Brief communication (Original)

Predictive factors for postoperative complications in radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma

Non Wongvittavas, Kamol Panumatrassamee, Julin Opanuraks, Manint Usawachintachit, Supoj Ratchanon, Kavirach Tantiwongse, Chanatee Bunyaratavej, Apirak Santi-ngamkun, Kriangsak Prasopsanti Division of Urology, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand

Background: Radical nephrectomy is the treatment of choice for large renal cell carcinoma (RCC).

Objectives: To describe the complications after radical nephrectomy for suspected or proven RCC and analyze the risk factors.

Results: Fifty postoperative complications occurred in 34 patients (31%) within 30 days, including 11% transfusion related complications. There were 22% minor complications (6% grade 1, 16% grade 2) and 9% major complication (5% grade 3, 2% grade 4, and 2% grade 5). The most common complications were transfusion-related, re-laparotomy because of bleeding, and prolong ileus. In univariate analysis, pathological T-stage (P = 0.001), American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score (P = 0.007), tumor size (P = 0.01), and tumor diameter >4 cm (P = 0.03) were significant predicting factors. Major Charlson comorbidity index (CCI >2) was the only significant factor for major complications (P = 0.04). In multivariate analysis, ASA score was a significant independent predictor for overall complications (odds ratio 4.83, P = 0.01).

Conclusions: ASA score was a significant predictive factor for overall postoperative complications. Comorbidities was also a predictor for major complications in radical nephrectomy. Preoperative risk stratification for complications should be considered during decision-making and for proper counseling of patients.

Keywords: Complication, radical nephrectomy, renal cancer

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) comprises approximately 2% of all cancer diagnoses [1]. The incidence, particularly in asymptomatic patients, has increased because of the development of imaging techniques and widespread use of the cross-sectional imaging studies [2]. Radical nephrectomy (RN), first described by Robson [3], is still the treatment of choice for large RCC. With the increasing incidence of RCC in elderly populations, the age of the patient and their comorbidities are the important factors for predicting surgical outcomes besides tumor characteristics [4, 5]. This strengthens the importance of preoperative decision-making for those who might benefit from surgical treatment of RCC.

Although complication rates are often used to compare the success of renal surgical techniques, there is no definition for complications or guidelines for reporting surgical outcomes. Martin et al. [6] proposed 10-standard criteria that should be incorporated into the analysis of data for surgical complications in pancreatectomy, esophagectomy, and hepatectomy. These criteria included the method of accruing data, duration of follow-up, inclusion of outpatient information, definition of complications, mortality and morbidity rates, procedure-specific complications, grading system, length of stay data, and risk factor analysis. More recently in 2007, Donat [7] modified the reporting criteria for procedure-specific complications in urologic oncologic surgery including RN.

One standardized system, that systematically scores the severity of surgical complications, is the Clavien–Dindo system (CCSC) [8]. The CCSC has

Materials and methods: We retrospectively reviewed medical records from 110 patients who underwent radical nephrectomy for RCC in our institution between January 2007 and December 2013. The clinicopathological data of all patients were recorded and complications were graded using modified Clavien classification. Univariate and multivariate analysis was made of the predictive factors for complications.

Correspondence to: Kamol Panumatrassamee, Division of Urology, Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok 10330, Thailand. E-mail: kamol_uro@hotmail.com

been developed and validated for complication assessment in general surgery; however, it can be adjusted to any surgical procedures.

There were several studies that analyzed the correlation between preoperative predictive factors and postoperative complications in RN [9-13]. The purpose of this study was to describe the postoperative complications after RN in a single-center experience and identify the risk factors for complications by using standardized reporting criteria in Thai patients treated in a university referral hospital.

Materials and methods

We retrospectively reviewed medical records of all patients who underwent RN (by either open or laparoscopic approach) in our institution from January 2007 to December 2013. One hundred and ten patients were identified and included in this study.

Indication for surgery in all patients was a large enhancing renal mass suspicious for RCC on preoperative computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). All operations were performed under general anesthesia. The kidney was totally removed with Gerota's fascia in standardized fashion. The ipsilateral adrenal gland was concomitantly removed in case of upper pole tumor and lymph node dissection was performed when lymphadenopathy was detected.

The choice of surgical approach was chosen based on tumor size, patient, and surgeon preference. In the open approach, either a subcostal incision or midline incision was made. In the laparoscopic approach, all cases were performed with the transperitoneal approach with 3 or 4 laparoscopic trocars.

Postoperative management included removal of the close-suction drain when the content was clear and the amount less than 30 ml/day. The patient was discharged once able to walk and tolerate food.

The study was approved by the Institution Review Board (IRB) of King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital Ethics Committees. Data are based on chart reviews. All patients operated on had given informed consent before being treated (IRB No.129/57).

Date collection and statistical analysis

Studied parameters included age, sex, body mass index (BMI), American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) score, Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI), tumor size, tumor laterality, previous abdominal surgery, operative approach, metastasis at time of diagnosis, 2002 TNM classification, Fuhrman nuclear grade and subtype of renal mass.

The CCI is a validated comorbidity measurement based on relative risks of mortality for 19 conditions observed during a longitudinal study of 559 internal medicine cases [14]. The CCI was categorized as described by Santos et al. [15], by which minor comorbidity is defined as a CCI score of ≤ 2 and major comorbidity is defined as a CCI score of >2.

Postoperative complications within 30 days of surgery were categorized according to the CCSC. Minor complication are defined as grade 2 and major complication are defined as grade >2. Complication that was expected after nephrectomy, such as a decline of renal function but not leading to dialysis, was not included in this study. In patients with multiple complications, all complications were graded and the highest grade was used for statistical analysis.

Categorical data were reported as count (%) and continuous data were reported as median (IQR). Patient parameters in univariate analysis for predicting postoperative complications include age, sex, body mass index (BMI), ASA score, CCI, tumor size, tumor laterality, previous abdominal surgery, surgical approach, metastasis at time of diagnosis, pathological T stage, Fuhrman nuclear grade, and subtype of renal mass.

The Chi-square and Fisher exact tests were used to compare the difference among the categorical variables. A Student *t* test was used for continuous variables. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant in comparison. Variables with P < 0.05 in univariate analysis were selected in a multivariate logistic regression model to assess the independent predictive factors for postoperative complications. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 16.0.

Results

Patient's demographic data and pathological reports are presented in **Table 1**. RN was mostly performed using an open approach (83%). Median patient age was 60 years. Median tumor size was 8.3 cm. Fifty patients (46%) had major comorbidities (CCI >2) and 11 patients (10%) had metastasis at the time of diagnosis.

Pathology reports showed RCC in 91 patients (83%) and clear cell cancer was the most common subtype (56%). Eleven patients (10%) were diagnosed

as benign disease including 5 angiomyolipoma, 2 chronic pyelonephritis, 1 oncocytoma, 1 cystic nephroma, 1 xanthogranulomatous pyelonephritis and 1 hemorrhagic cyst. Eight patients (7%) had other types of cancer (3 urothelial carcinoma, 3 malignant spindle cell tumor, 1 metastatic adenoma, and 1 malignant epithelioid angiomyolipoma).

Table 1. Patient's demographic data and pathological reports (N = 110)

| Variables | n (%) | | |
|--|------------|--|--|
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 60(13.3) | | |
| BMI, kg/m^2 , mean (SD) | 24.3 (4.7) | | |
| Male sex, n (%) | 63 (57) | | |
| Operative approach, n (%) | | | |
| Laparoscopic | 19(17) | | |
| Open | 91 (83) | | |
| Metastasis at time of diagnosis, n (%) | 11 (10) | | |
| ASA score, n (%) | | | |
| 1–2 | 89(81) | | |
| 3–4 | 21 (19) | | |
| Tumor diameter, cm., mean (SD) | 8.3 (4.9) | | |
| Tumor diameter, n (%) | | | |
| <4cm | 28 (26) | | |
| >4cm | 82(75) | | |
| Charlson's comorbidity index, n (%) | | | |
| 0 | 18(16) | | |
| 1 | 16(15) | | |
| 2 | 26(24) | | |
| 3 | 24 (22) | | |
| 4 | 17 (16) | | |
| 5 | 2(2) | | |
| ≥6 | 7(6) | | |
| Previous abdominal surgery, n (%) | 9(8) | | |
| Renal cell carcinoma pathological stage, n (%) | | | |
| pT1 | 34(31) | | |
| pT2 | 19(17) | | |
| pT3 | 33 (30) | | |
| pT4 | 5 (5) | | |
| Benign tumor | 11 (10) | | |
| Other malignancy | 8(7) | | |
| Tumor subtype, n (%) | | | |
| Clear cell RCC | 62 (56) | | |
| Papillary RCC | 18(16) | | |
| Chromophobe RCC | 4(4) | | |
| RCC, not otherwise specified | 7(6) | | |
| Benign and other malignancy | 19(17) | | |
| Fuhrman nuclear grade, n (%) | | | |
| 1–2 | 47 (43) | | |
| 3–4 | 34(31) | | |
| Unclassified | 29 (26) | | |

BMI = body mass index, ASA = American Society of Anesthesiologists, RCC = renal cell carcinoma, SD = standard deviation

Complications

There were 50 postoperative complications occurring in 34 patients (31%) within 30 days after surgery. The distribution of patients according to the grade of complication as per Clavien–Dindo classification is presented in **Table 2**. There were 22% of patients with minor complications (Clavien grade 1-2) and 10% of patients with major complication (Clavien 3–5). There were two (2%)

fatal complications leading to perioperative deaths (Clavien grade 5).

The details of complications classified by event and management are summarized in **Table 3**. The most common minor complications were anemia requiring blood transfusion (n = 12) and prolonged ileus requiring total parenteral nutrition (n = 4). The most common major complication was relaparotomy because of bleeding (n = 5).

Table 2. Thirty-day postoperative complications classified by Clavien Classification* (N = 110)

| Clavien Classification | Number of patients (%) | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| No complications | 76(69) | | |
| Grade 1 | 7(6) | | |
| Grade 2 | 17 (16) | | |
| Grade 3a | 1(1) | | |
| Grade 3b | 5(5) | | |
| Grade 4a | 2(2) | | |
| Grade 4b | 0(0) | | |
| Grade 5 | 2(2) | | |
| Grade 4b Grade 5 | $ \begin{array}{c} 2 (2) \\ 0 (0) \\ 2 (2) \end{array} $ | | |

*Highest grade of complication was used to classify in patient with more than one complication

| Clavien grade | vien grade Number Complication (n) | | Management | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | 7 | Prolonged ileus (1) | Conservative | |
| | | Wound infection (1) | Wound dressing | |
| | | Prolonged fever (1) | Conservative | |
| | | Atelectasis (1) | Chest physiotherapy | |
| | | Vertigo (1) | Conservative | |
| | | Prolonged drain leakage (1) | Conservative | |
| | | Acute Tubular necrosis (1) | Conservative | |
| 2 | 27 | Anemia (12) | Transfusion | |
| | | Prolonged ileus (4) | TPN | |
| | | Pneumonia (2) | Antibiotic | |
| | | Urinary tract infection (2) | Antibiotic | |
| | | Pulmonary embolism (2) | Anticoagulant | |
| | | Hypertensive urgency (2) | Antihypertensive | |
| | | Atrial fibrillation (1) | Anticoagulant | |
| | | Transient ischemic attack (1) | Anticoagulant | |
| | | Partial small bowel obstruction (1) | TPN | |
| За | 3 | Pleural effusion (1) | PCD | |
| | | Congestive heart failure (1) | Central line insertion | |
| | | Intraabdominal collection (1) | PCD | |
| 3b | 6 | Postoperative bleeding (5) | Relaparotomy | |
| | | Wound dehiscence (1) | Secondary wound closure | |
| 4a | 5 | Acute renal failure (2) | Hemodialysis | |
| | | Epilepsy (1) | Admission to ICU | |
| | | Ischemic stroke (1) | Admission to ICU | |
| | | Septic shock (1) | Admission to ICU | |
| 5 | 2 | Rupture aortic aneurysm (1) | - | |
| | | Multi-organ failure leading to death (1) | - | |

Table 3. Detail of complications and managements by events (n = 50)

Predictive factors for postoperative complications

All analyzed data are shown in **Table 4**. In univariate analysis, pathological T-stage (P = 0.001), ASA score (P = 0.007), tumor size (P = 0.01), and tumor diameter >4 cm (P = 0.03) were significant parameters predicting overall postoperative complications. In multivariate analysis, ASA score was

the only significant independent predictor for overall complications; odds ratio 4.83 (1.4–16.66), P = 0.01.

For major complication, major comorbidity (CCI >2) was the only significant parameter that increased the risk of complication compared with minor comorbidity (CCI \leq 2); 16% vs. 3%, *P* = 0.04. (Data is not shown in the Table).

Table 4. Univariate and multivariate analysis between all predictive factors and overall postoperative complications

| Parameters | Univariate | | | Multivariate | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|
| | Without complications (n = 76) | With complications (n = 34) | Р | OR (95% CI) | Р |
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 59.76(11.97) | 59.82 (16.10) | 0.98 | _ | _ |
| BMI, kg/m ² , mean (SD) | 24.84 (4.76) | 22.91 (4.49) | 0.05 | _ | _ |
| Sex, n (%) | | | 0.54 | _ | _ |
| Male | 42 (66.7) | 21 (33.3) | | | |
| Female | 34 (72.3) | 13 (27.7) | | | |
| Operative approach, n (%) | | | 0.17 | _ | _ |
| Laparoscopic | 16(84.2) | 3(15.8) | | | |
| Open | 60 (65.9) | 31 (34.1) | | | |
| Metastasis at diagnosis, n (%) | | | 0.09 | _ | _ |
| Mx/M0 | 71 (71.7) | 28(28.3) | | | |
| M 1 | 5 (45.5) | 6(54.5) | | | |
| ASA score, n (%) | | × / | 0.007* | | 0.01* |
| 1–2 | 67 (75.3) | 22(24.7) | | _ | |
| 3–4 | 9(42.9) | 12(57.1) | | 4.83(1.4-16.66) | |
| Tumor diameter, cm, mean (SD) | 7.47 (4.6) | 10.06(5.25) | 0.01* | 1.07(0.93-1.23) | 0.33 |
| Tumor diameter, n (%) | | | 0.03* | | 0.18 |
| ≤4 cm | 24 (85.7) | 4(14.3) | | _ | |
| >4 cm | 52(63.4) | 30(36.6) | | 3.77(0.54-26.22) | |
| Tumor subtype, n (%) | | | 0.13 | _ | _ |
| Clear cell RCC | 47 (75.8) | 15(24.2) | | | |
| Papillary RCC | 9 (50) | 9(50) | | | |
| Chromophobe RCC | 3(75) | 1 (25) | | | |
| RCC, not otherwise specific | ed $3(42.9)$ | 4(57.1) | | | |
| Benign tumor | 9(81.8) | 2(18.2) | | | |
| Other malignancy | 5(62.5) | 3(37.5) | | | |
| Fuhrman nuclear grade, n (%) | | | 0.09 | _ | _ |
| 1–2. | 36(76.6) | 11(23.4) | 0.07 | | |
| 3-4 | 20(58.8) | 14(412) | | | |
| Pathological T-stage, n (%) | 20 (0010) | 1 ((11-2) | 0.001* | | 0.586 |
| nT1 | 27 (79 4) | 7(20.6) | 01001 | _ | Ref |
| nT2 | 16(84.2) | 3(15.8) | | 0.25(0.33 - 1.93) | 0 184 |
| pT2 pT3 | 20(60.6) | 13(394) | | 0.55(0.88 - 3.42) | 0.521 |
| pT2 pT4 | 0(0) | 5(100) | | 1.297×10^9 | 0.999 |
| Charlson's comorbidity index n | (%) | 5 (100) | 0.29 | | _ |
| | 44 (73 3) | 16(267) | 0.2 | | |
| >2 | 32 (64) | 18(36) | | | |
| Previous abdominal surgery n (| %) | 10(50) | 0.27 | _ | _ |
| No | 68(673) | 33(327) | 0.27 | | |
| Ves | 8(88.9) | 1(111) | | | |
| 100 | 0(00.7) | . () | | | |

BMI = body mass index, ASA = American Society of Anesthesiologists, RCC = renal cell carcinoma.

Discussion

Currently, RN is the treatment of choice for large renal tumors. Studies specifically looking at the complications associated with RN have been reported, but not all of them were using standardized reporting criteria. Thus, additional literature adopting rigorous methodology for reporting of surgical complications following RN is needed.

The range of complication rates after RN in patients with RCC were 6%–51%. There were many predictive factors for complications after RN. From previous studies, ASA classification, weight loss >10%, CCI, pathological stage, patient age, operative time, higher volume surgeon, and chronic pulmonary disease were associated with complication rates after RN [5, 9, 12, 16-22]. Postoperative complication rates are summarized in **Table 5**.

In our study, the overall complication rate was 31%, with 9% being major complications. Blood transfusion is the most common complication in our study (11%). All of our Clavien grade 4 complications were medical complications.

Two deaths occurred in our study cohort (2%). The first patient was a 76-year old man with history of brain infarction who presented with 20-cm renal tumor. He had aspiration pneumonia, and died from septicemia. The second patient was a 50-year old man with a chronic dissecting aortic aneurysm type B and end stage renal disease. He presented with a ruptured 3-cm renal tumor and underwent laparoscopic RN. He had postoperative bleeding and required laparotomy to stop bleeding. The immediate

postoperative period was uneventful; however, the patient died because of a ruptured dissecting aorta 1 week after surgery.

Although complication rates are often used to compare the success of renal surgery, there is no consensus about the criteria for reporting postoperative complications. Therefore, comparison cannot be made directly between studies. The present study shows the CCSC is feasible and easy to apply for grading complications after surgery. Moreover the advantage of CCSC, the grading system, is followed by the therapeutic consequences of complications, which is important for the patient's outcome.

Limitations of our study include its retrospective, nonrandomized study design. The procedures were performed by multiple surgeons, which can affect surgical outcomes. Long term oncological outcomes and renal function study were not specifically assessed and interpreted in this study.

Conclusion

RN represents safe surgical treatment for large renal tumors. It offers an acceptable perioperative complication rate which, mostly, can be effectively managed conservatively. ASA score was a significant predictive factor for overall postoperative complications and major comorbidities was the predictor for major complications. Our analysis consists of accurate information that can represent a useful tool for counseling patients before surgery.

No authors have any conflict of interest to declare.

| Study | Year | Patients (n) | Complication rate | Standard system | Risk factors |
|------------------------|------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Tan et al. [17] | 2011 | 8,003 | Open 5.3% Lap 36.9% | No | high volume surgeon and hospital |
| Stephenson et al. [18] | 2004 | 688 | 16% | 5-tiered scale | age, operative time, pathological stage |
| Dunn et al. [20] | 2000 | 33 | Open 55% Lap 37% | No | _ |
| Joudi et al. [22] | 2007 | 18,575 | 18.2% | ICD-9 | age, male gender, comorbidity, hospital location |
| Hennus et al. [9] | 2012 | 158 | 34% | CCSC | comorbidity, tumor |
| Abouassaly et al. [16] | 2011 | 20,286 | 34.1% | ICD-9 and 10 | age, comorbidity |

Table 5. Postoperative complication rate and predictive factors of radical nephrectomy in selected series

ICD = International Classification of Diseases, CCSC = Clavien Classification of Surgical complications

References

- 1. Motzer RJ, Bander NH, Nanus DM. Renal-cell carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 1996; 335:865-75.
- 2. La Vecchia C, Negri E, Levi F. Increasing incidence of renal cell cancer. JAMA. 1999; 282:2120-1.
- 3. Robson CJ, Churchill BM, Anderson W. The results of radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. J Urol. 2002; 167:873-5; discussion 6-7.
- Bensalah K, Pantuck AJ, Crepel M, Verhoest G, Mejean A, Valeri <u>A, et al. Prognostic variables to</u> predict cancer-related death in incidental renal tumours. BJU Int. 2008; 102:1376-80.
- de Cassio Zequi S, de Campos EC, Guimaraes GC, Bachega W, Jr., da Fonseca FP, Lopes A. The use of the American Society of Anesthesiology Classification as a prognostic factor in patients with renal cell carcinoma. Urol Int. 2010; 84:67-72.
- Martin RC 2nd, Brennan MF, Jaques DP. Quality of complication reporting in the surgical literature. Ann Surg. 2002; 235:803-13.
- Donat SM. Standards for surgical complication reporting in urologic oncology: time for a change. Urology. 2007; 69:221-5.
- Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg. 2004; 240:205-13.
- 9. Hennus PM, Kroeze SG, Bosch JL, Jans JJ. Impact of comorbidity on complications after nephrectomy: use of the Clavien Classification of Surgical Complications. BJU Int. 2012; 110:682-7.
- Brassart E, Lebdai S, Berger J, Traore S, Bernhard JC, Fardoun T, et al. Overall mortality after radical nephrectomy in patients aged over 80 years with renal cancer: a retrospective study on preoperative prognostic factors. Int J Urol. 2012; 19:626-32.
- O'Malley RL, Hayn MH, Hellenthal NJ, Kim HL, Underwood W 3rd, Schwaab T. Safety and outcomes of surgical treatment of renal cell carcinoma in the elderly. Can J Urol. 2012; 19:6111-7.
- 12. Tokgoz H, Akduman B, Unal I, Erol B, Akyurek E, Mungan NA. Chronic pulmonary diseases are independent risk factors for complications after

radical nephrectomy. Int Urol Nephrol. 2011; 43: 1025-31.

- Ather MH, Nazim SM. Impact of Charlson's comorbidity index on overall survival following tumor nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. Int Urol Nephrol. 2010; 42:299-303.
- Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. J Chronic Dis. 1987; 40:373-83.
- Santos MS, Gomes JA, Hofling-Lima AL, Rizzo LV, Romano AC, Belfort R, Jr. Survival analysis of conjunctival limbal grafts and amniotic membrane transplantation in eyes with total limbal stem cell deficiency. Am J Ophthalmol. 2005; 140:223-30.
- Abouassaly R, Alibhai SM, Tomlinson GA, Urbach DR, Finelli A. <u>The effect of age on the morbidity of</u> kidney surgery. J Urol. 2011; 186:811-6.
- Tan HJ, Wolf JS, Jr., Ye Z, Wei JT, Miller DC. Complications and failure to rescue after laparoscopic versus open radical nephrectomy. J Urol. 2011; 186: 1254-60.
- Stephenson AJ, Hakimi AA, Snyder ME, Russo P. Complications of radical and partial nephrectomy in a large contemporary cohort. J Urol. 2004; 171:130-4.
- Corman JM, Penson DF, Hur K, Khuri SF, Daley J, Henderson W, et al. Comparison of complications after radical and partial nephrectomy: results from the National Veterans Administration Surgical Quality Improvement Program. BJU Int. 2000; 86:782-9.
- Dunn MD, Portis AJ, Shalhav AL, Elbahnasy AM, Heidorn C, McDougall EM, et al. Laparoscopic versus open radical nephrectomy: a 9-year experience. J Urol. 2000; 164:1153-9.
- Silberstein JL, Adamy A, Maschino AC, Ehdaie B, Garg T, Favaretto RL, et al. Systematic classification and prediction of complications after nephrectomy in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (RCC). BJU Int. 2012; 110:1276-82.
- 22. Joudi FN, Allareddy V, Kane CJ, Konety BR. Analysis of complications following partial and total nephrectomy for renal cancer in a population based sample. J Urol. 2007; 177:1709-14.