Laparoscopic pyeloplasty with fragmented DJ removal for left PUJ obstruction and fragmented DJ in pelvis: A unique case report
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Abstract
Increased use of the DJ stent in urological problems has been associated with a marked increase in DJ related complications. Possible complications of ureteral stents include stent migration, encrustation, stone formation, and fragmentation. Spontaneous fragmentation of DJ stent is a rare complication and removal of upper fragmented part is technically difficult and very challenging. We report a case of laparoscopic left pyeloplasty with fragmented DJ removal for left PUJ obstruction and fragmented upper coil of DJ in pelvis.
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Introduction
Ureteric stenting is a common urological procedure. Ureteric surgeries, genitourinary oncology, trauma, transplantation and reconstructive urological surgeries are common procedures where Double-J (DJ) stent is placed.1 Due to the widespread usage of indwelling ureteral catheters, a number of possible complications such as migration, infection, pyelonephritis, breakage, encrustation, stone formation, and fragmentation have been noted.2,3 Several cases of fragmented ureteral stents have been reported in the literature.4 Here in we report a unique case of laparoscopic left pyeloplasty with fragmented DJ stent removal and review the relevant literature.

Case Report
A 59-year-old male patient presented to our clinic with left-side pain. Patient gives history of left pcnl 10 years back. He also gives history of Left DJ Removal 1year post surgery. After that he has not followed up anywhere else. On imaging X RAY KUB showing fragmented left DJ in the left renal area and staghorn calculus in right in right renal area (Fig. A).MR UROGRAM showing upper coil of the DJ stent fragment in left renal pelvis with narrow pelvi uretric junction and right sided staghorn renal calculus (Fig. B). DTPA Scan was done which showed significant left pelvi ureteric junction narrowing with decreased GFR. Laparoscopic ports were inserted (one “10”mm supraumbilical for telescope, two “5”mm ports were inserted for working elements. Standard laparoscopic pyeloplasty approach was planned. The peritoneal reflection done of descending colon. Left ureter identified and hooked up (Fig. C). Pelvis mobilised and dismembered (Fig. D). Ureter spatulated laterally. The fragmented upper coil of the DJ stent is removed (Fig. E,F). Anastomosis of PUJ done posteriorly by 3-0 vicryl (Fig. G). 5fr 26cm DJ stent placed (Fig. H).and the anterior layer of PUJ done by 3-0 vicryl (Fig. I). 20fr Drain placed and port closure done. Patient Discharged on POD5. After 4 weeks DJ stent was removed. After DJ stent installation, each patient should be checked by giving required information and told that the stent must be removed. In cases with forgotten stents and complications, the stents should be removed with suitable medical, endourological, or minimally invasive surgical methods taking care to protect kidney functions.

Fig. A: X-Ray KUB showing fragmented left DJ in the left renal area and staghorn calculus in right in right renal area.

Fig. B: MR Urogram showing upper coil of the DJ stent fragment in left renal pelvis with narrow pelvi ureteric junction and right sided staghorn renal calculus.
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Discussion

Double J-stents are routinely used in urologic practice as a simple, safe, and cost-effective way to re-establish or to improve drainage from kidney to bladder without external diversion.\(^5\)\(^6\) Since the introduction of the double J ureteral stent in 1978 by Finney,\(^7\) many improvements have been made in stent composition, indications, and design, but various complications such as stent migration, occlusion, encrustation, fragmentation, and stone formation are often encountered and could result in significant morbidity.\(^8\)

Ureteral stent fragmentation rates range between 0.3 and 10% in the literature.\(^9\)\(^10\) Different materials and coatings have been designed to avoid them.\(^11\) Caused by poor patient compliance with the instructions on returning for stent removal and inadequate counseling by practitioners, a forgotten ureteral stent is another challenging concern for the urologists. In the study made by Ringel et al. on 90 patients who had ureteral stent for 3–12 months, they reported that 10% of the patients had catheter fragmentation, 8.2% had catheter migration, 5.4% had nonrecovering hydronephrosis, and 9.1% had urinary infection, and ureteral catheters were removed in an average of 3.27% of the patients due to the occurring complications.\(^12\) In another study by Adanur and Ozkaya on 54 patients who had forgotten stents, 7.4% of the patients had fragmentation and 27.7% had urinary infection.\(^13\) Joshi et al. reported that 78% of the 40 patients they included in their study had irritative urinary symptoms, incontinence, and hematuria and the daily activities of >80% were affected by catheter-related pain, 38% had sexual dysfunction, and 58% had lower professional performance.\(^14\)

Conclusion

In the conclusion, greater expertise and good technical skills are required in the proper management of such cases. Detailed patient education would be the best treatment to prevent such types of complication. The cause for the PUJ obstruction in this case, could be due to initial procedure-PCNL or the fragmented DJ, which itself can cause infection and PUJO. The importance of ureteral stents should be explained by the urologists to the patients.
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