

# The association between skin-to-vessel distance and surgical complications in renal transplantation

Joseph Moryousef<sup>1</sup>, Braden Millan<sup>1</sup>, Casey Qian<sup>2</sup>, Sean Lifshits<sup>2</sup>, Ruben Blachman-Braun<sup>3</sup>, Michael Uy<sup>1</sup>, Rahul Bansal<sup>1</sup>, Shahid Lambe<sup>1</sup>, Yanbo Guo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Surgery, Division of Urology, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Michael G. DeGroot School of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Department of Urology, University of Miami, Miller School of Medicine, Miami, FL, United States

Cite as: Moryousef J, Millan B, Qian C, et al. The association between skin-to-vessel distance and surgical complications in renal transplantation. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2026;20(2):44-9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.9331>

Published online October 27, 2025

Appendix available at [cuaj.ca](http://cuaj.ca)

## ABSTRACT

**INTRODUCTION:** Obesity is common among renal transplant recipients and increases the risk of perioperative complications. This study evaluated whether the distance from the skin to the external iliac vessels (SVD) is associated with adverse surgical outcomes in renal transplant recipients.

**METHODS:** A retrospective cohort study of 167 consecutive patients with preoperative cross-sectional imaging who underwent renal transplantation was conducted at a single center. SVD was measured as the distance from the skin to the anterior edge of the external iliac vein at its bifurcation through the musculoaponeurotic layer of the transversus abdominis and oblique muscles. The primary outcome was the rate of postoperative complications, classified by the Clavien-Dindo system.

**RESULTS:** SVD was associated with wound dehiscence (area under the curve [AUC] 0.696, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.55–0.84,  $p=0.007$ ) and wound complications (AUC 0.719, 95% CI 0.60–0.84,  $p<0.001$ ). Using an SVD threshold of  $\geq 19$  cm, we observed an overall accuracy of 87.4% for predicting wound dehiscence and 85.6% for any wound complication. The retrospective, single-center design and absence of standardized criteria for CT imaging are inherent limitations that can introduce several biases.

**CONCLUSIONS:** SVD is associated with adverse perioperative outcomes in renal transplantation. Given the indication for preoperative imaging only in high-risk patients, prospective data with a more general renal transplant population is warranted to further evaluate SVD.

## INTRODUCTION

Renal transplantation is the preferred treatment for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD), significantly improving quality of life and survival.<sup>1,2</sup> The prevalence of obesity has been rising, and is itself an independent risk factor for ESRD.<sup>3</sup>

Patients with obesity are often considered higher-risk transplant recipients due to increased perioperative complications, including wound dehiscence, infections, and delayed graft function, as well as long-term medical complications, such as graft failure and cardiovascular events.<sup>4-6</sup> Body mass index (BMI) has been shown to be an independent risk factor for graft loss and mortality; notably, its risk distribution follows a bimodal pattern, with an increased relative risk for individuals with a BMI  $>30$  kg/m<sup>2</sup> and  $<20$  kg/m<sup>2</sup>.<sup>7</sup>

Although many centers still use BMI in transplant selection criteria, emerging evidence suggests that the surgical risk associated with BMI thresholds may be overstated.<sup>8-10</sup> BMI has well-documented limitations, failing to account for variations in body composition, fat distribution, and muscle mass.<sup>6,11,12</sup> Given that many centers deny renal transplantation based solely on BMI, the need for a more precise measure of obesity to predict adverse outcomes is particularly important.

Cross-sectional imaging is an essential tool for preoperative surgical planning, as it enables the assessment of vascular health and a safe target landing zone for the graft anastomosis. In addition, the preoperative images can also allow for better differentiation of anatomical adiposity, which may be a

more accurate predictor of obesity-related risks in renal transplantation. This study aimed to evaluate whether the distance from the skin to external iliac vessels (SVD) is associated with adverse perioperative and postoperative surgical outcomes in renal transplant recipients.

**METHODS**

**Study design and population**

This was a retrospective cohort study of consecutive patients who underwent renal transplantation at a single center (St. Joseph’s Hospital, Hamilton, Ontario) between 2015 and 2019. Patients were identified using the Trillium Gift of Life database. Consecutive adult (age ≥ 18) patients undergoing deceased or living donor renal transplantation (solitary kidney transplant only) with preoperative computed tomography (CT) imaging within 12 months of surgery and a minimum of 12-month postoperative followup were included.

Only potential recipients who were deemed high risk for atherosclerotic disease (i.e., advanced age, time on dialysis, smoking status, history of cardiovascular disease, previous failed transplant) underwent a preoperative CT as a part of their transplant assessment cutoff. No specific BMI cutoff is used at our centre, although patients with a BMI ≥ 35 are encouraged to lose weight and are re-reviewed by a multidisciplinary team prior to placement on the transplant list. The Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB) approved the study protocol (REB #8074).

**Surgical approach and perioperative management**

Induction immunosuppression was done using methylprednisolone and basiliximab (low-risk or at the discretion of the transplant nephrologist) or anti-thymocyte globulin. Three surgeons performed all renal transplants via a modified Gibson incision. There was no use of prophylactic mesh or perinephric drains. The fascia was closed using two #1 loop PDS sutures. Patients are left with a Foley catheter for four days and a double-J ureteric stent for 4–6 weeks.

**Data collection**

All data were collected using a standardized form with prespecified categories, including demographic information, comorbidities, BMI, type of transplant, intraoperative details, postoperative complications, readmissions, graft function, and survival. SVD was measured from the skin to the anterior edge of the external iliac vein at its bifurcation through the musculoaponeurotic line

**Table 1. Demographic, morphometric and outcomes data**

Feature	Renal transplant recipients (n=167)
Age at transplant [years]	58.0 [50–66]
Sex	
Male	117 (70.1)
Female	50 (29.9)
Dialysis modality	
Hemodialysis	132 (79)
Peritoneal dialysis	19 (11.4)
No dialysis	7 (4.2)
Both	9 (5.4)
No previous RTx	145 (86.8)
RTx donor	
Living	49 (29.3)
NDD	38 (22.8)
DCD	80 (47.9)
Comorbidities	
Diabetes	91 (54.5)
Hypertension	144 (86.2)
Pulmonary disease	44 (26.3)
Cardiac disease	86 (51.5)
Ever smoker	54 (32.3)
Morphometric data	
BMI [kg/m <sup>2</sup> ]	29.4 [24.5–33.0]
SVD [cm]	13.23 [11.18–15.75]
Time from CT to RTx [mo]	9.0 [4.0–14.0]

Continuous variables reported as median [interquartile range]; nominal data reported as n (% cohort). BMI: body mass index; CT: computed tomography (contrast or non-contrast enhanced); DCD: donor after cardiac death; DGF: delayed graft function; EBL: estimated blood loss; LOS: length of stay; NDD: neurologic death donor; RTx: renal transplant; SVD: skin to external iliac vein distance; WIT: warm ischemic time.

of the transversus abdominis and oblique muscles. Measurements were performed using the axial sections from the preoperative CT scan. All SVD measurements were recorded by a single author (BM).

The primary outcome was the rate of postoperative wound complications (including surgical site infections, superficial and deep wound dehiscence, hemias, and col-

**Table 1 (cont'd). Demographic, morphometric and outcomes data**

Feature	Renal transplant recipients (n=167)
<b>Outcomes</b>	
EBL [mL]	250 [200–400]
WIT [min]	34.5 [29.0–41.0]
LOS [days]	7.0 [6.0–10.0]
DGF	34 (20.4)
Any post-op complication	83 (49.7)
Wound infection	12 (7.2)
Wound dehiscence	14 (8.4)
Any wound complication	21 (12.6)
30-day readmission	73 (43.7)
Postoperative complications ( $\geq 3$ Clavien-Dindo)	83 (49.7)

Continuous variables reported as median [interquartile range]; nominal data reported as n (% cohort). BMI: body mass index; CT: computed tomography (contrast or non-contrast enhanced); DCD: donor after cardiac death; DGF: delayed graft function; EBL: estimated blood loss; LOS: length of stay; NDD: neurologic death donor; RTx: renal transplant; SVD: skin to external iliac vein distance; WIT: warm ischemic time.

lections that required intervention). Secondary outcomes included wound complications that required procedural intervention (surgical or interventional radiology), all postoperative complications with Clavien-Dindo  $>3$ .

### Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS v.30 software. Categorical variables were expressed as counts and percentages, and continuous variables were expressed as medians, ranges, and interquartile ranges (IQR), based on normality testing. Univariable and multivariable-adjusted logistic regression was performed to evaluate the association (odds ratio [OR] and 95% confidence interval [CI]) between prespecified clinical variables and surgical outcomes. Missing variables were replaced with the median for that variable in the regression analysis based on a normality test.

Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were constructed to assess wound complications against BMI and SVD, and the area under the curve (AUC) of ROC curves was reported for the overall population. The sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and accuracy for different SVD distances were calculated.

Correlational analysis was conducted using the Pearson correlation test ( $\rho$ ). A two-tailed  $p$ -value  $<0.05$  was considered statistically significant. This study adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines (Supplementary Table 1; available at [cuaj.ca](http://cuaj.ca)).<sup>13</sup>

## RESULTS

### Patient demographics and clinical features

Table 1 summarizes the cohort demographic and surgical data. A total of 167 renal transplant recipients were included for analysis, with a median age of 58 years (IQR 50–66), of whom 117 (70.1%) were male. Only seven (4.2%) individuals were not on dialysis before transplantation, 132 (79.0%) were on hemodialysis, 19 (11.4%) on peritoneal dialysis, and nine (5.4%) transitioned between modalities. Most individuals (145, 86.8%) had no history of previous renal transplantation. The most prevalent comorbidities were hypertension (144, 86.2%), diabetes mellitus (91, 54.5%), cardiac disease (86, 51.5%), and a smoking history (52, 32.3%).

### Renal transplant

Among the 167 recipients, 49 (29.3%) received living donor grafts, while 118 (70.7%) received deceased donor grafts. The median estimated blood loss (EBL) was 250 cc (IQR 200–400), the median warm ischemic time (WIT) was 34.5 minutes (IQR 29.0–41.0), the median length of hospital stay was seven days (IQR 6.0–10.0), and the 30-day all-cause readmission rate was 43.7%. Wound infections were observed in 12 (7.2%) recipients, and 83 (49.7%) experienced a major complication, including 14 (8.4%) patients who experienced wound dehiscence.

### Outcomes

The median SVD was 132.3 mm (IQR 111.8–157.5). On univariable analysis (Table 2), SVD was associated with an increased risk of all wound complications (OR 1.26, 95% CI 1.09–1.45,  $p=0.002$ ), wound complications requiring intervention (OR 1.21, 95% CI 1.03–1.43,  $p=0.022$ ), and all postoperative complications  $>$ Clavien-Dindo 3 (OR 1.13, 95% CI 1.03–1.24,  $p=0.012$ ).

Similarly, SVD was a significant predictor for any wound complications (AUC 0.719, 95% CI 0.60–0.84,  $p<0.001$ ), wound complications requiring intervention (AUC 0.696, 95% CI, 0.55–0.84,  $p=0.007$ ), and all postoperative complications. Using  $\geq 19$  cm as a threshold,

**Table 2. Univariable and multivariable-adjusted logistic regression analysis to determine the association between clinical variables and postoperative complications**

	Univariable								
	Wound dehiscence			Any wound complication			Postoperative complications*		
	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p
Age (per 1-year increase)	1.004	0.962–1.048	0.846	1.007	0.971–1.044	0.699	1.023	0.998–1.048	0.067
Sex (male vs. female)	3.524	1.154–10.762	0.027	1.921	0.753–4.900	0.172	1.017	0.525–1.973	0.960
BMI (per 1 kg/m <sup>2</sup> increase)	1.173	1.052–1.309	0.004	1.174	1.069–1.289	<0.001	1.036	0.981–1.095	0.199
Diabetes mellitus	1.559	0.499–4.866	0.445	1.792	0.684–4.698	0.235	1.589	0.860–2.935	0.139
Hypertension	2.183	0.272–17.536	0.463	3.548	0.453–27.810	0.228	1.644	0.669–4.040	0.278
Ever smoked	1.641	0.539–4.989	0.383	1.683	0.662–4.279	0.274	1.581	0.822–3.041	0.170
SVD (per 1 cm increase)	1.210	1.027–1.425	0.022	1.256	1.089–1.449	0.002	1.129	1.027–1.241	0.012
EBL (per 100 cc)	1.202	1.011–1.428	0.037	1.149	0.982–1.346	0.084	1.102	0.956–1.271	0.182
Warm ischemic time	1.004	0.966–1.043	0.853	0.997	0.959–1.036	0.873	1.017	0.988–1.047	0.250
Donor allograft									
Living	1			1			1		
Deceased	5.943	0.756–46.740	0.090	2.760	0.774–9.839	0.117	3.083	1.517–6.263	0.002
	Multivariable								
	Wound dehiscence			Any wound complication			Postoperative complications*		
	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p	OR	95% CI	p
Age (per 1-year increase)	0.982	0.923–1.044	0.553	0.979	0.930–1.031	0.421	1.001	0.973–1.031	0.919
Sex (male vs. female)	3.602	0.987–13.140	0.052	1.864	0.633–5.490	0.259	1.058	0.516–2.168	0.878
BMI (per 1 kg/m <sup>2</sup> increase)	1.203	1.025–1.411	0.023	1.163	1.021–1.325	0.023	0.996	0.917–1.081	0.915
Diabetes mellitus	0.681	0.145–3.195	0.626	0.996	0.291–3.411	0.995	1.101	0.538–2.251	0.793
Hypertension	4.090	0.307–54.532	0.287	4.680	0.451–48.558	0.196	1.543	0.587–4.058	0.380
Ever smoked	1.845	0.458–7.424	0.389	2.153	0.693–6.683	0.185	1.606	0.789–3.272	0.192
SVD (per 1 cm increase)	1.035	0.801–1.337	0.794	1.102	0.898–1.353	0.354	1.102	0.957–1.270	0.177
EBL (per 100 cc)	1.111	0.924–1.335	0.265	1.077	0.908–1.278	0.395	1.048	0.898–1.223	0.552
Warm ischemic time	0.997	0.939–1.059	0.923	0.986	0.934–1.041	0.613	1.003	0.974–1.031	0.863
Donor allograft									
Living	1			1			1		
Deceased	8.680	0.906–83.18	0.061	4.272	0.948–19.251	0.059	2.834	1.265–6.346	0.011


\*Postoperative complications ≥3 Clavien-Dindo. BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; SVD: skin-to-vessel distance; OR: odds ratio.

the model achieved an accuracy of 87.4% for predicting wound dehiscence and 85.6% for predicting any wound complication.


On multivariable analysis, however, SVD was not significantly predictive of our primary or secondary outcomes. BMI was a significant predictor of wound

complications (OR 1.17, 95% CI 1.07–1.29, p<0.001) and wound complications requiring intervention (OR 1.17, 95% CI 1.05–1.31, p=0.004).

SVD and BMI were positively correlated (Pearson coefficient 0.68, p<0.001); however, they clearly could differ based on body composition and proportions. Figure



**Figure 1.** Sample calculation of skin to vessel distance for two individuals with a body mass index of 29, but differing skin to the external iliac vessels of (A) 114 mm and (B) 133 mm.



**Figure 2.** (A) Pearson correlational analysis between body mass index (BMI) (kg/m<sup>2</sup>) and skin-to-vessel distance (SVD) ( $\rho=0.682$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for (B) wound dehiscence in relation for BMI (area under the curve [AUC] 0.724, 95% CI 0.595–0.854,  $p=0.001$ ) and SVD (AUC 0.696, 95% CI 0.553–0.840,  $p=0.007$ ), and (C) any wound complication in relation for BMI (AUC 0.731, 95% CI 0.622–0.840,  $p<0.001$ ) and SVD (AUC 0.719, 95% CI 0.601–0.836,  $p<0.001$ ). CI: confidence interval.

l demonstrates an example of SVD measurement in two individuals with a BMI of 29 but differing SVD of (A) 114 mm and (B) 133 mm. In our sample, there were 16 patients (9.5%) who were in the upper quartile of BMI (>33.0) but not in the upper quartile of SVD (>15.8).

BMI was correlated with SVD ( $\rho=0.682$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (Figure 2A); and both BMI and SVD demonstrated discriminatory ability for predicting wound dehiscence and overall wound complications, with comparable AUCs ranging from 0.696–0.731 (Figure 2B, 2C).

## DISCUSSION

This study demonstrates that increased SVD is associated with worse postoperative outcomes in renal transplantation, postoperative wound complications, wound complications that required procedural inter-

vention, and overall postoperative complications with a Clavien-Dindo >3.

SVD was not an independent predictor separate from BMI on multivariate analysis. Clearly, SVD and BMI are highly correlated; however, BMI has well-documented limitations, as it fails to account for body composition, fat distribution, or fluid status fluctuations in dialysis patients.<sup>14,15</sup> We did find a subset of our study population that had an elevated BMI but relatively normal SVD, and those with an elevated SVD and BMI; however, given the size of our sample, we were not able to identify whether BMI or SVT would be a stronger predictor of their postoperative risks.

Emerging literature is re-evaluating various obesity parameters in addition to BMI in surgical risk assessment. A notable cohort study of 248 overweight or obese renal transplant recipients also found that SVD was a significant predictor of postoperative complications within one year (OR 1.2, 95% CI 1.1–1.3,  $p=0.002$ ), corroborating our results.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, a study of 163 obese patients found that the abdominal perimeter was predictive of postoperative complications (OR 1.05, 95% CI 1.02–1.09,  $p=0.03$ ).<sup>16</sup>

Morphometric parameters can be quickly evaluated on routine preoperative cross-sectional imaging. Increasing SVD may increase operative complexity by necessitating longer incisions for adequate exposure in deep dissections, thereby elevating the risk of wound-related complications such as surgical site infections, fascial dehiscence, and incisional hernias. As such, SVD offers a simple and practical supplement for preoperative risk stratification, facilitates patient counseling, and can be readily incorporated into clinical assessment.

A key motivation for improving obesity assessment in renal transplant is the well-documented increased perioperative risk in this population. Multiple studies have shown an increased risk of adverse outcomes, including delayed graft function, graft failure, increased urine protein, acute rejection, infections, dehiscence, and secondary interventions.<sup>4,5,17</sup> While BMI may not fully capture the complexities of obesity-mediated perioperative transplant morbidity, its role in stratifying perioperative risk underscores the need for a more nuanced approach to obesity assessment in renal transplant candidates.

Some proponents advocate for early transplantation regardless of obesity status.<sup>4</sup> The “obesity paradox” suggests that weight loss may be associated with adverse outcomes, such as infections due to suboptimal nutritional status.<sup>8,17</sup> Additionally, delaying transplantation to allow for sufficient weight loss prolongs time on dialysis, which has been associated with worse postoperative graft function and overall survival.<sup>9,16</sup> Morphometric parameters, such as

SVD, have the potential to provide an adjunct measure of body composition and postoperative risks.

Recently, there has been increasing interest in robot-assisted renal transplantation, particularly for obese patients. Robotic techniques provide greater dexterity and precision for vascular anastomoses while also offering the minimally invasive benefits of laparoscopy.<sup>18</sup> Patient selection remains critical, and morphometric parameters, such as SVD, may guide our choice of surgical approach.

### Strengths and limitations

This study benefits from a well-characterized cohort of renal transplant recipients representative of a real-world population, including variation in dialysis modality, donor type, and comorbidities. The inclusion of consecutive patients with standardized measurement of a novel morphometric parameter (i.e., SVD) from preoperative imaging, and its direct comparison to BMI — a widely used clinical benchmark — enhances the clinical relevance and interpretability of the findings.

However, the study is limited by its retrospective, single-center design, which introduces potential selection and measurement biases. The absence of standardized criteria for preoperative CT imaging raises the possibility of confounding by indication, as imaging was more likely obtained in higher-risk patients, including individuals with known coronary or peripheral vascular disease, chronic medical comorbidity (i.e., diabetes mellitus, hypertension), significant smoking history, and obesity; this selection bias consequently introduces a demographic at higher risk for adverse perioperative outcomes within this cohort.

Furthermore, the time interval between imaging and surgery was not controlled for, which may have affected the accuracy of SVD measurements relative to operative risk. The modest sample size has limited power for subgroup analysis, and residual confounding remains a concern despite multivariable adjustment.

Future research should evaluate SVD prospectively, particularly in assessing its role in predicting outcomes following weight loss.

### CONCLUSIONS

Obesity presents a significant challenge in renal transplantation due to its association with increased perioperative risks. Our study assessed the SVD, an anatomic morphometric parameter, and its association with adverse postoperative surgical outcomes, including major postoperative complications (Clavien-Dindo  $\geq 3$ ), wound complications, and wound dehiscence. While BMI remained a strong predictor of postoperative com-

plications, SVD may act as an adjunct measure in a subset of the population. Further research is required prior to its use as a validated tool in clinical practice.

COMPETING INTERESTS: The authors do not report any competing personal or financial interests related to this work.

### REFERENCES

1. Reese PP, Shults J, Bloom RD, et al. Functional Status, time to transplantation, and survival benefit of kidney transplantation among wait-listed candidates. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2015;66:837-45. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.ajkd.2015.05.015>
2. Kostro JZ, Hellmann A, Kobiela J, et al. Quality of Life after kidney transplantation: A prospective study. *Transplant Proc* 2016;48:50-4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2015.10.058>
3. Wang Y, Chen X, Song Y, et al. Association between obesity and kidney disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Kidney Int* 2008;73:19-33. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ki.5002586>
4. Marzorati S, Iovino D, Inversini D, et al. Open renal transplantation in obese patients: A Correlation study between BMI and Early and late complications with implementation of a prognostic risk score. *Life* 2024;14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/life14070915>
5. Johnson DW, Isbel NM, Brown AM, et al. The effect of obesity on renal transplant outcomes. *Transplantation* 2002;74:675-81. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007890-200209150-00015>
6. Aziz F, Ramadorai A, Parajuli S, et al. Obesity: An Independent predictor of morbidity and graft loss after kidney transplantation. *Am J Nephrol* 2020;51:615-23. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000509105>
7. Lynch RJ, Ranney DN, Shijie C, et al. Obesity, surgical site infection, and outcome following renal transplantation. *Ann Surg* 2009;250:1014-20. <https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181b4ee9a>
8. Chung H, Lam WWT, Yuen LPK, et al. Renal transplantation: better fat than thin. *J Surg Res* 2015;194:644-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.12.027>
9. Varelziz R, Naljayam M, Reisin E. The Incidence and pathophysiology of the obesity paradox: Should peritoneal dialysis and kidney transplant be offered to patients with obesity and end-stage renal disease? *Curr Hypertens Rep* 2018;20:84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11906-018-0882-y>
10. Cacciola RA, Pujar K, Ilham MA, et al Effect of degree of obesity on renal transplant outcome. *Transplant Proc* 2008;40:3408-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2008.05.085>
11. Pinar U, Rod X, Mageau A, et al. Surgical complications risk in obese and overweight recipients for kidney transplantation: A predictive morphometric model based on sarcopenia and vessel-to-skin distance. *World J Urol* 2021;39:2223-30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-020-03407-5>
12. Westenberg LB, van Londen M, Zorgdrager M, et al. Higher abdominal fat area associates with lower donor kidney function before and after living kidney donation. *Sci Rep* 2024;14:31487. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-83320-8>
13. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:344-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008>
14. Gurunathan U, Myles PS. Limitations of body mass index as an obesity measure of perioperative risk. *BJA* 2016;116:319-21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aev541>
15. Charra B. Fluid balance, dry weight, and blood pressure in dialysis. *Hemodialysis Int* 2007;11:21-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4758.2007.00148.x>
16. Kuntz S, Rouby AF, Schaeffer M, et al. Computed-tomography-based predictive scores of surgical complications to help decision-making in enrolling obese patients in kidney transplantation list. *Int J Obes* 2021;45:2274-6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-021-00886-3>
17. Kwan JM, Hajjiri Z, Metwally A, et al. Effect of the Obesity epidemic on kidney transplantation: Obesity is independent of diabetes as a risk factor for adverse renal transplant outcomes. *PLoS One* 2016;11:e0165712. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0165712>
18. Tzvetanov IG, Tulla KA, Di Cocco P, et al. Robotic kidney transplant: The modern era technical revolution. *Transplantation* 2022;106. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TP.0000000000003881>

CORRESPONDENCE: Dr. Yanbo Guo, McMaster University, St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton, ON, Canada; [yanbo.guo@medportal.ca](mailto:yanbo.guo@medportal.ca)