

# Ureteral Stent Placement following Ureteroscopy Increases Emergency Department Visits in a Statewide Surgical Collaborative



# Spencer C. Hiller,\* Stephanie Daignault-Newton,† Hector Pimentel, Sapan N. Ambani, John Ludlow, John M. Hollingsworth, Khurshid R. Ghani‡,§ and Casey A. Dauw§

From the Department of Urology (SCH, SD-N, SNA, JMH, KRG, CAD), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Spectrum Health (HP), Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Western Michigan Urological Associates (JL), Holland, Michigan

**Purpose:** Ureteral stents are commonly placed after ureteroscopy. Although studies indicate that stents are associated with patient discomfort, their impact on downstream health services use is unclear. We examined patterns of stent utilization in Michigan and their association with unplanned health care encounters.

**Materials and Methods:** We used the Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative's Reducing Operative Complications from Kidney Stones (MUSIC ROCKS) clinical registry to identify ureteroscopy cases between 2016 and 2019. Factors associated with stent placement were examined using bivariate and multivariable statistics. Using multivariable logistic regression, we evaluated whether stent placement was associated with emergency department visits and hospitalizations within 30 days.

**Results**: We identified 9,662 ureteroscopies and a stent was placed in 7,025 (73%) of these. Frequency of stent use across the 137 urologists varied (11%-100%, p <0.001) and was not associated with total case volume. Factors associated with stent use included age and stone size. Pre-stented cases and renal stones had a decreased odds of stent placement. On multivariable analysis after adjusting for risk factors, stent placement was associated with a 1.25 higher odds of emergency department visit (OR 1.25, 95% CI 1.01–1.54, p=0.043) but not hospitalization (OR 1.28, 95% CI 0.94–1.76, p=0.12). In a single high volume practice, 0.5% of cases that omitted a stent required urgent stenting postoperatively.

**Conclusions:** There is substantial variation in the use of stents in Michigan, irrespective of case volume. Stent placement significantly increased the odds of an emergency department visit after surgery. Importantly, stent omission rarely required subsequent urgent stent placement.

Key Words: ureter; stents; ureteroscopy; urinary calculi; emergency service, hospital

URETEROSCOPY is the most frequently performed surgical procedure for urinary stone disease.<sup>1</sup> In the United States, as many as 15% of patients undergoing ureteroscopy have an emergency department visit or hospitalization postoperatively, amounting to a significant financial burden.<sup>2</sup> Thus, efforts targeted toward reducing such unplanned visits would result in significant cost savings for the health care system. Pain and hematuria are among the most common chief complaints for these visits,<sup>2,3</sup> symptoms commonly attributed to a ureteral stent.<sup>4</sup> However, the impact

0022-5347/21/2056-0001/0 THE JOURNAL OF UROLOGY<sup>®</sup> © 2021 by American Urological Association Education and Research, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1097/JU.000000000001653 Vol. 205, 1-8, June 2021 Printed in U.S.A.

Abbreviations and Acronyms						
BMI = body mass index						
CCI = Charlson comorbidity index						
ED = emergency department						
MUSIC = Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative						
ROCKS = Reducing Operative Complications from Kidney Stones						
UAS = ureteral access sheath						
URS = ureteroscopy						

Accepted for publication January 5, 2021.

Study was funded by grants from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan, *The Journal of Urology*®, National Institutes of Health and Boston Scientific.

\*Correspondence: Department of Urology, University of Michigan, 1500 E. Medical Center Dr., 3875 Taubman Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109 (telephone: 734-936-7030; FAX: 734-232-2400; email: spehill@med.umich.edu).

† Financial interest and/or other relationship with the Society for Urodynamics & Female Urology (SUFU) Research Foundation.

 $\mbox{\tt +}$  Financial interest and/or other relationship with Lumenis.

 ${\bf \$}$  Financial interest and/or other relationship with Boston Scientific.

of stent placement on subsequent health care utilization remains unclear.

The American Urological Association and European Association of Urology's guidelines on the surgical management of urinary stones advocates stent omission in the setting of uncomplicated URS.<sup>5,6</sup> Despite these guidelines, stents are commonly placed, with large series demonstrating placement rates ranging from 66% to 84%.<sup>3,7</sup> Although a recent analysis from the Cochrane Database concluded that stent placement after URS may slightly reduce the number of unplanned health care visits following surgery, this finding was tempered by very low certainty of evidence.<sup>8</sup>

In this context, we used the Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative's Reducing Operative Complications from Kidney Stones registry to characterize the patterns of stent use following URS in the state of Michigan. In particular, we define factors associated with ureteral stent utilization, as well as determine the association between stent placement and unplanned health care encounters following URS. Our goal is to learn from these analyses to better inform patients undergoing URS of the risks and stimulate future research to develop interventions that reduce unnecessary ED visits and hospitalizations after surgery.

#### METHODS

#### **Data Source**

Established in 2011, MUSIC is a statewide quality improvement consortium formed in partnership with Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan. The ROCKS initiative was launched in 2016 with the overarching goal of reducing unplanned health care encounters following URS. This prospective clinical registry is comprised of a diverse collection of academic and community urology practices throughout the state. Currently, 37 practices participate in ROCKS, accounting for greater than 90% of the urologists within Michigan. Methods of data collection have been previously described.<sup>9,10</sup> To ensure data quality, the coordinating center performs regular on-site data audits. Each practice has obtained an exemption or approval by the local institutional review board for participation in the collaborative (IRB No. HUM00054438).

#### **Study Cohort**

We included all primary URS within the registry occurring from June 2016 to May 2019. We excluded cases on patients <18 years old, synchronous bilateral surgery, and staged cases which we defined as 2 or more ipsilateral URS within a 4-week period. We chose to exclude staged cases as they are likely to be left with a stent to facilitate the secondary procedure. We additionally excluded procedures for stones >20 mm, as there are few within the registry (129) and are not likely to be considered for stent omission.

 Table 1. Demographics, clinical characteristics and outcomes in cases with and without stent placement

	No Stent	Stent	p Value
No. URS cases (%) Mean±SD age (yrs)	2,637 (27.3) 53.2±16.4	7,025 (72.7) 55.8±15.9	<0.001
No. gender (%):			< 0.001
Male	1,218 (46.2)	3,514 (50.0)	
Female	1,419 (53.8)	3,510 (50.0)	
No. insurance (%):			0.004
Private	1,580 (60.3)	4,050 (57.9)	
Public	972 (37.1)	2,809 (40.2)	
None	69 (2.6)	135 (1.9)	
No. BMI (%):			0.5
<u>≤</u> 25	517 (22.0)	1,416 (21.6)	
>25-≤30	758 (32.2)	2,057 (31.4)	
>30-<35	531 (22.6)	1,513 (23.1)	
>35	548 (23.3)	1,569 (23.9)	
No. CCI (%):			0.2
0	1,898 (72.0)	4,855 (69.1)	
1	358 (13.6)	1,200 (17.1)	
<u>≥</u> 2	379 (14.4)	967 (13.8)	
No. preop urine culture result (%):			0.6
Pos	319 (12.1)	862 (12.3)	
Neg	1,775 (67.4)	4,779 (68.1)	
Not performed	541 (20.5)	1,376 (19.6)	
No. pre-stented (%)	1,337 (50.8)	2,443 (35.1)	< 0.001
Mean $\pm$ SD stone size (mm)	6.1±2.8	$7.6 \pm 3.5$	< 0.001
No. stone diameter (%):			< 0.001
<u>≤</u> 5 mm	1,202 (47.7)	1,987 (29.6)	
>5 mm—≤10 mm	1,144 (45.4)	3,527 (52.5)	
>10 mm	176 (7.0)	1,209 (18.0)	
No. stone location (%):			0.002
Ureter	1,542 (63.5)	3,858 (59.4)	
Kidney	528 (21.8)	1,522 (24.1)	
Both	358 (14.7)	1,068 (16.5)	
No. ureteral access sheath use (%)	395 (15.1)	3,096 (44.9)	< 0.001
No. intraop complication (%):	9 (0.3)	73 (1.0)	<0.001
Bleeding	8 (88.9)	50 (68.5)	
Perforation	1 (11.1)	23 (31.5)	
No. emergency department visit (%)	186 (7.1)	599 (8.5)	0.018
No. hospitalization	76 (2.9)	267 (3.8)	0.030

#### **Outcomes and Statistical Methods**

We characterized cases with and without stent placement across a range of demographic and clinical measures. Demographic factors included age, gender and insurance type. Clinical factors included body mass index, Charlson comorbidity index,<sup>11</sup> urine culture (positive, negative, not performed), presence of a stent prior to URS (pre-stented), stone size ( $\leq 5$  mm, >5 mm to  $\leq 10$  mm, >10 mm), stone location (renal, ureteral, both), ureteral access sheath use, and occurrence of an intraoperative ureteral perforation or bleeding that precluded case completion. Categorical variables were compared using chi-square tests, and continuous variables were compared using a t-test or Wilcoxon rank-sum. Provider and practice-level variation in stent utilization across the ROCKS registry was described using proportions and differences tested using a Wald chi-square. Correlation between URS case volume and stent placement rate at a surgeon and practice-level was calculated using Spearman correlation. The count and 95% exact binomial confidence interval are reported. For reliability purposes, only providers or practices with  $\geq$  10 URS in the registry were included in the provider and practice-specific analysis. Since a potential ramification of stent omission is the need for urgent stent placement, we performed an independent chart review of all

# ARTICLE IN PRESS

#### STENT PLACEMENT DURING URETEROSCOPY



cases with stent omission with a 30-day ED visit at a single practice to understand the magnitude of this complication.

We used a multivariable logistic regression mixed model with provider nested in practice as random effects as well as BMI, CCI, urine culture result, pre-stent status, stone size, stone location, UAS use, and occurrence of an intraoperative ureteral perforation or bleeding that precluded case completion as fixed effects to determine the factors independently associated with stent placement. Two separate logistic regression mixed models were constructed to assess the association of stent placement with ED visit and with hospitalization within 30 days as dependent variables. These models also included provider nested in practice as random effects as well as BMI, CCI, urine culture result, pre-stent status, stone size, stone location, UAS use, and occurrence of an intraoperative ureteral perforation or bleeding that precluded case completion as fixed effects. To address the significant difference in rates of stent placement between pre-stented and nonpre-stented cases, analysis for confounding was performed assessing the difference in odds of an ED visit between these 2 groups via the Breslow-Day test for homogeneity of odds ratios.

Propensity score analyses were performed as a sensitivity analysis to address potential confounding. In short, the propensity for stenting was estimated from the logistic model for stent placement described above. Greedy 1-to-1 matching was performed with an absolute difference of less than 0.001 between propensity scores of stented to nonstented patients, resulting in 1,307 matched pairs. Odds ratios among the matched pairs are presented and the McNemar test was used to assess significance. Additionally, inverse probability treatment weighting propensity score logistic models were performed with multiple propensity score trimming cutoffs based on propensity score overlap to provide a range of effect size estimates for ranges of confounding adjustment. The analysis was completed with 2-sided significance testing assuming a type I error of 0.05 using SAS® 9.4.

#### RESULTS

We identified a total of 9,662 URS procedures performed between June 2016 and May 2019. Overall, a stent was placed in 72.7% of URS cases, including 71.4% of cases for ureteral stones, 72.6% of cases for renal stones, and 74.9% of cases when both a ureteral and renal stone were present.

Table 1 displays the demographic and clinical characteristics of cases in our analysis. There were significant differences between cases with and without a stent placed with regard to age, gender, insurance, pre-stenting, UAS use, intraoperative complication, stone size and location. Cases with stent placement tended to be larger and without pre-stent.

There were 137 surgeons from 24 practices who had performed at least 10 URS cases. We observed significant variation in the frequency of stent use at both a provider and practice level. The mean frequency of stent placement among urologists was

# ARTICLE IN PRESS



Figure 2. Variation in rates of stent placement by practice (bars) and by urologist (bubble) within each practice. Size of bubble is scaled to represent total URS case volume for individual urologist.

74.8% and varied from 10.7% to 100% (p <0.001; fig. 1). Eight urologists (6%) placed a stent in all URS cases and 120 (88%) placed a stent in  $\geq$  50% of URS cases. Academic practices (associated with a residency program) had a significantly lower rate of stent placement compared to nonacademic practices (67.9% vs 75.7%, p < 0.001). There was a broad range of stent usage irrespective of total URS volume (fig. 1). Within the 24 practices with  $\geq$  10 URS cases, stent placement rates ranged from 33.6% to 100% (p <0.001; fig. 2). Even within individual practices, the rates of stent placement varied between urologists irrespective of case volume (fig. 2). We found no significant correlation between total URS case volume and stent placement rate among urologists as well as practices (-0.1, 95% CI - 0.26 - 0.07, p = 0.24 and -0.25, 95%CI -0.58-0.19, p=0.27, respectively).

The results of our multivariable model, accounting for provider and practice-level variation, indicated that several factors were independently associated with stent utilization (table 2). In particular, age, pre-stenting, stone size, stone location and UAS use significantly impacted the odds of stent placement. Those with larger stones (>5 mm-  $\leq$  10mm OR 1.89, and >10 mm OR 4.68) had a significantly higher odds of stent placement. However, those with stones located within the kidney (OR 0.69) had decreased odds of stent

placement relative to the ureter. Cases with a UAS had fivefold higher odds of having a stent placed (OR 5.43). However, pre-stented cases had 75% lower odds of having a stent placed (OR 0.25).

The overall rate of an ED visit within 30 days of URS was 8.1%, while the rate of hospitalization was 3.5%. Reasons for ED visits are compared between those with and without a stent in table 3. Stented and unstented patients had significantly different unadjusted rates of ED visits (8.5% vs 7.1%, p=0.02) and hospitalization (3.8% vs 2.9%, p=0.03; table 1). After controlling for patient, provider and practice-level differences on multivariable analysis, stent placement during URS was independently associated with a 1.25 higher odds of an ED visit within 30 days (OR 1.25, 95% CI 1.01-1.54, p=0.043) but not significantly associated with postoperative hospitalization (OR 1.28, 95% CI 0.94-1.76, p=0.12; table 4). These associations persisted on sensitivity analysis with propensity score models (table 5). The propensity score distribution by stent placement status is presented in figure 3. The odds of an ED visit were not significantly different between those with and without a pre-stent (OR 1.28, 95% CI 0.96-1.70 vs OR 1.08, 95% CI 0.87–1.34, p=0.36). At a single practice, of the 399 cases without intraoperative stent placement, only 2 (0.5%) required urgent stenting.

Variation						
	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p Value			
Age (unit change from mean)	1.01	1.00-1.01	< 0.001			
Male gender (vs female)	1.12	0.99-1.27	0.079			
BMI:			0.6			
<25 (vs >35)	1.01	0.84-1.22				
>25-<30 (vs $>35$ )	0.91	0.77-1.07				
>30-35 (vs $>35$ )	0.97	0.81-1.17				
Insurance:			0.4			
Private (vs public)	0.97	0.85-1.12				
None (vs public)	0.76	0.49-1.17				
CCI:			0.4			
1 (vs 0)	1.13	0.94-1.35				
>2 (vs 0)	1.00	0.83-1.21				
Urine culture:			0.5			
Pos (vs neg)	1.11	0.91-1.35				
Not performed (vs neg)	0.97	0.81-1.16				
Pre-stented (vs no)	0.25	0.22-0.29	< 0.001			
Stone diameter:			< 0.001			
>5 mm—<10 mm (vs <5 mm)	1.89	1.65-2.15				
>10 mm (vs <5 mm)	4.68	3.70-5.92				
Stone location:			< 0.001			
Kidney (vs ureter)	0.69	0.59-0.82				
Both (vs ureter)	0.99	0.83-1.19				
Ureteral access sheath (vs.no)	5 43	4 57-6 46	< 0.001			

2.18

0.92-5.20

0.078

**Table 2.** Multivariable model assessing risk factors for stentplacement at ureteroscopy, adjusting for provider and practicevariation

## DISCUSSION

Intraop complication (vs no)

In our study, representing a diverse group of urology practices, we found that stents were placed in nearly three-quarters of URSs. Patterns of use varied greatly between individual urologists and practices. Several factors were independently associated with stent placement including age, stone size, and UAS use while pre-stenting and stones located in the kidney were associated with a lower odds of stent placement. Stent placement had important implications for patients in that they had higher odds of an ED visit within 30 days of surgery. Additionally, stent omission had a low rate of subsequent urgent stent placement. Collectively, these findings suggest that the decision to place a stent is influenced by both patient and surgeon-level factors but its use is not inconsequential.

There is currently insufficient evidence to accurately characterize every factor that contributes to the decision to place a stent. Although guidelines advocate for stent omission in uncomplicated URS,<sup>5,6</sup> the definition of uncomplicated URS remains ambiguous. Investigators representing the Clinical Research Office of the Endourological Society identified presence of an intraoperative complication, stone impaction, increasing operative time and stone burden, and increased patient age as predictors for stent placement.<sup>7</sup> These findings are consistent with the results of our study.

In a survey of Endourological Society members, 64% of respondents indicated that they utilize a stent in every URS.<sup>12</sup> When limited to the United

**Table 3.** Reason for ED visit in patients with and withoutureteral stent

	No. No Stent (%)	No. Stent (%)	Total (%)
ED visits	186 (23.7)	599 (76.3)	785 (100)
Flank pain	109 (58.6)	317 (52.9)	426 (54.3)
Other	69 (37.1)	212 (35.4)	281 (35.8)
Hematuria	29 (15.6)	113 (18.9)	142 (18.1)
Urinary tract infection	26 (14.0)	113 (18.9)	139 (17.7)
Fever	26 (14.0)	79 (13.2)	105 (13.4)
Nausea	20 (10.8)	76 (12.7)	96 (12.2)
Abdominal pain	10 (5.4)	41 (6.8)	51 (6.5)
Dysuria	8 (4.3)	38 (6.3)	46 (5.9)
Sepsis	13 (7.0)	32 (5.3)	45 (5.7)
Urinary frequency	7 (3.8)	30 (5.0)	37 (4.7)
Urinary retention	10 (5.4)	24 (4.0)	34 (4.3)
Stent displacement	0 (0)	17 (2.8)	17 (2.2)
Bladder pain	2 (1.1)	11 (1.8)	13 (1.7)
Syncope	0 (0)	9 (1.5)	9 (1.1)
Obstructing stone	2 (1.1)	5 (0.8)	7 (0.9)
Deep venous thrombosis	0 (0)	4 (0.7)	4 (0.5)
Renal failure	1 (0.5)	3 (0.5)	4 (0.5)
Peri-renal hematoma	0 (0)	2 (0.3)	2 (0.3)
Ureteral injury	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1 (0.1)
Cerebrovascular accident	0 (0)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.1)

States, 76% and 81% of respondents indicated placing a stent in three-quarters of URSs for ureteral and renal stones, respectively.<sup>13</sup> In the present study, universal stent use was observed in only 6% of providers. Regardless, it appears clear that stents are placed frequently. Variation between prior studies and our own only further highlights the inconsistencies in practice patterns surrounding stent placement.

An important finding from our study relates to the implications of stent placement on patients and the health care system. Results of our logistic regression model indicate that stent placement is associated with a higher odds of ED visit following URS. These findings differ from a recent Cochrane Review that included 16 randomized controlled trials and a total of 1,970 patients.<sup>8</sup> The authors concluded that placement of a stent may slightly reduce the risk of an ED visit but they acknowledge a high level of uncertainty of this finding and graded the quality of evidence as very low.

Our findings must be viewed within the context of some limitations. Although the MUSIC registry includes a wide range of clinical and surgical variables, it is not exhaustive, thus introducing the possibility of confounding. Specifically, the registry does not include the size or type of stent or UAS, grade of ureteral perforation, degree of bleeding or operative time. Furthermore, the registry inherently lacks the granularity to collect subjective metrics such as the amount of resistance while passing the UAS or tightness of the ureter. As such, there are factors unaccounted for in our model. Additionally, our results are based on practices within a single state and may not be generalizable

	ED Visit			Hospitalization			
	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p Value	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p Value	
Stent placement (vs no)	1.25	1.01-1.54	0.0428	1.28	0.94—1.76	0.12	
Age (unit change from mean)	0.99	0.98-0.99	< 0.001	0.99	0.98-1.00	0.012	
Male vs female gender	0.87	0.74-1.03	0.011	1.06	0.83-1.35	0.6	
BMI:			0.7			0.9	
<25 (vs >35)	0.89	0.70-1.14		1.10	0.78-1.56		
>25 - <30 (vs $>35$ )	0.95	0.76-1.18		1.04	0.75-1.44		
>30 - <35 (vs $>35$ )	1.02	0.81-1.28		0.96	0.67-1.37		
Insurance:			0.3			0.03	
Private (vs public)	0.87	0.73-1.04		0.73	0.56-0.94		
None (vs public)	0.84	0.46-1.53		0.43	0.13-1.38		
CCI:			< 0.001			< 0.001	
1 (vs 0)	1.26	1.00-1.58		1.57	1.14-2.17		
>2 (vs 0)	1.59	1.26-2.02		2.19	1.59-3.02		
Urine culture:			0.007			0.005	
Pos (vs neg)	1.27	1.00-1.61		1.54	1.12-2.13		
Not performed (vs neg)	0.77	0.60-0.98		0.79	0.55-1.13		
Pre-stented (vs no)	0.73	0.60-0.88	0.001	1.02	0.78-1.33	0.9	
Stone diameter:			< 0.001			< 0.001	
>5 mm $-<10$ mm (vs $<5$ mm)	0.69	0.57-0.83		0.56	0.42-0.74		
>10 mm (vs <5 mm)	0.81	0.63-1.05		0.9	0.63-1.28		
Stone location:			< 0.001			0.029	
Kidney (vs ureter)	1.39	1.13-1.70		1.42	1.06-1.91		
Both (vs ureter)	1.47	1.18-1.83		1.41	1.02-1.95		
Ureteral access sheath (vs no)	1.22	1.01-1.48	0.043	1.25	0.95-1.64	0.12	
Intraop complication (vs no)	2.40	1.27—4.55	0.007	1.5	0.53-4.25	0.4	

**Table 4.** Multivariable analysis assessing odds of ED visit and hospitalization following ureteroscopy associated with ureteral stent placement adjusting for provider and practice variation

to a national sample. That stated, our variation in practice size, geographic location, and academic or private affiliation tempers this potential limitation. Unplanned health care utilization is only 1 of the many objective metrics through which we can measure success following URS and future research should include additional clinical outcomes such as stone-free rate and need for secondary URS. However, this cannot be addressed in this study.

Limitations notwithstanding, our findings are both provocative and novel. We do not capture the cost of these unplanned episodes of care, but they have been previously quantified and amount to a significant financial burden.<sup>2</sup> Extrapolating from previous data (\$23,436 per episode),<sup>2</sup> unplanned health care utilization in stented patients during our study period resulted in a \$14,155,344 increase in cost of care, not accounting for the indirect costs. We found that stent placement increased the odds of an ED visit by 25%, which, in the context of the scope and burden of stone disease, amounts to a substantial clinical significance.

We acknowledge that the decision to place a stent after URS is complex, and the significant variation in stent use underscores the uncertainty regarding utilization. There are clearly cases where stent omission is ill advised. Better defining cases where stent omission is acceptable is of great importance. One of the greatest strengths of a robust continuous quality improvement program like MUSIC ROCKS is that we can actively translate such findings into action. When to place a stent and for how long it should remain in place has been a concern of our member urologists since the early days of MUSIC. To this end, we recently concluded an appropriateness panel to understand clinical scenarios where stent omission can be considered after URS using the RAND-UCLA Methodology.<sup>14</sup> In addition, ongoing efforts to measure patient reported outcomes following URS in MUSIC should help us

Table 5. Sensitivity analysis of odds of ED visit and hospitalization associated with ureteral stent placement (vs no stent)

		ED Visit			Hospitalization		
	No.	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p Value	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p Value
Multivariable model	7,796	1.25	1.01-1.54	0.043	1.28	0.94-1.76	0.120
Matched by propensity score	2,614	1.38	1.05-1.82	0.018	1.42	0.94-2.14	0.099
Inverse probability of treatment weighting propensity score:							
Cutoff 0.05 <p <0.95<="" td=""><td>5,910</td><td>1.39</td><td>1.21-1.60</td><td>&lt; 0.001</td><td>1.46</td><td>1.18-1.81</td><td>&lt; 0.001</td></p>	5,910	1.39	1.21-1.60	< 0.001	1.46	1.18-1.81	< 0.001
Cutoff 0.2 <p <0.90<="" td=""><td>4,689</td><td>1.39</td><td>1.19-1.62</td><td>&lt; 0.001</td><td>1.47</td><td>1.16-1.85</td><td>0.001</td></p>	4,689	1.39	1.19-1.62	< 0.001	1.47	1.16-1.85	0.001
Cutoff 0.4 <p <0.90<="" td=""><td>3,959</td><td>1.41</td><td>1.19—1.67</td><td>&lt;0.001</td><td>1.42</td><td>1.10-1.84</td><td>0.008</td></p>	3,959	1.41	1.19—1.67	<0.001	1.42	1.10-1.84	0.008



Figure 3. Propensity scores by those with and without ureteral stent placed at time of surgery.

better understand the implications of stent omission on quality of life.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Ureteral stent placement is commonly performed following URS in Michigan, and there exists wide variation in stent use at both a provider and practice level, irrespective of case volume. Several factors significantly impact the decision to place a stent. In this analysis, we found stent placement is associated with increased odds of an ED visit following URS and stent omission appears safe. However, randomized trials are needed to substantiate these conclusions. These findings have broad implications for patients, in whom stents negatively impact quality of life, as well as the health care system. Efforts are underway to operationalize a pragmatic approach to stent use after URS in Michigan, as well as to continue to evaluate their downstream consequences via patient reported outcomes.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

MUSIC is funded by Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Michigan (BCBSM) as part of the BCBSM Value Partnerships program. The authors acknowledge the significant contributions of the clinic champions, urologists, administrators and data abstractors in each participating Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative (MUSIC) practice (details around specific participating urologists and practices can be found at <u>www.musicurology.com</u>), as well as members of the MUSIC Coordinating Center at the University of Michigan. In addition, we would like to acknowledge the support provided by the Value Partnerships program at BCBSM.

## REFERENCES

- Raheem OA, Khandwala YA, Sur RL et al: Burden of urolithiasis: trends in prevalence, treatments, and costs. Eur Urol Focus 2017; 3: 18.
- Scales CD Jr, Saigal CS, Hanley JM et al: The impact of unplanned postprocedure visits in the management of patients with urinary stones. Surgery 2014; 155: 769.
- 3. Mittakanti HR, Conti SL, Pao AC et al: Unplanned emergency department visits and hospital

admissions following ureteroscopy: do ureteral stents make a difference? Urology 2018; **117:** 44.

- Joshi HB, Stainthorpe A, MacDonagh RP et al: Indwelling ureteral stents: evaluation of symptoms, quality of life and utility. J Urol 2003; 169: 1065.
- Assimos D, Krambeck A, Miller NL et al: Surgical management of stones: American Urological

Association/Endourological Society Guideline, part I. J Urol 2016; **196:** 1153.

- Türk C, Petřík A, Sarica K et al: EAU guidelines on interventional treatment for urolithiasis. Eur Urol 2016; 69: 475.
- Muslumanoglu AY, Fuglsig S, Frattini A et al: Risks and benefits of postoperative double-J stent placement after ureteroscopy: results from the clinical research office of

endourological society ureteroscopy global study. J Endourol 2017; **31:** 446.

- Ordonez M, Hwang EC, Borofsky M et al: Ureteral stent versus no ureteral stent for ureteroscopy in the management of renal and ureteral calculi. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2019; 2: Cd012703.
- Dauw CA, Swarna K, Qi J et al: Shockwave lithotripsy use in the state of Michigan: American Urological Association Guideline adherence and clinical implications. Urology 2020; 137: 38.
- Dauw CA, Ghani KR, Qi J et al: Variable use of postoperative imaging following ureteroscopy: results from a statewide quality improvement collaborative. Urology 2020; **136**: 63.
- Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL et al: A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. J Chronic Dis 1987; 40: 373.
- 12. Dauw CA, Simeon L, Alruwaily AF et al: Contemporary practice patterns of flexible

ureteroscopy for treating renal stones: results of a worldwide survey. J Endourol 2015; **29:** 1221.

- Pereira JF, Bower P, Jung E et al: Ureteral stenting practices following routine ureteroscopy: an international survey. World J Urol 2019; 37: 2501.
- Fitch K, Bernstein S, Aguilar M et al: The RAND/ UCLA Appropriateness Method User's Manual. Santa Monica, California: RAND 2001.



EDITORIAL COMMENT

Placing a ureteral stent after uncomplicated ureteroscopy has been long-standing urological dogma that has been shown time and time again to be unnecessary.<sup>1</sup> Ureteral stents are associated with significant discomfort and decreased quality of life in postoperative patients (reference 4 in article). However, the risk of postoperative obstruction and the potential need for a secondary procedure to urgently place a stent results in stents being placed after the majority of ureteroscopies, as confirmed in this paper.

The authors go in-depth to assess the practice patterns of a comprehensive group of urologists, comprising 137 private practice and academic urological surgeons in Michigan. They reviewed more than 9,600 ureteroscopies, noting that the mean frequency of ureteral stent placement was 74.8% with a wide variation among the providers. Notably, ureteral stenting was associated with 1.25 increased odds of an emergency department visit, without a corresponding increase in urgent stent placement in the nonstented cohort. In fact, there was a negligible rate (0.5%) of returning to the opeating room for urgent stent placement in the nonstented population. Research like this indicates that urologists likely "over-stent." Ideally this well executed study will encourage more urologists to omit stenting in concordance with the American Urological Association guidelines and decrease unnecessary patient morbidity after ureteroscopy (reference 5 in article).

#### Karen L. Stern Department of Urology Mayo Clinic Arizona Phoenix, Arizona

## REFERENCE

1. Pengfei S, Yutao L, Wuran W et al: The results of ureteral stenting after ureteroscopic lithotripsy for ureteral calculi: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Urol 2011; 186: 1904.