

Pre-operative risk assessment by ASA score and modified Frailty Index (mFI) in oncological and non oncological urological surgery



¹Serretta V., ¹Guarneri A.G., Scalici Gesolfo C., Muffoletto F., ¹Tulone G., ¹Dioguardi S., ¹Guzzardo C., ¹Billeci S., ¹Baiamonte D., ¹Giannone S., ²Sanfilippo C., ¹Simonato A. ¹Section of Urology, Dept. of Surgical, Oncological and Oral Sciences, University of Palermo, Italy, ²GSTU Foundation, Statistics, Palermo, Italy

Aims of Study:

Elderly patients are a vulnerable population at increased risk for treatment-related toxicity due to geriatric comorbidities. Almost 25% of the urological population is older than 75 years. Moreover, individual frailty might be not age-related.

Development of methods and interventions to reduce the morbidity from surgery are eagerly awaited. The ASA score is a worldwide adopted system for assessing the fitness of patients before surgery proposed by the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA). A frailty index predicting adverse outcome among selected patients undergoing urologic oncological major surgery was retrospectively validated by Lascano (1) and simplified by Chappidi (2) as a preoperative predictor of complications following radical cystectomy.

The aim of our prospective study was to test the modified frailty index (mFI) to identify those patients at greatest risk for complications among consecutive patients undergoing urological procedures for oncological and non-oncological diseases. Moreover mFI was compared to ASA score.

ASA		1-2	3-4	Divolue
ASA		1-2	3-4	P value
# Patients		82	165	
Age		57 (44-65)	71 (66-77)	<0,05
Surgical procedure		45	35	
(minutes)		(25-78,8)	(20-107,5)	0,4037
Serius	Yes	2	14	
Complication	No	78	147	0,06
Any	Yes	13	32	
Complication	No	67	148	0,76
Readmission	Yes	1	13	
Readimosion	No	80	147	0,03
Lenght of	Days	2,5	3,5	
Hospital Stay	Hospital Stay (extra)		(2 - 3,5) (2,5 - 5)	
Complication	Yes	4	12	
at 30 days	No	62	120	0,46
Complication	Yes	5	5	
at 90 days	No	61	123	0,45

Tab. 3 Patients'outcome according to ASA score

Conclusions:

A concordance between ASA score and mFI emerges only for low risk classes. Both mFI and ASA score were not associated with surgical complications when oncological and non oncological urologic surgery were considered. However, ASA score showed a better performance resulting associate with readmission rate and length of hospital stay

Teachin	ssion rate and length of in
SIUro	Società Italiana di Urologia Oncologica Italian Society of Uro-Oncology

	Patients n° (%)		
Number	247		
Gender			
Female	44 (18%)		
Male	203 (82%)		
Age			
<=75	193 (79%)		
>75	53 (21%)		
Frailty Index			
0	61 (25%)		
1	86 (35%)		
2	60 (24%)		
3	32(13%)		
4	5 (2%)		
5	3 (1%)		
ASA			
1	5 (2%)		
11	77 (31%)		
<i>III</i>	162 (66%)		
IV	3 (1%)		

Tab.1 Patients' distribution
according to ASA score and mFI

mFrailty		ASA				
Index	1	П	Ш	IV	Tot.	
	5	35	21		61	
0	(2%)	(14%)	(9%)	0	(25%)	
		28	58		86	
1	0	(11%)	(23%)	0	(35%)	
		11	47	2	60	
2	0	(4%)	(19%)	(1%)	(24%)	
		3	28	1	32	
3	0	(1%)	(11%)	(0%)	(13%)	
			8		8	
4-5	0	0	(3%)	0	(3%)	
	5	77	162	3	247	
Tot.	(2%)	(31%)	(66%)	(1%)		

Tab.2 Concordance between ASA score and mFI classes

Methods:

Consecutive patients undergoing urological procedures were prospectively entered. The surgical interventions were classified as follows: 1. Major open/laparoscopic; 2. Lower urinary tract endoscopy; 3. Upper urinary tract procedures; 4 Minor surgery. For all patients age, ASA score, BMI, serum albumin, smoking status and routine hematological exams were preoperatively recorded. mFI was calculated. Operative time, hospital length of stay and post-operative complications according to Clavien-Dindo classification were recorded.

Results:

247 consecutive patients, 203 men and 44 women underwent urological surgery. Age was over 75 years in 53 (21%) patients. Patients' characteristics and their distribution within ASA and mFI classes are given in tables 1 and 2. ASA 2 and 3 categories included 239 (97%) patients, more widely distributed among the 5 mFI groups. Out of the 165 (66.8%) patients classified as ASA 3-4, 37 (22.4%) only were allocated in 3-5 mFI classes while of the 82 patients with ASA 1-2 score, 79 (96.3%) were allocated in 0-2 mFI categories (Table 2). Patients'outcome according to ASA and mFI scores are given in Tables 3 and 4. No association was statistically significant both for ASA and mFI with "any complication", "serious complications" and "late complications" rates. mFI was associated (p<0.05) with age only, while ASA index with age (p<0.05), readmission rate (p=0.03) and length of hospital stay (p=0.004). The performaces of ASA and mFI did not change when the different categories of surgical procedures were considered.

mFrailty I	ndex	0	1	2	3	4/5	p value
# Patients		61	86	60	32	8	
		50	69,5	69	70	71	
Age		(35-61,5)	(63-75)	(64-77)	(66-76)	(70-79)	<0,05
Surgical procedure		50	35	30	35	25	
(minute		(31,3-85)	(20-115)	(15-75)	(25-100)	(16, 3-48, 8)	0,165
Serius	Yes	2	8	3	3	0	0,49
omplication	No	58	77	55	27	8	
Any omplication	Yes	14	12	12	5	2	0,67
	No	46	72	46	25	6	
eadmission	Yes	3	4	2	3	2	0,13
	No	57	82	55	27	6	
Lenght of	Days	3	3,5	3,5	3	3,5	
ospital Stay	(extra)	(2,5-4,5)	(2,5-4,5)	(2,5-4,5)	(2,5-4,5)	(3,5-4,6)	0,82
omplication at 30 days	Yes	4	5	2	3	2	0,28
	No	45	62	44	26	5	
omplication at 90 days	Yes	5	3	2	0	0	0,2975
	No	42	64	43	29	6	,

Tab. 4 Patients'outcome according to modified Frailty Index