

Case – Conservative management of deep penile skin infection post-three-piece penile prosthesis implantation

Mohammad H. Alkandari; Iman Sadri; Serge Carrier

Cite as: Alkandari MH, Sadri I, Carrier S. Case – Conservative management of deep penile skin infection post-three-piece penile prosthesis implantation. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2021 February 12; Epub ahead of print. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.7056>

Published online February 12, 2021

Introduction

Erectile dysfunction (ED) is the consistent inability to obtain or maintain penile erection of sufficient rigidity to permit satisfactory sexual performance for at least 3 months.¹ It affects 1 in 2 males over the age of 40.¹ Once reversible causes of ED have been ruled out, the treatment steps involve oral medication followed by injection therapy, urethral therapy and vacuum erection devices. Surgical penile prosthesis (PP) implantation is an excellent option and remains a very successful alternative for men with refractory ED. Every year, up to 25,000 PP implantations are performed in the United States.²

Although penile prosthesis infection (PPI) rates are less than 3% in virgin cases involving otherwise healthy patients, the rates of infection are much higher in patients who are diabetic (8%), undergoing revision surgery (10%) or on oral prednisone (20%).³ It remains the most serious post-operative complication and requires prompt surgical consultation.

Historically, removal of the prosthesis followed by a long course of antibiotics and re-implantation after 3-6 months is recommended.² In the last 20 years, the Mulcahy salvage technique, a one-stage salvage operation involving prompt removal of all hardware and several steps of antibiotic irrigation with immediate implantation of a new device, has gained popularity in similar scenarios.^{2,4}

Recent studies have explored the role of conservative management (i.e. antibiotics) for localized/superficial infections following insertion of PP and have shown promising findings.⁵⁻⁸ In these circumstances, given the lack of systemic symptoms (temperature $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$, leukocytosis, skin necrosis), the infection is localized in the skin and subcutaneous tissues. Therefore, rapid intervention with the appropriate antibiotics may prevent prosthesis involvement which would require surgical extraction of the device or a salvage procedure.

Case report

A 58-year-old male was referred to a urologist for a 22-year history of erectile dysfunction (ED) at despite first- and second-line treatment. He failed phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitor and intracavernosal injections such as Trimix and Supertrimix. Etiology of the ED was determined to be secondary to severe impairment of veno-occlusion, moderate arterial insufficiency and a ventral Peyronie's plaque resulting in a 40-degree ventral deviation based on the penile doppler assessment. His Sexual Health Inventory for Men and Quality of Life score and were 2/25 and 1/6, respectively. The patient was an active smoker and was known for recurrent (x3) bladder transitional cell carcinomas (CIS), the latest recurrence being in 2016. He had a transurethral resection of bladder tumor in 2014 and BCG treatment in 2017.

A Coloplast Titan® prosthesis (3-piece) was inserted using a longitudinal penoscrotal incision. The patient was given Vancomycin and Gentamycin IV before the implantation of the prosthesis. The implant was also dipped in Septra antibiotic (AB). The surgery and immediate post-operative course were uneventful.

At one-month follow up (post-operative day 28), the patient was doing well with no signs of infection of the prosthesis. The following day, the patient accidentally opened the incision with his nail. He had also initiated oral sexual intercourse around the same time against medical advice.

He presented to the emergency room (ER) on a Sunday night with penile swelling, erythema, nausea and increased pain. His vital signs were normal. However, there was visible erythema, swelling, induration and a 2mm long and 10mm depth wound dehiscence on the ventral aspect of the penis above the testicles with a purulent discharge from the site of incision (figure 1). The groin lymph nodes were enlarged. Abdominal and testicular exam were unremarkable for inflammation. PPI was suspected by the ER doctor.

Management

CBC, electrolytes, urinalysis and urine microscopy were unremarkable. Wound site swabs were taken for culture and sensitivity. The opened wound got enlarged, yet the penile prosthesis was covered by a layer of tissue and was not visible, which was reassuring for sparing of the prosthesis. Local drainage of the abscess was performed at the bedside by the ER physician before the patient was admitted under Urology. Treatment with 2 grams of IV Cefazolin TID, in addition to analgesics and DVT prophylaxis were initiated by the urologist on call. The urologist who had performed the surgery was consulted and requested to change the AB to Tobramycin 260mg IV daily and IV Vancomycin 1g TID. The surgeon planned to assess the case on the following day since the CBC was normal and the patient did not have fever or evidence of systemic infection.

Case: Conservative management of deep penile skin infection

The next morning, the treating urologist assessed the patient and saw a 3x1cm open wound which was still draining. The implant could not be seen through the wound and the induration was limited. The pump in the scrotum was free and easily palpable in the posterior aspect of the scrotum. After a thorough discussion with the patient, the shared decision was made to continue conservative management with ABs and regular local cleaning with 0.9% saline.

On day 4, the wound culture results demonstrated the presence of *Corynebacterium*, *Peptostreptococcus asaccharolyticus* and *anaerobius*, *Bacteroides asaccharolytica* and *Staphylococcus epidermidis*. The Infectious Disease specialist was consulted and recommended removal of the PP and switching the AB to Piperacillin-Tazobactam TID. However, the wound was progressively healing with no sign of involvement of the implant and the surgeon decided against removal of the implant at this stage. The symptoms had greatly improved by day 6 and he was discharged home with 500mg of Clavulanate TID and 500mg of Metronidazole TID for 4 weeks. An antifungal was added to his outpatient regimen due to the presence of oral microbes in the wound. The patient was seen in clinic 24 days later with no signs of infection as in figure 2.

Discussion

Penile prosthesis implantation is an excellent treatment option for men with refractory erectile dysfunction. Over the years, despite many advancements to minimize the risk of prosthesis infection, PPI remains a non-negligible and serious complication with rates of infection ranging between 1-20% depending on a patient's comorbidities.^{2,3,5} When an infection occurs, complete and timely prosthesis removal, systemic antibiotics, and local irrigation/drainage of the surgical site are the mainstay of treatment in many patients. The decision to insert a new PP would only be discussed with the patient once the infection had cleared a few months later, unless a Mulcahy salvage technique is performed.⁴

There is scarce evidence to support the sole use of antibiotics to treat such infections. *Derouiet et al.* published a case series on three patients with PPI presenting with minimal systemic symptoms or laboratory abnormalities that were successfully managed with local and systemic clindamycin.⁷ In these cases, the prosthetic parts were not visible after opening the abscess, but connection with the prosthesis was confirmed with radiographs or MRI. The patients reported complete resolution of symptoms and were satisfied with their PP in subsequent follow-ups.⁷ More recently, *Henry et al.* presented an abstract where 13 of their included 15 PPI cases had complete resolution with conservative therapy. In that study, conservative therapy was only considered if the patients did not have systemic or septic symptoms.⁸ Finally, *Habous et al.* performed the largest retrospective study on 37 patients who underwent conservative therapy for a PPI and reported an 84% success rate with a mean complete resolution at 49 days (range: 29-97, SD 15.8 days).⁵ Patients were excluded if they presented with signs, symptoms or laboratory findings suggestive of sepsis. They concluded that conservative therapy is a safe, patient-friendly and cost-effective option for those with no signs of systemic illness.⁵

This was the first case of a significant localized infection associated with recent implantation of a PP treated with conservative management in our centre. The patient experienced complete resolution of symptoms within 24 days and was able to return to normal sexual activity shortly after. Such a result is not possible with surgical management. Despite the heterogeneity in the antibiotic regimens across the cited studies, the success of conservative therapy remains important. However, given that this was the first case of conservative management in our center, we are unable to derive specific management recommendations from our experience. Instead, we would highly suggest that the management of such presentations be approached in a strict case by case basis until further evidence be published on the matter. We believe that this report may contribute to further studies on the role of conservative management in patients with superficial PPI.

DRAFT

References

1. Bella AJ, Lee JC, Carrier S, et al. 2015 CUA practice guidelines for erectile dysfunction. *J Can Urol Assoc* 2015;9:23-29. doi:10.5489/cuaj.2699
2. Darouiche RO, Bella AJ, Boone TB, et al. North American consensus document on infection of penile prostheses. *Urology* 2013;82:937-42. doi:10.1016/j.urology.2013.05.048
3. Muench PJ. Infections versus penile implants: The war on bugs. *J Urol* 2013;189:1631-7. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2012.05.080
4. Mulcahy JJ. Long-term experience with salvage of infected penile implants. *J Urol* 2000;163:481-2. doi:10.1016/S0022-5347(05)67906-2
5. Habous M, Farag M, Williamson B, et al. Conservative therapy is an effective option in patients with localized infection after penile implant surgery. *J Sex Med* 2016;13:972-6. doi:10.1016/j.jsxm.2016.04.064
6. Lopategui DM, Balise RR, Bouzoubaa LA, et al. The Impact of Immediate Salvage Surgery on Corporeal Length Preservation in Patients Presenting with Penile Implant Infections. *J Urol* 2018;200:171-7. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2018.01.082
7. Derouet H, Uder M, Freyfogle EB, et al. Successful conservative treatment of infected penile prostheses. *Eur Urol* 2002;41:66-70. doi:10.1016/S0302-2838(01)00011-2
8. Henry G, Price G, Pryor M, et al. PD20-04 Observation of Local Clinical Penile Prosthesis Infections Instead of Immediate Salvage Rescue / Removal: Multicenter Study with Surprising Results. *J Urol* 2014;191:e613-3 doi:10.1016/j.juro.2014.02.1694

Figures and Tables

Fig. 1.



Fig. 2.

