Comparison of three different antibiotic protocols in transurethral resection of bladder tumour and the possible infectious risk factors: A non-randomized, prospective study

Jorge Panach-Navarrete, MD; Lorena Valls-González, MD; Eduardo Sánchez-Cano, MD; María Medina-González, MD; Ana Castelló-Porcar; José María Martínez Jabaloyas, MD, PhD
Department of Urology, University Clinic Hospital of Valencia. Facultat de Medicina i Odontologia, Universitat de València, Valencia, Spain

Cite as: *Can Urol Assoc J* 2018 June 8; Epub ahead of print. http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.5207

Published online June 8, 2018

***

Abstract

Introduction: We sought to investigate three different antibiotic protocols in transurethral resection of a bladder tumour (TURBT), and the possible infectious risk factors of this surgery.
Methods: We conducted a non-randomized, prospective study, gathering cases of patients in whom TURBT had been performed. The sample was divided into three groups based on those who received antibiotics as: a single preoperative dose (Group A); a preoperative dose, plus a long protocol during the hospitalization (Group B); a preoperative dose, plus a long protocol during the hospitalization, plus five days at home (Group C). Intra- and postoperative data that could be relevant to infections was gathered.
Results: A total of 219 patients were included. In the multivariate analysis, it was observed that the patients in Group A were more prone to re-hospitalization due to fever than were those from Group C (odds ratio [OR] 11.13; p=0.03). Furthermore, the cases with tumour necrosis and those who entered surgery with a urinary catheter were more prone to have a temperature above 37.5ºC (OR6.74; p=0.02 and OR6.4; p=0.04, respectively), as well as have an increased risk per every additional tumour in the cystoscopy (OR 1.32; p=0.01). Those who received mitomycin had a lower chance of a positive urine culture (OR0.29; p=0.01), contrary to those patients with over two days of hospitalization (OR 4.11; p<0.01) and those who entered surgery with a urinary catheter (OR 12.35; p=0.02).
Conclusions: Those patients that only received a single dose of antibiotic before TURBT may have an increased risk of re-hospitalization due to fever in comparison to

those who received prolonged antibiotic protocols. In addition, there are perioperative factors in this surgery that predict the risk of infectious complications.

Introduction

The benefit of different antibiotic protocols to prevent infections has been studied in diverse surgical endourological techniques. In the ureterorenoscopy, for example, the usage of preoperative prophylaxis has been seen as beneficial in cases of proximal and impacted lithiasis, but not in cases of exclusive diagnostic procedures or in the treatment of distal lithiases in healthy individuals (1). That notwithstanding, the transurethral resection of the prostate (TURPT) tumour is probably the best studied procedure regarding antimicrobial prophylaxis, with at least two meta-analyses and several randomised prospective studies. It has been concluded that there is a relative risk reduction of 65% and 77% for bacteriuria and septicaemia respectively with the use of antibiotic prophylaxis in the TURPT (2, 3). Besides the TURPT, there are no well-designed prospective studies that contribute any important conclusions about the benefit of preoperative antibiotic usage in endourological techniques (4, 5).

In the specific case of the transurethral resection of a bladder tumour (TURBT), despite the frequency of this intervention, there is a lack of consensus about the use and preoperative benefit of antibiotics. The European Association of Urology clinical guidelines, explain that there is no evidence in favour of the use of antibiotics in TURBT because the studies do not distinguish between resection and fulguration, between single or multiple tumours and between the presence or absence of necrosis. It is because of this that the recommendation transmitted is to distinguish between clean-contaminated TURBT (standard cases) or contaminated TURBT (cases with bacteriuria and necrotic tumours), where the use of antibiotics in case of a contaminated surgery is practical. The greatest benefit of the preoperative use of antibiotics is observed in high risk patients, ample resections and tumours with necrotic characteristics, according to these guidelines (4, 6). Nevretheless, the American Association of Urology, references only one dated clinical study , which concludes that three antibiotic doses diminish bacteriuria. It is concluded in these guidelines that there are no other similar clinical studies that study this aspect (6, 7).

Therefore, starting from the lack of evidence in the present context, this study was posed. It was fixed as a main objective to compare three different antibiotic protocols in the preoperative of TURBT, to observe if there were more infectious complications between them. A secondary objective was to set pre-, intra- and postoperative factors that increase the risk of developing infectious complication after this surgery.

Methods

Study design and source of data

This was a non-randomised prospective comparative study, gathering all cases of patients subjected to TURBT between October 2015 and June 2016 at our centre. There was and is no existing protocol for antibiotic use in TURBT in our service.

Consequently, every urologist uses the one deemed best according to experience. Each surgeon used the same antibiotic protocol in all the patients they intervened, with no individualisation. To analyse the objective of the study, the sample was divided in three groups, depending on the antibiotic protocol indicated, according to each surgeon's criteria. The first group included those patients that received only one preoperative prophylactic dose (group A), the second one included those cases that received a preoperative dose and continued doses during the entire hospitalization, regardless of the number of days (group B), and a third group that received a preoperative antibiotic, continued the treatment during hospitalization, and continued it for five days after the medical release (group C). All patients were asked for a urinary culture at the moment of medical release, in the first micturition after the removal of the urinary catheter, and another culture a week afterwards.

The present study was approved by the ethical committee of the Hospital Clínico Universitario of Valencia (Valencia, Spain), and by the Spanish Agency of Medicine and Sanitary Products (AEMPS).

Surgical protocol

The patients did not have a routine urine culture prior to the intervention. In all cases, the preoperative antibiotic dose was administered 30 minutes prior to the intervention. The antibiotic used was cefuroxime, and in the case of allergies to any beta-lactam, ciprofloxacin was used. Only the situation of allergies to both groups was a different drug used. In the cases of prolonged antibiotic protocols, the same one was used during the entire period. During the postoperative, the use or omission of antibiotics depended on the surgeon's criteria, as noted before.

The patients received spinal or general anaesthesia, in accordance with the criteria of the anaesthetist. The surgical material used was a Storz resector with a 26Ch sheath. In all cases, monopolar energy was used (handling 5 mm of width), with glycine as the instillation liquid. When finishing the resection, a Foley catheter of 20Ch or 22Ch was left with a continuum physiological serum wash in all cases. During the hours following the intervention, a single dose of 40 mg of intravesical mitomycin was administered, following the surgeon's criteria. The catheter was removed when the haematuria was minimal, per the urologist's determination.

Study variables

The basal characteristics of all patients were registered: age, sex and comorbidities. Intraoperative variables were noted the kind of antibiotic used; entering surgery with a bladder catheter; the size of the tumour (taking as reference the 0.5 cm of width of the resection loop); the presence of the macroscopic necrotic characteristics of the tumour; the duration of the surgery in minutes; bladder perforation during the TURBT (understood as the visualization of perivesical fat); the stenosis of the urethral meatus; the stenosis of the urethra (independent of location and length); and the false urethral pathway during the introduction of the resector.

Postoperative variables were registered: the administration or not of postoperative mitomycin; the days of hospitalisation; the days in the postoperative with catheter; the need of manual washings through the catheter or of catheter replacement during the hospitalisation; the registering of a temperature during the stay at the hospital equal to or greater than 37.5ºC; the need to visit the emergency room during the first month after surgery because of symptomatology of the inferior urinary tract; and the need to re-hospitalise due to fever ≥ 38ºC during the first month after surgery. We decided to use the temperature higher than 37.5 ºC during the hospitalisation as an indicator of infectious complications because we think that shows an infection, and not only inflammation secondary to surgery even without the presence of infection.

Whether the urine cultures were positive or negative , both the one solicited at the time of release and the one the week after were registered, as was the microorganism isolated. A urinary culture was considered positive if it contained over 10^5 UFC/ml, for both men and women. The stage of the tumour according to the TNM and the degree according to the WHO classifications of 1973 and 2016 were registered too.

Statistical analysis

A descriptive analysis was performed with the basal characteristics of the sample. For the study of the main objective, a univariate analysis was performed comparing among the three groups those variables considered to indicate or relate to infection: positive in any of the two solicited cultures for each patient, temperature ≥37.5ºC during hospitalisation, the need to visit the emergency room due to symptomatology of the lower urinary tract, and the re-hospitalisation due to fever ≥38ºC during the first month after the intervention.

For the secondary objective, the same four variables that may indicate infection were related though a univariate analysis with the rest of the pre-, intra- and postoperative variables of the study in order to see if these intra- and postoperative factors could prevent infection in TURBT. Those variables with a tendency to be significant ($p<0.2$) were included in the same way in a multivariate analysis.

For the univariate analyses, a chi-squared test was used to compare percentages. A Mann-Whitney U test or a Kruskall-Wallis test was performed in order to compare averages. For the multivaraite, binary logistic regressions was performed. Furthermore, the minimal sample size to establish differences between groups A, B and C was calculated, in case these existed. A sample size of 167 cases was calculated in order to find differences with a level of signification of $p<0.05$. All the calculations were performed with the SPSS ver. 20.0 software (IBM Corp. Released 2011. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.).

Results

219 patients were included, 61 (27.9%) in group A, 54 (24.7%) in group B, and 104 (47.5%) in group C. The baseline characteristics of the sample were homogeneous between the groups. The data can be observed in table 1. As "oncological antecedent" we accept any type of neoplasm other than bladder cancer. The percentages of kinds of

microorganisms isolated in the cultures can be consulted in supplementary table 1. The three most frequent were *E. faecalis* (in 5.7% of the total of 438 cultures of the study), *E. coli* (4.56%) and *Pseudomona* (1.82%). The mean length of stay in group A, B and C was: 2.33 +/- 1.53, 3.78 +/- 4.61, and 2.62 +/- 1.68 days, respectively.

The univariate analysis is shown in table 2. It must be highlighted that up to 9.8% of the patients that received a single preoperative dose had a re-hospitalisation within a month due to a fever ≥38ºC at home (compared to 1.9% and 1% in the other groups). The multivariate analysis, shown in table 4, reveals that the patients in group A had 11.53 times more chances of re-hospitalisation within a month due to fever than did those in group C. There were no differences in the percentages of positive cultures in any of the three groups, with group A being the one with the lowest percentage (18%) and group C the one with the highest (31.7%).

The analyses corresponding to the relationship between pre-, intra- and postoperative factors with infectious complications are shown in table 3. The results corresponding to stage and tumour degree are not shown in table 3 because of there not being statistically significant in any case (these analyses can be seen in supplementary table 2). Within the multivariate analysis (table 4), it stands out that those patients that were administered mitomycin postoperative had a lower chance of a later culture being positive than those who did not receive chemotherapy (OR=0.35, p=0.02). Still, those patients with over two days of hospitalisation (OR=4.11, p=<0.01) and those who went into surgery with a urinary catheter (OR=12.35, p=0.02) had an increased risk of a positive urinary culture. Regarding the possibility of developing a temperature ≥37.5ºC during hospitalisation, tumoural necrosis (OR=7.48, p=0.01), the number or tumours (OR=1.32, p=0.01), and entering surgery with a catheter (OR=6.48, p=0.04) were all related to it.

Discussion

The TURBT is a urologic procedure with a low rate of complications and mortality in comparison to other techniques. It is estimated that the complications oscillate between a 4-6%, with the urinary tract infection and haematuria being the most frequent ones (8). Nevertheless, the mortality rate has been calculated at 1.3% within 30 days, and in 3.3% within 90 days (9). Even though risk factors that have an influence on the development of general postoperative complications have been established, such as a low serum albumin, high blood levels of creatinine, low body weight, the location of the tumours in the bladder dome, or the status of the surgeon as resident doctor, the factors that predispose the appearance of infectious complications have not been clearly established (9, 10). Due to the frequency with which this surgery is performed, and the lack of evidence on the optimal usage of preoperative antibiotics, the results of the following study may be interesting for the urological community.

Nowadays, few review articles strictly recommend the use of antibiotics in the TURBT preoperative, partially because of the lack of studies on the topic. Alsaywid *et al*., undifferentiating between TURBT and TURPT, affirm that the antibiotic prophylaxis in TURBT diminishes the postoperative bacteriuria from 17.6% to 6.8%,

the symptomatic urinary infection from 10.1% to 2.9%, and the postoperative bacteraemia from 6.1% to 2.1% (3). Other authors distinguish different situations within the TURBT, in order to recommend the usage of antibiotic prophylaxis or not, or the usage of long antibiotic protocols. This way, in case of small tumours, prophylaxis may not be recommended, while it is in the case of big or necrotic tumours (11). Regarding the prolonged antibiotic use for several days after the TURBT, there is no published evidence. Currently, there are only two existing clinical studies on the topic, both with small samples. In one of them, a single preoperative dose with pefloxacin is compared to a placebo. In the other one, three doses of cephradine the day of the intervention is compared to using no drug (4). In the first one, with 61 patients, it was observed that significant bacteriuria was 24.1% in the placebo group, compared to 9.4% in the pefloxacin group, with no significant statistic differences. Furthermore, none of the patients in both groups had symptomatic urinary infections (12). In the other study, bacteriuria reached 17% of the cases in the no-antibiotic group, and 4.5% in the cephradine group, with no significant differences (6). The present study, in contrast to the previous ones, gathered a bigger patient sample and registered variables other than bacteriuria, which may show the benefit of one or another antibiotic protocol. Without a group that did not receive antibiotics in our sample, there are no observable differences in the percentage of positive cultures between the different antibiotic protocols, although these can be seen in the percentage of patients that were re-hospitalised within the first month due to fever, so those with a single preoperative dose were 11.13 times more likely to re-hospitalised for fever than those with a prolonged antibiotic regimen.

The present sample showed that those patients with necrotic tumour characteristics had an augmented risk of temperatures over 37.5ºC during the hospitalisation. The necrosis of the urothelial tumour had been described as a fact that may translate into higher tumour aggressiveness and worse oncological results, but it has not been defined yet as a factor that would predispose for infection independently (13). In the clinical guidelines of the European Association of Urology, tumour necrosis is referenced as a fact that turns a surgery into a contaminated one. This makes at least a single preoperative antibiotic dose recommended, and a prolonged protocol worth considering. It has been described In TURPT which tissue characteristics of the resected material may influence, together with other factors, in the appearance of bacteraemia (14). Furthermore, according to the results of the present study, entering surgery with a urinary catheter and the number of tumours were also related to an increased risk of elevated temperature during hospitalisation. These variables had not been demonstrated previously as predisposing factors in an independent way with an augmented risk of febricula or fever in this context.

The result obtained from the use of postoperative mitomycin is worth mention. Those patients that received treatment with this cytostatic had a lower risk of having a positive urinary culture. Regarding the relationship between the instillation of mitomycin and infected bladders, there is published data. There is a higher absorption of the drug in the case of an infected bladder (15). Nonetheless, up to what is known, the

data in the present study is the first that shows a possible beneficial effect of the cytostatic on the postoperative infection. Despite the typical histological changes in the bladder after the instillation of mitomycin, such as the denudation of the urothelium, or the development of inlaid cystitis that might be viewed as predisposing to an infection, its use here presented a lower risk of positive cultures (16). Even though it is true that a significant bacteriuria in postoperative TURBT does not always translate into infection, it is rather related to the intervention itself, this diminished risk of positive cultures may mean that mitomycin acts upon the microorganisms that cause the infection (14, 17). While it is true that currently there are topical drugs that have been proven effective in the prevention of repetitive cystitis, such as hyaluronic acid, these results may be the base for future research into new treatments aimed at this (18). Furthermore, wearing a catheter for over two days during the postoperative, or entering surgery with it were also shown as factors that predisposed to having positive cultures.

Besides this, regarding the factors related to an augmented risk of infection, some are described in the literature that the present analysis has not been able to prove. Matulewicz *et al.*, in a sample of 10599 cases of TURBT, relate the duration of the intervention to an augmented risk of infection of the urinary tract and sepsis. Furthermore, the study gathers variables that have not been registered in the present study. They conclude that the prolonged duration of the surgical procedure independently increases the risk of deep venous thrombosis, myocardial infarction and death (8). Other analyses performed on TURPT cases have related not only the duration of the intervention, but also the number of days of catheterization or the unplugging of the catheter's closed system as risk factors for the appearance of bacteriuria (19, 20). No such relationship has been found for age, which might be thought of as an independent factor that increases the infectious complications after surgery.This matches with what has been published up to the present moment (21).

The current study presents some limitations. The main one is the lack of randomisation, because the patients received one antibiotic protocol or another according to the surgeon's criteria. Furthermore, this fact is the one that caused group C to have a higher number of patients than the other two. The other limitation is that this study has been performed in a single centre. The ideal situation would have been a multicentre design, so the results could have been more generalisable. For example, the microorganisms that cause infection may change with the area, and this fact could have been controlled if several centres had participated in the gathering of patients. Despite these limitations, especially given the scarcity of previous studies on the topic, the present one presents a larger sample, a greater number of intra- and postoperative variables recorded, and three different protocols for comparison.

Conclusions

Those patients that receive only one dose of antibiotic before TURBT may have an increased risk of re-hospitalisation because of fever compared to those using a prolonged antibiotic protocol. Furthermore, tumour necrosis, the number of tumours, entering surgery with a urinary catheter and prolonged hospitalisations, may predispose

to the development of infectious complications. That notwithstanding, the instillation of postoperative mitomycin seems to reduce the risk of positive urinary cultures.

References

1. Martov A, Gravas S, Etemadian M, et al. Postoperative infection rates in patients with a negative baseline urine culture undergoing ureteroscopic stone removal: a matched case-control analysis on antibiotic prophylaxis from the CROES URS global study. J Endourol. 2015;29:171-80.
2. Qiang W, Jianchen W, MacDonald R, et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis for transurethral prostatic resection in men with preoperative urine containing less than 100,000 bacteria per ml: a systematic review. J Urol. 2005;173:1175-81.
3. Alsaywid BS, Smith GH. Antibiotic prophylaxis for transurethral urological surgeries: Systematic review. Urol Ann. 2013;5:61-74.
4. Bootsma AM, Laguna Pes MP, Geerlings SE, et al. Antibiotic prophylaxis in urologic procedures: a systematic review. Eur Urol. 2008;54:1270-86.
5. Mirone V, Franco M. Clinical aspects of antimicrobial prophylaxis for invasive urological procedures. J Chemother. 2014;26 Suppl 1:S1-S13.
6. MacDermott JP, Ewing RE, Somerville JF, et al. Cephradine prophylaxis in transurethral procedures for carcinoma of the bladder. Br J Urol. 1988;62:136-9.
7. Bhanot N, Sahud AG, Sepkowitz D. Best practice policy statement on urologic surgery antimicrobial prophylaxis. Urology. 2009;74:236-7.
8. Matulewicz RS, Sharma V, McGuire BB, et al. The effect of surgical duration of transurethral resection of bladder tumors on postoperative complications: An analysis of ACS NSQIP data. Urol Oncol. 2015;33:338 e19-24.
9. Hollenbeck BK, Miller DC, Taub D, et al. Risk factors for adverse outcomes after transurethral resection of bladder tumors. Cancer. 2006;106:1527-35.
10. Bansal A, Sankhwar S, Goel A, et al. Grading of complications of transurethral resection of bladder tumor using Clavien-Dindo classification system. Indian J Urol. 2016;32:232-7.
11. Concia E, Azzini AM. Aetiology and antibiotic resistance issues regarding urological procedures. J Chemother. 2014;26 Suppl 1:S14-23.
12. Delavierre D, Huiban B, Fournier G, et al. The value of antibiotic prophylaxis in transurethral resection of bladder tumors. Apropos of 61 cases. Prog Urol. 1993;3:577-82.
13. Soave A, John LM, Dahlem R, et al. The Impact of Tumor Diameter and Tumor Necrosis on Oncologic Outcomes in Patients With Urothelial Carcinoma of the Bladder Treated With Radical Cystectomy. Urology. 2015;86:92-8.
14. Mohee AR, Gascoyne-Binzi D, West R, et al. Bacteraemia during Transurethral Resection of the Prostate: What Are the Risk Factors and Is It More Common than We Think? PloS one. 2016;11:e0157864.
15. Schmidbauer CP, Porpaczy P, Georgopoulos A, et al. Absorption of doxorubicin-hydrochloride and mitomycin-C after instillation into noninfected and infected bladders of dogs. J Urol. 1984;131:818-21.
16. Lopez-Beltran A, Paner GP, Montironi R, et al. Iatrogenic changes in the urinary tract. Histopathology. 2017;70:10-25.

17. El Basri A, Petrolekas A, Cariou G, et al. Clinical significance of routine urinary bacterial culture after transurethral surgery: results of a prospective multicenter study. Urology. 2012;79:564-9.
18. Ciani O, Arendsen E, Romancik M, et al. Intravesical administration of combined hyaluronic acid (HA) and chondroitin sulfate (CS) for the treatment of female recurrent urinary tract infections: a European multicentre nested case-control study. BMJ Open. 2016;6:e009669.
19. Huang X, Shi HB, Wang XH, et al. Bacteriuria after bipolar transurethral resection of the prostate: risk factors and correlation with leukocyturia. Urology. 2011;77:1183-7.
20. Colau A, Lucet JC, Rufat P, et al. Incidence and risk factors of bacteriuria after transurethral resection of the prostate. Eur Urol. 2001;39:272-6.
21. Gregg JR, McCormick B, Wang L, et al. Short term complications from transurethral resection of bladder tumor. Can J Urol. 2016;23:8198-203.

Figures and Tables

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the sample. Data is shown for each of the groups.					
Variable	**Group A (preop)**	**Group B (preop + hospitalization)**	**Group C (preop.+ hospitalization + home)**	**Total**	**p**
Age	71.36±11.54	71.52±11.27	77.25±11.14	70.88±11.25	0.74*
Sex					
Male	48 (78.7%)	46 (85.2%)	87 (83.7%)	181 (82.6%)	0.61**
Female	13 (21.3%)	8 (14.8%)	17 (16.3%)	38 (17.4%)	
Primary					
Primary	33 (55%)	31 (57.4%)	61 (58.7%)	125 (57.3%)	0.90**
Recurrent	27 (45%)	23 (42.6%)	43 (41.3%)	93 (42.7%)	
High blood pressure					
Yes	27 (45%)	36 (66.7%)	57 (54.8%)	120 (55%)	0.06**
No	33 (55%)	18 (33.3%)	47 (45.2%)	98 (45%)	
Dyslipidemia					
Yes	32 (52.2%)	20 (37%)	53 (51%)	105 (47.9%)	0.17**
No	29 (47.5%)	34 (63%)	51 (49%)	114 (52.1%)	
Diabetes mellitus					
Yes	13 (21.3%)	12 (22.2%)	32 (31.4%)	57 (26.3%)	0.27**
No	48 (78.7%)	42 (77.8%)	70 (68.6%)	160 (73.7%)	
Neumopathy					
Yes	13 (21.3%)	9 (16.7%)	15 (14.6%)	37 (17%)	0.53**
No	48 (78.7%)	45 (83.3%)	88 (85.4%)	181 (83%)	
Cardiopathy					
Yes	5 (8.2%)	11 (20.4%)	17 (16.3%)	33 (15.1%)	0.16**

No	56 91.8%)	43 (79.6%)	87 (83.7%)	186 (84.9%)	
Neuropathy					
Yes	4 (6.6%)	5 (9.3%)	5 (4.8%)	14 (6.4%)	0.55**
No	57 (93.4%)	49 (90.7%)	99 (95.2%)	205 (93.6%)	
Vasculopathy					
Yes	8 (13.1%)	5 (9.3%)	12 (11.5%)	25 (11.4%)	0.80**
No	53 (86.9%)	49 (90.7%)	92 (88.5%)	194 (88.6%)	
Renal insufficiency					
Yes	6 (9.8%)	5 (9.3%)	11 (10.6%)	22 (10%)	0.96**
No	55 (90.2%)	49 (90.7%)	93 (89.4%)	197 (90%)	
Oncological antecedent					
Yes	15 (24.6%)	13 (24.1%)	18 (17.3%)	46 (21%)	0.44**
No	46 (75.4%)	41 (75.9%)	86 (82.7%)	173 (79%)	
Type of antibiotic					
Cefuroxime	54 (88.5%)	47 (87%)	95 (91.3%)	196 (89.5%)	
Ciprofloxacine	3 (4.9%)	5 (9.3%)	9 (8.7%)	17 (7.8%)	0.12**
Other	4 (6.6%)	2 (3.7%)	0 (0%)	6 (2.7%)	

*Kruskal-Wallis; ** Chi-squared.

Table 2. Univariate analysis: Relationship between the variables indicative of infection and each group according to antibiotic protocol

Variable	Group A (preop)	Group B (preop + hospitalization)	Group C (preop + hospitalization + home)	Total	p
At least one positive culture					
Yes	11 (18%)	16 (29.6%)	33 (31.7%)	60 (27.4%)	
No	50 (82%)	38 (70.4%)	71 (68.3%)	159 (72.6%)	0.14*
Temperature ≥37.5ºC					
Yes	6 (10%)	5 (9.4%)	10 (9.8%)	21 (9.8%)	0.99*
No	54 (90%)	48 (90.6%)	92 (90.2%)	194 (90.2%)	
ER 1 month for urinary tract symptoms					
Yes	10 (16.4%)	7 (13%)	9 (8.7%)	26 (11.9%)	0.31*
No	51 (83.6%)	47 (87%)	95 (91.3%)	193 (88.1%)	
Re-hospitalization due to fever					
Yes	6 (9.8%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (1%)	8 (3.7%)	0.01*
No	55 (90.2%)	53 (98.1%)	102 (99%)	210 (96.3%)	

*Chi-squared. ER: emergency room

Table 3A. Univariate analysis: Relationship between the variables indicative of infection and the intra- and postoperative variables											
Variable	**Entering surgery with catheter**		**Tumour size**	**Tumour necrosis**		**Nº tumours**	**Duration of surgery (min.)**	**Stenosis of urethra**		**False urethral pathway**	
	Yes	**No**		**Yes**	**No**			**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
At least one positive culture											
Yes	7 (87.5%)	50 (24%)	5.23±4.24	7 (58.3%)	51 (25.1%)	3.39±2.68	38.94±16.75	4 (23.5%)	54 (27.3%)	2 (50%)	56 (26.5%)
No	1 (12.5%)	158 (76%) <0.001*	3.5±3.3 0.004**	5 (41.7%)	152 (74.9%) 0.012*	2.15±1.86 0.008**	29.88±13.88 <0.001**	13 (76.5%)	144 (72.7%) 0.73*	2 (50%)	155 (73.5%) 0.29*
Temperature ≥ 37.5ºC											
Yes	4 (57.1%)	16 (7.8%)	5.98±4.64	5 (41.7%)	16 (8%)	4.19±2.8	42.11±18.95	1 (5.9%)	19 (9.8%)	1 (25%)	19 (9.2%)
No	3 (42.9%)	189 (92.2%) <0.001*	3.79±3.5 0.019**	7 (58.3%)	183 (92%) <0.001*	2.3±2.03 0.001**	31.47±14.49 0.019**	16 (94.1%)	175 (90.2%) 0.59*	3 (75%)	188 (90.8%) 0.28*
ER 1 month for urinary tract symptoms											
Yes	1 (12.5%)	24 (11.5%)	4.36±3.18	1 (8.3%)	25 (12.3%)	2.84±2.3	30.6±10.34	0	25 (12.6%)	0	25 (11.8%)
No	7 (87.5%)	184 (88.5%) 0.93*	3.92±3.72 0.26**	11 (91.7%)	178 (87.7%) 0.68*	2.44±2.17 0.38**	32.53±15.76 0.885**	17 (100%)	173 (87.4%) 0.119*	4 (100%)	186 (88.2%) 0.46*

Re-hospitalization due to fever											
Yes	1 (12.5%)	7 (3.4%)	5.88±3.97	0	8 (4%)	3.75±2.32	32.25±9.05	0	7 (3.6%)	0	7 (3.3%)
No	7 (87.5%)	200 (96.6%) 0.18*	3.91±3.64 0.12**	12 (100%)	194 (96%) 0.48*	2.44±2.18 0.023**	32.38±15.4 0.59**	17 (100%)	190 (96.4%) 0.42*	4 (100%)	203 (96.7%) 0.46*

*Chi-squared; **Mann-Whitney U.

Table 3B. Univariate analysis: Relationship between the variables indicative of infection and the intra- and postoperative variables

Variable	MMC postop		Perforation		Over 2 days hospitalization		Over 2 days catheter		Manual washes		Catheter replacement	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	YES	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
At least one positive culture												
Yes	9 (10.7%)	48 (37.5%)	16 (32.7%)	41 (25.3%)	44 (44.4%)	16 (13.3%)	43 (43.9%)	17 (14%)	19 (31.1%)	40 (25.5%)	3 (30%)	57 (27.3%)
No	75 (89.3%)	80 (62.5%) <0.001*	33 (67.3%)	121 (74.7%) 0.31*	55 (55.6%)	104 (86.7%) <0.001*	55 (56.1%)	104 (86%) <0.001*	42 (68.9%)	117 (74.5%) 0.39*	7 (70%)	152 (72.7%) 0.85*
Temperature ≥37.5ºC												
Yes	3 (3.8%)	17 (13.3%)	6 (12.2%)	14 (8.9%)	17 (17.5%)	4 (3.4%)	17 (17.5%)	4 (3.4%)	9 (15%)	12 (7.7%)	1 (10%)	20 (9.8%)
No	77 (96.2%)	111 (86.7%) 0.023*	43 (87.8%)	144 (91.1%) 0.48*	80 (82.5%)	114 (96.6%) 0.001*	80 (82.5%)	114 (96.6%) 0.001*	51 (85%)	143 (92.3%) 0.10*	9 (90%)	185 (90.2%) 0.98*
ER 1 month for IUTS												
Yes	7 (8.3%)	18 (14.1%)	7 (14.3%)	17 (10.5%)	14 (14.1%)	12 (10%)	13(13.3 %)	13 (10.7%)	4 (6.6%)	22 (14%)	1 (10%)	25 (12%)
No	77 (91.7%)	110 (85.9%) 0.206*	42 (85.7%)	145 (89.5%) 0.46*	85 (85.9%)	108 (90%) 0.34*	85 (86.7%)	108 (89.3%) 0.56*	57 (93.4%)	135 (86%) 0.12*	9 (90%)	184 (88%) 0.85*
Re-hospitalization due to fever												

Yes	3 (3.6%)	5 (3.9%)	1 (2%)	6 (3.7%)	5 (5.1%)	3 (2.5%)	5 (5.1%)	3 (2.5%)	3 (4.9%)	5 (3.2%)	1 (10%)	7 (3.4%)
No	81 (96.4%)	122 (96.1%) 0.89*	48 (98%)	155 (96.3%) 0.56*	94 (94.9%)	116 (97.5%) 0.32*	93 (94.9%)	117 (97.5%) 0.30*	58 (95.1%)	151 (96.8) 0.54*	9 (90%)	201 (96.6%) 0.27*

*Chi-squared; **Mann-Whitney U. ER: emergency room; IUTS: inferior urinary tract symptoms. MMC: mitomycin.

Table 4. Multivariate analysis: Relationship between the variables indicative of infection and the pre-, intra- and postoperative variables			
Dependent variable: Positivity in any of the two cultures			
Variable	**p***	**OR**	**95% CI**
Over two days of hospitalization	<0.00	4.11	1.87–9.00
Postoperative mmc	0.02	0.35	0.14–0.86
Entering surgery with catheter	0.02	12.35	1.39–109.94
Antibiotic protocol	0.19		
Group A	0.13	0.49	0.20–1.22
Group B	0.15	0.52	0.21–1.26
Group C	(ref)	1	--
Tumour necrosis	0.22	2.38	0.59–9.53
Duration of surgery (minutes)	0.74	1.00	0.98–1.03
Over two days with catheter	0.85	1.26	0.11–14.95
Size of largest tumour	0.91	0.99	0.89–1.11
Number of tumours	0.97	1.00	0.80–1.24
Dependent variable: Temperature ≥37.5° C during hospitalization			
Tumour necrosis	0.01	7.48	1.76–31.69
Number of tumours	0.01	1.32	1.08–1.62
Entering surgery with catheter	0.04	6.48	1.06–39.62
Over two days of hospitalization	0.13	2.59	0.74–9.04
Antibiotic protocol	0.27		
Group A	0.79	1.18	0.35–3.98
Group B	0.14	0.30	0.06–1.51
Group C	(ref)	1	--
Duration of surgery (minutes)	0.51	0.99	0.94–1.03
Manual washes	0.73	0.79	0.20–3.05
Over two days with catheter	0.75	1.93	0.03–123.15
Postoperative MMC	0.75	0.74	0.12–4.50
Size of largest tumour	0.95	1.01	0.85–1.19
Dependent variable: Re-hospitalization due to fever ≥38°C			
Antibiotic protocol	0.04		
Group A	0.03	11.13	1.31–94.79
Group B	0.65	1.93	0.12–31.38
Group C	(ref)	1	--
Number of tumours	0.06	1.32	0.99–1.76
Entering surgery with catheter	0.22	5.65	0.35–91.11
Size of largest tumour	0.51	1.07	0.88–1.29

*Logistic binary regression. CI: confidence interval; MMC: Mitomycin; OR: odds ratio.