

Editorial referring to the paper published in this issue on pp. 108–111 **TRAUMA AND RECONSTRUCTIVE UROLOGY**

Laparoscopy and pediatric urology

Wojciech Apoznański¹, Andrzej Jankowski²

¹Department of Pediatric Surgery and Urology, Medical University, Wrocław, Poland

²Department of Surgery, Traumatology and Pediatric Urology, Medical University, Wrocław, Poland

Minimally invasive surgery has become in the recent years a synonyme of laparoscopic surgery. It may be simply attributed to the significant advances in surgical technique worldwide. However it must be stated that laparoscopy has not found such a wide application in pediatric urology, as in other surgical specialities.

The manuscript “The retroperitoneal approach to distal part of the ureter [1] illustrates own experience of the surgeons from the excellent center of

pediatric urology of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków in original operative approach to the distal ureter in children. This novel technique was first introduced into a clinical practice by Chen in 2002 [2]. It enables a safe approach to the distal prevesical portion of the ureter and diminishes the risk of injury to the perivesical neural plexus. The author’s statement that classical surgical technique may be regarded in pediatric urological patients as minimally invasive is important [3, 4].

References

1. Urabnowicz W, Honkisz I, Sulisławski J, Dobrowolska–Glazae B. The retroperitoneal, inguinal approach to distal part of the ureter. Cent European J Urol. 2014; 67: 108–111.
2. Chen HW, Lin GJ, Lai CH, Chu SH, Chuang CK. Minimally invasive extravesical ureteral reimplantation for vesicoureteral reflux. J Urol. 2002; 167: 1821–1823.
3. Chen HW, Yuan SS, Lin CJ. Ureteral reimplantation for vesicoureteral reflux: comparison of minimally invasive extravesical with transvesical and convectional extravesical techniques. Urology. 2004; 63: 364–367.
4. Ashley R, Vandersteen D. Mini–Ureteroneo-cystostomy: a safe and effective outpatient treatment for unilateral vesicoureteral reflux. J Urol. 2008; 180: 1621–1625. ■

Correspondence

Prof. Wojciech Apoznański
agn1grze@wp.pl