King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1111/bju.14189](https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14189)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Chandak, P., Byrne, N., Lynch, H., Allen, C., Rottenberg, G., Chandra, A., Raison, N., Ahmed, H. U., Kasivisvanathan, V., Elhage, O., & Dasgupta, P. (2018). 3D printing in robotic assisted radical prostatectomy - an IDEAL Phase 2a study. *BJU International*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14189>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

MR. PANKAJ CHANDAK (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-6873-5965)

MR. NICHOLAS RAISON (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-0496-4985)

Article type : Research Correspondence

3D printing in robotic assisted radical prostatectomy - an IDEAL Phase 2a study

P Chandak¹, N Byrne², H Lynch³, C Allen⁴, G Rottenberg⁵, A Chandra⁶, N Raison¹, H Ahmed⁷, V Kasivisvanathan⁸, O Elhage¹, P Dasgupta¹

¹MRC Centre for Transplantation, NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, King's College London,

²Department of Medical Physics, St Thomas' Hospitals

³Nuada Medical London

⁴University College Hospital London, Department of Radiology

⁵ Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust,
Departments of Radiology

⁶Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust,
Departments of Histopathology

⁷Department of Urology, Imperial College NHS Trust

⁸University College Hospital London, Department of Urology

Correspondence to:

Professor Prokar Dasgupta

King's College London

Tel: 02071885906

Fax: 02071886787

Email: prokar.dasgupta@bjui.info

Conflict of Interest: None

Funding: King's-Vattikuti Institute of Robotic Surgery

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/bju.14189

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Dear Editor,

The surgical management of prostate cancer has been shown to be determined by the anatomical location of the tumour and its associated intricate relationship to the neurovascular bundle and the prostatic capsule. Studies have shown an improvement in decision making about preservation or resection of neurovascular bundles during robotic assisted prostatectomy (RARP) [1,2] during which the surgeon lacks the tactile feedback of conventional open surgery. In T3 disease, around 35% positive margin rates have been reported [3] irrespective of the open or minimally invasive approach. In this context, improvement in tactile appreciation of the size, number and location of the tumour(s) during RARP may prove useful. Early reports of preoperative 3D printing technology in urological surgery have focused on proof of concept, face and content validity [4,5]. We report an IDEAL phase 2a study [6] of the use of patient specific 3D printing in RARP.

10 patients with localised T3 prostate cancer either clinically or on pre-biopsy multi-parametric magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), subsequently treated with RARP, were included in this prospective pilot study after ethics approval, patient consent and discussion at the regional multidisciplinary team meeting (MDT).

Patient-specific geometries were segmented from MRI data. The 2D, axial, T2 images were used. To account for the relatively coarse resolution (typically 3 mm) of these scans, all image segmentation was also informed by biopsy result and at least one of coronal and sagittal T2 acquisitions and diffusion weighted imaging. Manual segmentation was performed using Mimics Medical v.18.0 (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium) with the multi slice editing tool. Boolean subtraction of the tumour from the prostate geometry was completed using 3-Matic Medical v.10.0 (Materialise, Leuven, Belgium) and ensured two isolated components, that were subsequently exported in standard triangulation language (STL) file format. Patient-specific models were printed in house using multimaterial polyjet printing technology (Objet500 Connex1, Objet-Stratasys, Rehovot, Israel). Materials were assigned such that the tumour could be visualised and palpated as an opaque structure within a transparent prostate gland (VeroClear FullCure810, UK).

All RARPs were performed by a single surgeon who inspected the 3D model prior to surgery and took it into the operating room during the procedure. This allowed tactile interaction with the model and incremental nerve spare or wider excision of the neurovascular bundles were performed around the palpable tumours. For anterior tumours the fat in front of the prostate was sent for histology. The models were also shown to the patients as part of the informed consent process prior to the procedure and given to the patients after surgery. The final excised prostates were sent for histological examination.

The mean patient age was 58y (54-68) and mean PSA was 6.2 (3.8 - 14.9). Bilateral nerve sparing was achieved in 2 patients with anterior tumours, unilateral nerve spare and wider excision in 5 patients and unilateral nerve spare and contralateral incremental nerve spare in the remaining 3 patients. There were no intraoperative complications and all patients had an unremarkable post-operative recovery.

The Gleason score was 3+4 (Grade Group 2) in 4 patients, 4+3 in (Grade Group 3) in 3 patients, 4+4 (Grade Group 4) in 2 patients and Gleason 4+5 (Grade Group 5) in 1 patient. The final pathological stage was pT2 in 3 (down-staged), pT3a in 6 and pT3b in 1 patient. One patient (10%) had a positive margin of 1 mm at the apex. There were no positive lymph nodes and the anterior fat biopsies were clear. All patients have completed at least one-year follow-up with the pT3b patient opting for adjuvant radiotherapy. There have been no biochemical recurrences thus far. Continence (no pads) was immediate in 40%, 70% at 3 months, 80% at 6 months and 100% at 12 months. With penile rehabilitation, of 7 patients with pre-operative SHIM scores >21, 4 achieved erections strong enough for intercourse at 24 months, which included the two patients with anterior tumours who had bilateral nerve sparing. All patients found "personalised" counselling using their 3D printed prostates useful although this has not been compared to standard of care where a 3D print was not used.

3D printing is a cutting-edge topic and we chose to explore its potential role in RARP, adopting the IDEAL framework as a basis for this implementation, progressing from phase 1 (idea) to phase 2a (development) within this small cohort of patients. The models do not however replicate normal tissue elasticity and add extra cost to the procedure (~£250). A

multi-centre randomised controlled trial - TIGERS (Touch and Image Guided Robotic Surgery) is being planned with positive margins as the primary outcome.

Acknowledgments: MRC Centre for Transplantation and NIHR BRC, KCL, Vattikuti Foundation

P Chandak¹, N Byrne², H Lynch³, C Allen⁴, G Rottenberg², A Chandra², N Raison¹, V Kasivisvanathan⁴, H Ahmed⁵, O Elhage¹, P Dasgupta¹

¹King's College London, ²Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, ³Nuada Medical London, ⁴University College Hospital London, ⁵Imperial College London

References

1. Park BH, Jeon HG, Jeong BC, et al. Influence of magnetic resonance imaging in the decision to preserve or resect neurovascular bundles at robotic assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy. J Urol 2014; 192: 82–8
2. Tewari A, Peabody JO, Fischer M, et al. An operative and anatomic study to help in nerve sparing during laparoscopic and robotic radical prostatectomy. Eur Urol 2003; 43: 444-54
3. Khadhour S, Miller C, Fowler S, et al. The BAUS radical prostatectomy audit 2014/2015 – an update on current practice and outcomes by centre and surgeon case volume. BJUI (accepted 2018)
4. Shin T, Ukimura O, Gill IS. Three-dimensional Printed Model of Prostate Anatomy and Targeted Biopsy-proven Index Tumor to Facilitate Nerve-sparing Prostatectomy. Eur Urol 2016; 69: 377–9
5. Porpiglia F, Bertolo R, Checcucci E, et al. Development and validation of 3D printed virtual models for robot-assisted radical prostatectomy and partial nephrectomy: urologists' and patients' perception. World J Urol 2017 Nov 10. doi: 10.1007/s00345-017-2126-1. [Epub ahead of print]
6. McCulloch P, Altman DG, Campbell WB, et al. No surgical innovation without evaluation: the IDEAL recommendations. Lancet 2009;374:1105-12

Figure 1: 3D print with post-operative prostate gland showing anatomical geometrical correlation between the anterior tumour on the model (blue) and the tumour localised on the prostate (blue outline). The tumour was T3 on MRI and very close to the sphincter