is to remove completely the scar tissue in order to carry out the suture on healthy margin with an adequate vascularization without inflamed tissue. Hemostasis should be accurate in order to avoid postoperative bleed-

**Table III - Key points for healing of Recto-urinary fistula by TEM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment of RUF: Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete resection of scar tissue of fistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital and healthy tissues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate hemostasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undermine the rectal wall margins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension free suture lines in different planes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrin glue apposition (not mandatory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ing that can lead to hematomas and/or abscesses increasing the risk of dehiscence. It is crucial to undermine the margins of the rectal wall in order to obtain a tension free suture line, preferably in split level. Fibrin glue, apparently, can be useful due to its excellent haemostatic, adhesive and sealant capacity.

Despite good results reported, a healing treatment in irradiated patients seems still difficult to achieve. According to Kanekura et al. the recurrence rate appears to be higher both in patients treated with traditional approaches and in patients treated by TEM, due to extensive tissues fibrosis and a reduced capacity of tissue repair. On the other hand standard approaches seems to lead to an higher rate of success than TEM (trans-perineal, 90%, trans-sphincteric, 90% or trans-abdominal, 87% 1), but obtained through more invasive approaches, very debilitating for the patients, with considerable postoperative morbidity 1,2,7,8,19.

Conclusions

The treatment of RUF by TEM is safe and has a high overall success rate (77.8%) and seems to be a viable alternative to traditional methods due to its well recognized technical advantages. TEM allows to treat with successful results even patients who underwent previous surgical attempts of repair, despite the presence of fibrosis or inflamed tissues. More studies and cases reported are still necessary to verify these results.

Riassunto

Introduzione: Le fistole Retto-Urinearie (RUF) sono una rara complicanza della chirurgia pelvica. In letteratura sono stati descritti differenti approcci chirurgici, ma non è stato ancora stabilito un trattamento definitivo. La Transanal Endoscopic Microsurgery (TEM) è un approccio mini invasivo che permette di operare con una visione magnificata in tre dimensioni. Scopo di questa review è di riportare l'evidenza corrente in letteratura riguardo la tecnica e i risultati ottenuti nel trattamento della RUF con la TEM e di suggerire dei punti chiave per il suo corretto trattamento.

Materiali e Metodi: Dopo una ricerca medline nei database di Pubmed e Scopus, sono stati evidenziati sette lavori: i dati sono stati valutati sulla base dei casi riportati, sulle caratteristiche dei pazienti, sulla tecnica chirurgica utilizzata e sui risultati.

Risultati: In letteratura tra il 1996 e il 2015 sono stati riportati 18 casi di fistola retto-uroinaria trattati mediante approccio TEM. Il tasso di successo è stato del 77,8%. Prima del trattamento nell’83% dei pazienti è stata confezionata una stomia di protezione, mentre il 94% presentava un catetere vescicale a permanenza. In 4 pazienti, già precedentemente trattati chirurgicamente o sotto-posti a terapia radiante, è stata documentata l’insorgenza di recidiva.

Discussione: Il trattamento ideale della RUF dovrebbe garantire la resezione completa del tessuto cicatriziale intorno alla fistola, eseguendo la successiva sutura su margini sani adeguatamente vascolarizzati e senza tensione, su due diversi livelli, sul versante rettale e vescicale. La presenza di una stomia consente di proteggere la fistola in guarigione, riducendo l’inflammazione locale e prevenendo le infezioni.

Conclusioni: Su questo argomento non vi è ancora consenso in letteratura. Pertanto, chiarire quale possa essere il miglior trattamento è una condizione fondamentale, considerando l’alto tasso di recidive delle varie tecniche proposte. Il trattamento delle recidive, inoltre, ha un tasso di riuscita inferiore rispetto al trattamento primario, nonostante siano richiesti ancora ulteriori approfondimenti per confermare questi dati.
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