

PEDİATRİK ENDOÜROLOJİ ÇALIŞTAYI

(Canlı Cerrahi)

30 Mart - 01 Nisan 2011

Dicle Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Konferans Salonu

Diyarbakır



Dicle Üniversitesi Rektörü
Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Jale Saraç'ın himayelerinde...

PEDIATRIC ENDOUROLOGY WORKSHOP

30 MARCH – 01 APRIL 2011

DIYARBAKIR

COMPARISON OF TWO DIFFERENT INJECTABLE IMPLANT MATERIAL IN ENDOSCOPIC TREATMENT OF VESICoureTERAL REFLUX IN CHILDREN

The Medical Faculty of Uludag University, Department of Pediatric Surgery, Division of Pediatric Urology, Bursa, Turkey

Aim: The aim of this study is to compare the efficiency of two different injectable implant material in endoscopic treatment of vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) in children retrospectively.

Patients and Methods: Between 2007-2010, 123 (75 female, 48 male) patients were underwent endoscopic treatment because of VUR. The injectable material were pyrolytic carbon coated beads [PCCB (Durasphere)] (Group I) and dextranomer-hyaluronic acid [DHA (Dexell)] (Group II) in 23 (31 ureters) and 100 (136 ureters) patients respectively. On cystoscopy, we evaluated localizations and anatomical appearances of ureteral orifices. Both groups were compared in terms of efficiency retrospectively. Fisher's chi-square test was used to compare the results and demographic characteristics of both groups and $p < 0.05$ was accepted as a statistical significance.

Results: The mean age of the patients is 7.04 (1-17 years) and 6.33 (1-16 years) years in Group I and Group II respectively. Patients were evaluated according to the localization of reflux, grade of reflux and types of ureteral orifices (Table I). Both groups were similar according to the age, sex, grade of reflux and types of ureteral orifices ($p > 0.05$). Mean follow-up period was 1.2 years (6 months - 4 years). In both groups, there were no complications in early postoperative period. There are no statistically significant difference between two groups in terms of success rate ($p > 0.05$) (Table II). Ureteral reimplantation was performed in 4 ureters and 17 ureters in Group I and Group II respectively.

Rigidity of the catheter, easily blockage of the catheter during the injection and loss of visualisation after the leak of the material were disadvantages of the group I.

Conclusion: Endoscopic injection is a simple, safe and effective treatment of VUR in children. The success rates of PCCB and DHA were similar.

Table I: Patient characteristics

FEATURES		GROUP I	GROUP II
Localization	Right	7	27
	Left	8	37
	Bilateral	8	36
Grade	II	7	36
	III	12	51
	IV	11	40
	V	1	9
Type of Orifice	Normal	2	4
	Horse-shoe	11	44
	Stadium	9	36
	Golf Hole	9	52

Table 2: Success rates

NUMBER OF INJECTION	GROUP I	GROUP II
	(n:31)	(n:136)
Success rate after 1 st injection	67.7%	70.5%
	(n:21)	(n:96)
Success rate after 2 nd injection	83.8%	86.7%
	(n:26)	(n:118)
Success rate after 3 rd injection	87.1%	87.5%
	(n:27)	(n:119)