



## Reply to Peihua Liu, Yangle Li's Letter to the Editor regarding the article "Radical prostatectomy after previous transurethral resection of the prostate: oncological, surgical and functional outcomes—a meta-analysis"

Hai Liao<sup>1</sup> · Tao Wu<sup>2</sup>

Received: 6 June 2020 / Accepted: 9 June 2020 / Published online: 23 June 2020  
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Thank you very much for your careful reading of our research and your valuable comments. It is necessary for us to explain your questions. Firstly, not every meta-analysis need to be registered. For example, Donaldson's meta-analysis published in the European Journal of Urology was not registered [1], and du [2], Zhou [3], Li [4] and so on are also not registered. Secondly, in the three studies, TURP group includes a very small number of open prostatectomy patients. Due to the small number of patients, we believe that it has no significant influence on the overall conclusion. Thirdly, we search the EMBASE, PubMed, the Cochrane Library and find Fragkoulis [5], Pastore [6] and Ramirez [7], but we couldn't get the original text at that time, so we excluded them. Finally, match analysis is performed in ten of the 13 studies, so we believe that the basic characteristics of the two groups are basically the same. For example, Gleason scores of the two groups were the same in each study.

Li [8] published a meta-analysis similar to our meta-analysis. However, in the study of Li [8], there is no sensitivity analysis for  $I^2 > 50\%$ , the results are not reliable. In our meta-analysis, sensitivity analysis is performed for each outcome indicator with  $I^2 > 50\%$ , and after excluding some studies,  $I^2$  drop below 50%. Therefore, our results are more reliable.

---

This reply refers to the comment available online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-019-03072-3>.

---

✉ Tao Wu  
alhawking@163.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Urology, The First People's Hospital of Suining, Suining 629000, Sichuan, People's Republic of China

<sup>2</sup> Department of Urology, Affiliated Hospital of North Sichuan Medical College, Wenhua road 57, Shunqing district, Nanchong 637000, Sichuan, People's Republic of China

## References

1. Donaldson JF, Ruhayel Y, Skolarikos A et al (2019) Treatment of bladder stones in adults and children: a systematic review and meta-analysis on behalf of the European association of urology urolithiasis guideline panel [J]. *Eur Urol* 76(3):352–367
2. Du Y, Long Q, Guan B et al (2018) Robot-assisted radical prostatectomy is more beneficial for prostate cancer patients: a system review and meta-analysis [J]. *Med Sci Monit* 24:272–287
3. Zhou Z, Zhao S, Lu Y et al (2019) Meta-analysis of efficacy and safety of continuous saline bladder irrigation compared with intravesical chemotherapy after transurethral resection of bladder tumors [J]. *World J Urol* 37(6):1075–1084
4. Li H, Chen J, Cui Y et al (2019) Delayed versus standard ligation of the dorsal venous complex during laparoscopic radical prostatectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative studies [J]. *Int J Surg* 68:117–125
5. Fragkoulis C, Pappas A, Theocharis G et al (2018) Open radical prostatectomy after transurethral resection: perioperative, functional, oncologic outcomes [J]. *Can J Urol* 25(2):9262–9267
6. Pastore AL, Palleschi G, Silvestri L et al (2015) Laparoscopic radical prostatectomy after previous transurethral resection of prostate using a catheter balloon inflated in prostatic urethra: oncological and functional outcomes from a matched pair analysis [J]. *Int J Urol* 22(11):1037–1042
7. Ramírez BM, Juan EJ, Palmero MJ et al (2012) Importance of previous transurethral resection of the prostate before erpe. short-term functional outcomes in a single surgeon series [J]. *Arch Esp Urol* 65(7):675–683
8. Li H, Zhao C, Liu P et al (2019) Radical prostatectomy after previous transurethral resection of the prostate: a systematic review and meta-analysis [J]. *Transl Androl Urol* 8(6):712–727

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.