



APPROVED BY THE AUA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS APRIL
2023

Authors' disclosure of potential conflicts of interest and author/staff contributions appear at the end of the article.

© 2023 by the American Urological Association

URETHRAL STRICTURE DISEASE: AUA GUIDELINE

(Published 2016; Amended 2023)

Hunter Wessells, MD; Kenneth W. Angermeier, MD; Sean P. Elliott, MD; Christopher M. Gonzalez, MD; Ron T. Kodama, MD; Andrew C. Peterson, MD; James Reston, PhD; Keith Rourke, MD; John T. Stoffel, MD; Alex Vanni, MD; Bryan Voelzke, MD; Lee Zhao, MD; Richard A. Santucci, MD

Amendment: Hunter Wessells, MD; Allen Morey, MD; Lesley Souter, PhD; Alex Vanni, MD

SUMMARY

Purpose

The clinical guideline on urethral stricture provides a clinical framework for the diagnosis of urethral stricture and includes discussion of initial management, urethroplasty, reconstruction, contracture, stenosis, special circumstances, and post-operative follow-up care.

Methodology

A systematic review of the literature using the Pubmed, Embase, and Cochrane databases (search dates 1/1/1990 to 12/1/2015) was conducted to identify peer-reviewed publications relevant to the diagnosis and treatment of urethral stricture in men. The review yielded an evidence base of 250 articles after application of inclusion/exclusion criteria. The search for the 2023 Amendment used the Ovid, MEDLINE, Embase, and ClinicalTrials.gov databases and was modified to include females and males (search dates 12/2015 – 10/2022 for males; 01/1990 – 10/2022 for females) and one new Key Question on sexual dysfunction outcomes in men with bulbar urethral strictures was added (search dates: 01/1990 – 10/2022). All searches yielded 11,752 citations; after inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied, 81 studies were added to the existing evidence base. These publications were used to create the guideline statements. If sufficient evidence existed, then the body of evidence for a particular treatment was assigned a rating of A (high quality evidence; high certainty), B (moderate quality evidence; moderate certainty), or C (low quality evidence; low certainty) and evidence-based statements of Strong, Moderate, or Conditional Recommendation based on risks and benefits were developed. Additional information is provided as Clinical Principles and Expert Opinions when insufficient evidence existed.

GUIDELINE STATEMENTS

DIAGNOSIS/INITIAL MANAGEMENT

1. Clinicians should include urethral stricture in the differential diagnosis of patients who present with decreased urinary stream, incomplete emptying, dysuria, urinary tract infection, and after rising post-void residual. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)



2. After performing a history, physical examination, and urinalysis, clinicians may use a combination of patient reported measures, uroflowmetry, and ultrasound post-void residual assessment in the initial evaluation of suspected urethral stricture. (*Clinical Principle*)
3. Clinicians should use urethro-cystoscopy, retrograde urethrography, voiding cystourethrography, or ultrasound urethrography to make a diagnosis of urethral stricture. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
4. Clinicians planning non-urgent intervention for a known stricture should determine the length and location of the urethral stricture. (*Expert Opinion*)
5. Surgeons may utilize urethral endoscopic management (e.g., urethral dilation, direct visual internal urethrotomy) or immediate suprapubic cystostomy for urgent management of urethral stricture, such as discovery of symptomatic urinary retention or need for catheterization prior to another surgical procedure. (*Expert Opinion*)
6. Surgeons may place a suprapubic cystostomy to promote “urethral rest” prior to definitive urethroplasty in patients dependent on an indwelling urethral catheter or intermittent self-dilation. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

DILATION/INTERNAL URETHROTOMY/URETHROPLASTY

7. Surgeons may offer urethral dilation, direct visual internal urethrotomy, or urethroplasty for the initial treatment of a short (<2cm) bulbar urethral stricture. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
8. Surgeons may perform either dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy when performing endoscopic treatment of a urethral stricture. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
9. Surgeons may safely remove the urethral catheter within 72 hours following uncomplicated dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
10. In patients who are not candidates for urethroplasty, clinicians may recommend self-catheterization after direct visual internal urethrotomy to maintain urethral patency. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
11. a. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty, instead of repeated endoscopic management for recurrent anterior urethral strictures following failed dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
b. Surgeons may offer urethral dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy, combined with drug-coated balloons, for recurrent bulbar urethral strictures <3cm in length. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade B*)
12. Surgeons who do not perform urethroplasty should refer patients to surgeons with expertise. (*Expert Opinion*)

ANTERIOR URETHRAL RECONSTRUCTION

13. Surgeons may initially treat meatal or fossa navicularis strictures with either dilation or meatotomy. (*Clinical Principle*)
14. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty to patients with recurrent meatal or fossa navicularis strictures. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
15. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty to patients with penile urethral strictures given the expected high recurrence rates with endoscopic treatments. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
16. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty as the initial treatment for patients with long ($\geq 2\text{cm}$) bulbar urethral strictures given the low success rate of direct visual internal urethrotomy or dilation. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)



17. Surgeons may reconstruct long multi-segment strictures with one-stage or multi-stage techniques using oral mucosal grafts, penile fasciocutaneous flaps, or a combination of these techniques. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
- 18 a. Surgeons may offer perineal urethrostomy as a long-term treatment option to patients as an alternative to urethroplasty. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
- 18 b. Surgeons should offer perineal urethrostomy as a long-term treatment option to patients as an alternative to urethroplasty in patient populations at high risk for failure of urethral reconstruction. (*Expert Opinion*)
- 19 a. Surgeons should use oral mucosa as the first choice when using grafts for urethroplasty. (*Expert Opinion*)
- 19 b. Surgeons may use either buccal or lingual mucosal grafts as equivalent alternatives. (*Strong Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade A*)
20. Surgeons should not perform substitution urethroplasty with allograft, xenograft, or synthetic materials except under experimental protocols. (*Expert Opinion*)
21. Surgeons should not perform a single stage tubularized graft urethroplasty. (*Expert Opinion*)
22. Surgeons should not use hair-bearing skin for substitution urethroplasty. (*Clinical Principle*)

PELVIC FRACTURE URETHRAL INJURY

23. Clinicians should use retrograde urethrography with voiding cystourethrogram and/or retrograde + antegrade cystoscopy for preoperative planning of delayed urethroplasty after pelvic fracture urethral injury. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
24. Surgeons should perform delayed urethroplasty instead of delayed endoscopic procedures after urethral obstruction/obliteration due to pelvic fracture urethral injury. (*Expert Opinion*)
25. Definitive urethral reconstruction for pelvic fracture urethral injury should be planned only after major injuries stabilize and patients can be safely positioned for urethroplasty. (*Expert Opinion*)

FEMALE URETHRAL RECONSTRUCTION

26. Surgeons may reconstruct female urethral strictures using oral mucosal grafts, vaginal flaps, or a combination of these techniques. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

BLADDER NECK CONTRACTURE/VESICOURETHRAL STENOSIS

27. Surgeons may perform a dilation, bladder neck incision, or transurethral resection for bladder neck contracture after endoscopic prostate procedure. (*Expert Opinion*)
28. Surgeons may perform a dilation, vesicourethral incision, or transurethral resection for post-prostatectomy vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)
29. Surgeons may perform robotic or open reconstruction for recalcitrant stenosis of the bladder neck or post-prostatectomy vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis. (*Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

30. In men who require chronic self-catheterization (e.g., neurogenic bladder), surgeons may offer urethroplasty as a treatment option for urethral stricture causing difficulty with intermittent self-catheterization. (*Expert Opinion*)



LICHEN SCLEROSUS

31. Clinicians may perform biopsy for suspected lichen sclerosus and must perform biopsy if urethral cancer is suspected. (*Clinical Principle*)
32. In lichen sclerosus-proven urethral stricture, surgeons should not use genital skin for reconstruction. (*Strong Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade B*)

POST-OPERATIVE FOLLOW-UP

33. Clinicians should monitor urethral stricture patients to identify symptomatic recurrence following dilation, direct visual internal urethrotomy, or urethroplasty. (*Expert Opinion*)



INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Urethral stricture is chronic fibrosis and narrowing of the urethral lumen caused by acute injury, inflammatory conditions, and iatrogenic interventions including urethral instrumentation, surgery, and prostate cancer treatment. The symptoms of urethral stricture are non-specific and may overlap with other common conditions that confound timely diagnosis, including lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) and urinary tract infections (UTI). Urologists play a key role in the initial evaluation of urethral stricture and currently provide all accepted treatments. Thus, urologists must be familiar with the evaluation and diagnostic tests for urethral stricture as well as endoscopic and open surgical treatments. This guideline provides evidence-based guidance to clinicians and patients regarding how to recognize symptoms and signs of a urethral stricture/stenosis, carry out appropriate testing to determine the location and severity of the stricture, and recommend the best options for treatment. The most effective approach for a particular patient is best determined by the individual clinician and patient in the context of that patient's history, values, and goals for treatment. As the science relevant to urethral stricture evolves and improves, the strategies presented here will be amended to remain consistent with the highest standards of clinical care.

METHODOLOGY

2016 Guideline

A systematic review for the 2016 guideline was conducted to identify published articles relevant to the diagnosis and treatment of urethral stricture in men. Literature searches were performed on English-language publications using the Pubmed, Embase, and Cochrane databases from 1/1/1990 to 12/1/2015 by the ECRI Institute and were included in a systematic review evidence report. Preclinical studies (e.g., animal models), commentary, editorials, non-English language publications, and meeting abstracts were excluded. Additional exclusion criteria were as follows: studies of females; studies of stricture prevention; patients with epispadias, congenital strictures, and duplicated urethra; trauma already covered under trauma guidelines including diagnosis and

management of acute pelvic fracture urethral injury (PFUI) or pelvic fracture urethral disruption; urethral cancer not related to stricture; or voiding symptoms not related to stricture. Studies with less than 10 patients were generally excluded from further evaluation and thus data extraction given the unreliability of the statistical estimates and conclusions that could be derived from them. In rare instances, we have included studies with less than 10 patients or studies preceding the literature search date if no other evidence was identified. For certain key questions that had little or no evidence from comparative studies, we included case series with 50 or more patients. Review article references were checked to ensure inclusion of all possible relevant studies. Multiple reports on the same patient group were carefully examined to ensure inclusion of only non-redundant information. The systematic review yielded a total of 250 publications relevant to preparation of the guideline.

QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL STUDIES AND DETERMINATION OF EVIDENCE STRENGTH

The quality of individual studies that were either randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or clinical controlled trials was assessed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.¹ Observational cohort studies with a comparison of interest were evaluated with the Drug Effectiveness Review Project instrument.² Conventional diagnostic cohort studies, diagnostic case-control studies, or diagnostic case series that presented data on diagnostic test characteristics were evaluated using the QUADAS 2 tool, which evaluates the quality of diagnostic accuracy studies.³

The categorization of evidence strength is conceptually distinct from the quality of individual studies. Evidence strength refers to the body of evidence available for a particular question and includes not only individual study quality but also consideration of study design, consistency of findings across studies, adequacy of sample sizes, and generalizability of samples, settings, and treatments for the purposes of the guideline. The American Urological Association (AUA) categorizes the level of a body of evidence as Grade A (well-conducted and highly-generalizable RCTs or exceptionally strong observational studies with consistent findings); Grade B (RCTs with some weaknesses of procedure or generalizability or moderately strong observational studies with consistent findings); or Grade C (RCTs with serious deficiencies of procedure, generalizability, or extremely small sample



sizes or observational studies that are inconsistent, have small sample sizes, or have other problems that potentially confound interpretation of data). By definition, Grade A evidence is evidence about which the Panel has a high level of certainty, Grade B evidence is evidence about which the Panel has a moderate level of certainty, and Grade C evidence is evidence about which the Panel has a low level of certainty.⁴

2023 Amendment

The 2016 guideline search strategy was modified to include females in addition to males and was used to systematically search Ovid, MEDLINE, Embase, and ClinicalTrials.gov databases for new evidence published between December 2015 and October 2022. A second search was designed to only identify female urethral stricture studies published between January 1990 and December 2015, the timeframe covered in the original guideline for male patients. Finally, a third search (January 1990 – October 2022) was developed to address a new Key Question comparing sexual dysfunction outcomes in men with bulbar urethral strictures receiving either non-transecting anastomotic urethroplasty procedures or transecting procedures. Titles and abstracts of studies identified by all searches were reviewed in a two-stage process. During the first stage, studies were reviewed to determine if they assessed urethral stricture in males or females, and if they met the study selection criteria of prespecified study type, minimum allowable sample size, and if published in English. Allowable study types included systematic reviews, RCTs, diagnostic accuracy studies, cohort studies with and without comparison group, case-control studies, and case series. All other study types were excluded. Only studies that enrolled at least 10 patients were considered for inclusion in the evidence base. During the second stage of title and abstract review, abstracts were compared to the PICO criteria. Additionally, studies were assessed to determine if they either directly informed the Key Questions or if they presented data that could reaffirm or refute the original guideline statements.

In the original ECRI evidence report that underpinned the male urethral stricture guideline,⁵ single-arm observational studies that evaluated urethroplasty or

Urethral Stricture Disease

bulbar urethral strictures were excluded, and the evidence base was comprised of RCTs and comparative cohort studies. This exclusion criterion was retained in the amendment when evaluating studies that enrolled male or both male and female populations. However, based on a paucity of data, single-arm studies that enrolled a solely female population were retained. Following study selection, 81 studies were included in the amendment evidence base.

INDIVIDUAL STUDY QUALITY AND POTENTIAL FOR BIAS

Quality assessment for all retained studies was conducted. Using this method, studies deemed to be of low quality would not be excluded from the systematic review, but would be retained, and their methodological strengths and weaknesses discussed where relevant. To define an overall study quality rating for each included study, risk of bias as determined by validated study-type specific tools was paired with additional important quality features. AMSTAR-2 was used for assessment of systematic review with and without meta-analyses.⁶ To evaluate the risk of bias within the identified RCTs, the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool⁷ was employed, while for observational studies, a Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies – of Intervention (ROBINS-I) tool⁸ was used. Additional important quality features, such as study design, comparison type, power of statistical analysis, and sources of funding were extracted for each study.

CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE BY GRADE

The Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) system was used to determine the aggregate evidence quality for each recommendation statement.⁹ GRADE defines a body of evidence in relation to how confident guideline developers can be that the estimate of effects as reported by that body of evidence is correct. Evidence is categorized as high, moderate, low, and very low, and assessment is based on the aggregate risk of bias for the evidence base, plus limitations introduced as a consequence of inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision and publication bias across the studies.¹⁰ Upgrading of evidence is possible if the body of evidence indicates a large effect or if confounding would suggest either spurious effects or would reduce the demonstrated effect.



Table 1: Level of Evidence Definitions

AUA Level of Evidence Category	GRADE Certainty Rating	Definition
A	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
B	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderately confident in the effect estimate The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
C	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidence in the effect estimate is limited The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect
	Very Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very little confidence in the effect estimate The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

The AUA employs a 3-tiered strength of evidence system to underpin evidence-based guideline statements. Table 1 summarizes the GRADE categories, definitions, and how these categories translate to the AUA strength of evidence categories. In short, high certainty by GRADE translates to AUA A-category strength of evidence, moderate to B, and both low and very low to C

AUA NOMENCLATURE: LINKING STATEMENT TYPE TO EVIDENCE LEVEL

The AUA nomenclature system explicitly links statement type to body of evidence level, degree of certainty, magnitude of benefit or risk/burdens, and the Panel's judgment regarding the balance between benefits and risks/burdens (**Table 2**). Strong Recommendations are directive statements that an action should (benefits outweigh risks/burdens) or should not (risks/burdens outweigh benefits) be undertaken because net benefit or net harm is substantial. Moderate Recommendations are directive statements that an action should (benefits outweigh risks/burdens) or should not (risks/burdens outweigh benefits) be undertaken because net benefit or net harm is moderate. Conditional Recommendations are non-directive statements used when the evidence indicates that there is no apparent net benefit or harm or when the balance between benefits and risks/burden is unclear. All three statement types may be supported by

any body of evidence grade. Grade A evidence in support of a Strong or Moderate Recommendation indicates that the statement can be applied to most patients in most circumstances and that future research is unlikely to change confidence. Grade B evidence in support of a Strong or Moderate Recommendation indicates that the statement can be applied to most patients in most circumstances, but that better evidence could change confidence. Grade C evidence in support of a Strong or Moderate Recommendation indicates that the statement can be applied to most patients in most circumstances, but that better evidence is likely to change confidence. Grade C evidence is only rarely used in support of a Strong Recommendation. Conditional Recommendations also can be supported by Grade A, B, or C evidence. When Grade A is used, the statement indicates that benefits and risks/burdens appear balanced, the best action depends on patient circumstances, and future research is unlikely to change confidence. When Grade B evidence is used, benefits and risks/burdens appear balanced, the best action also depends on individual patient circumstances and better evidence could change confidence. When Grade C evidence is used, there is uncertainty regarding the balance between benefits and risks/burdens, alternative strategies may be equally reasonable, and better evidence is likely to change confidence.



Table 2: AUA Nomenclature Linking Statement Type to Degree of Certainty, Magnitude of Benefit or Risk/Burden, and Body of Evidence Level

Evidence Grade	Evidence Level: Grade A (High Certainty)	Evidence Level: Grade B (Moderate Certainty)	Evidence Level: Grade C (Low Certainty)
Strong Recommendation (Net benefit or harm substantial)	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) is substantial -Applies to most patients in most circumstances and future research is unlikely to change confidence	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) is substantial -Applies to most patients in most circumstances but better evidence could change confidence	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) appears substantial -Applies to most patients in most circumstances but better evidence is likely to change confidence (rarely used to support a Strong Recommendation)
Moderate Recommendation (Net benefit or harm moderate)	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) is moderate -Applies to most patients in most circumstances and future research is unlikely to change confidence	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) is moderate -Applies to most patients in most circumstances but better evidence could change confidence	-Benefits > Risks/Burdens (or vice versa) -Net benefit (or net harm) appears moderate -Applies to most patients in most circumstances but better evidence is likely to change confidence
Conditional Recommendation (Net benefit or harm comparable to other options)	-Benefits=Risks/Burdens -Best action depends on individual patient circumstances -Future Research is unlikely to change confidence	-Benefits= Risks/Burdens -Best action appears to depend on individual patient circumstances -Better evidence could change confidence	-Balance between Benefits & Risks/Burdens unclear -Net benefit (or net harm) comparable to other options -Alternative strategies may be equally reasonable -Better evidence likely to change confidence
Clinical Principle	a statement about a component of clinical care that is widely agreed upon by urologists or other clinicians for which there may or may not be evidence in the medical literature		
Expert Opinion	a statement, achieved by consensus of the Panel, that is based on members' clinical training, experience, knowledge, and judgment for which there may or may not be evidence in the medical literature		



For some clinical issues, particularly diagnosis, there was little or no evidence from which to construct evidence-based statements. Where gaps in the evidence existed, the Panel provides guidance in the form of Clinical Principles or Expert Opinion with consensus achieved using a modified Delphi technique if differences of opinion emerged.¹¹ A Clinical Principle is a statement about a component of clinical care that is widely agreed upon by urologists or other clinicians for which there may or may not be evidence in the medical literature. Expert Opinion refers to a statement, achieved by consensus of the Panel, that is based on members' clinical training, experience, knowledge, and judgment for which there is no evidence.

Panel Formation and Review

The Urethral Stricture Panel was created in 2013 by the American Urological Association Education and Research, Inc. The Practice Guidelines Committee (PGC) of the AUA selected the Panel Co-Chairs who in turn appointed the additional panel members with specific expertise in this area. The AUA conducted a thorough peer review process. The draft guidelines document was distributed to 90 peer reviewers. The panel reviewed and discussed all submitted comments and revised the draft as needed. Once finalized, the guideline was submitted for approval to the PGC and the AUA Science and Quality Council. Then it was submitted to the AUA Board of Directors for final approval. Funding of the panel was provided by the AUA; panel members received no remuneration for their work.

The Urethral Stricture Amendment Panel was created in 2020 by the AUA. The Chair of the original guideline was appointed Chair of the amendment panel. The balance of the panel was composed of one member of the original panel and one content expert who was not a member of the original guideline panel. The outside expert was approved by the PGC Chairs. The AUA conducted a thorough peer review process and the draft guideline document was distributed to 50 peer reviewers, 21 of whom submitted a total of 67 comments. The Amendment Panel reviewed and discussed all submitted comments and revised the draft as needed. Once finalized, the guideline was submitted for approval to the PGC and Science and Quality Council. It was then submitted to AUA Board of Directors for final approval. Panel members received no remuneration for their work.

BACKGROUND

The urethra extends from the bladder neck, which is composed of smooth muscle circular fibers, to the meatus, with varying histological features and stromal support based on anatomical location. The components of the posterior urethra are lined with transitional epithelium, whereas the male anterior urethra is lined with pseudostratified columnar epithelium that changes to stratified squamous epithelium in the fossa navicularis. The posterior urethra includes both the prostatic and membranous urethra in men whereas in women it consists solely of the membranous urethra. The prostatic urethra extends from the distal bladder neck to the distal end of the veru montanum. The distal external sphincter mechanism surrounds the membranous urethra and is comprised of both intrinsic smooth muscle and rhabdosphincter. The anterior urethra includes the bulbar urethra, penile urethra, and fossa navicularis. This portion of the urethra is surrounded by the corpus spongiosum, which in the bulbar urethra is surrounded by the bulbocavernosus muscle. The fossa navicularis is located entirely within the glans penis.

Urethral stricture is the preferred term for any abnormal narrowing of the anterior urethra, which runs from the bulbar urethra to the meatus and is surrounded by the corpus spongiosum. Urethral strictures are associated with varying degrees of spongiosis. Narrowing of the posterior urethra, which lacks surrounding spongiosum, is thus referred to as a "stenosis." PFUI typically creates a distraction defect with resulting obstruction or obliteration.¹²

Urethral strictures or stenoses are treated endoscopically or with urethroplasty. Endoscopic management is performed by either urethral dilation or direct vision internal urethrotomy (DVIU). There are a multitude of different urethroplasty techniques that can be generally divided into tissue transfer-involved procedures and non-tissue transfer-involved procedures. Anastomotic urethroplasty does not involve tissue transfer and can be performed in both a transecting and non-transecting manner. Excision and primary anastomosis urethroplasty involve transection and removal of the narrowed segment of urethra and corresponding spongiosis with anastomosis of the two healthy ends of the urethra and corpus spongiosum. Non-transecting anastomotic urethroplasty preserves the corpus spongiosum, thus



allowing the strictured urethra to be excised and reanastomosed or incised longitudinally through the narrowed segment of the urethra and closed in a Heineke-Mikulicz fashion.

Techniques that involve tissue transfer can be categorized into single-stage and multi-stage procedures. In single-stage procedures, the urethra is augmented in caliber by transferring tissue in the form of a graft or flap. Multi-stage procedures use a graft as a urethral substitute for future tubularization.

Epidemiology

Geographic setting, socioeconomic factors, and access to healthcare can affect stricture etiology. In high income countries, the most common etiology of urethral stricture is idiopathic (41%) followed by iatrogenic (35%). Late failure of hypospadias surgery and stricture resultant from endoscopic manipulation (e.g., transurethral resection) are common iatrogenic reasons. In comparison, trauma (36%) is the most common cause in low- and middle-income countries, reflecting higher rates of road traffic injuries, less developed trauma systems, inadequate roadway systems, and conceivably socioeconomic factors leading to a higher prevalence of trauma-related strictures.¹³⁻¹⁵

Strictures in the bulbar urethra are more common than other anatomic locations in males; however, certain etiologies are closely associated with an anatomic segment of the urethra.¹³ For example, strictures related to hypospadias and lichen sclerosus ([LS]; previously termed balanitis xerotica obliterans) are generally located in the penile urethra, while traumatic strictures and stenoses tend to be located in the bulbar and posterior urethra.

Preoperative Assessment

PRESENTATION

Patients with urethral stricture most commonly present with decreased urinary stream and incomplete bladder emptying but may also demonstrate UTI, epididymitis, rising post-void residual (PVR), or decreased force of ejaculation. Additionally, patients may present with urinary spraying or dysuria.¹⁶

Urethral Stricture Disease

PATIENT REPORTED OUTCOMES MEASURES

Patient reported measures (PRMs) help elucidate the presence and severity of patient symptoms and bother and thus may serve as an important component of urethral stricture diagnosis and management. While the American Urological Association Symptom Index (AUASI) includes items assessing decreased urinary stream and incomplete bladder emptying, it does not identify other symptoms seen in patients with a urethral stricture, such as urinary spraying and dysuria.¹⁶ Therefore, there is a need for development of a standardized urethral stricture PRM that can be used to assess symptoms, degree of bother, and quality of life (QoL) impact. A more disease specific standardized PRM will also allow for comparison of patient outcomes across research studies. Several have been developed in more recent years.^{17, 18}

DIAGNOSIS

All patients being evaluated for LUTS should have a complete history and physical examination and urinalysis at a minimum. Decreased urinary stream, incomplete emptying, and other findings such as UTI should alert clinicians to include urethral stricture in the differential diagnosis. In the initial assessment of patients suspected of having a urethral stricture, a combination of PRMs to assess symptoms, uroflowmetry to determine severity of obstruction, and ultrasound PVR volume to identify urinary retention may be used. Patients with symptomatic urethral stricture typically have a reduced peak flow rate.^{19, 20} Confirmation of a urethral stricture diagnosis is made with urethroscopy, retrograde urethrography (RUG), or ultrasound urethrography. In women, videourodynamic studies can be used to diagnose urethral strictures by demonstrating elevated detrusor voiding pressures and urethral obstruction on voiding cystourethrography (VCUG).^{21, 22} Urethroscopy readily identifies a urethral stricture but does not delineate the location and length of strictures. RUG, with or without VCUG, allows for identification of stricture location in the urethra, length of the stricture, and degree of lumen narrowing.^{23, 24} All of these stricture characteristics are important for subsequent treatment planning. Ultrasound urethrography can be used to identify the location, length, and severity of male urethral stricture.²⁵ While ultrasound urethrography is a promising technique, further studies are needed to validate its value in clinical practice.



Preoperative assessment for definitive reconstruction should elicit details of the etiology, diagnostic information about length and location of the stricture, and prior treatments. In the case of PFUI, a detailed history should document all associated injuries and angiographic embolization of any pelvic vessels. The history should assess preoperative sexual function and urinary continence. Physical examination should include an abdominal and genital exam, digital rectal exam, and assessment of lower extremity mobility for operative positioning.

PATIENT SELECTION

Patient selection and proper surgical procedure choice are paramount to maximize the chance of successful outcome in the treatment of urethral stricture. The main factors to consider in decision making include stricture etiology, location, and severity; prior treatment; comorbidity; and patient preference. As with any operation, surgeons should consider a patient's goals, preferences, comorbidities, and fitness for surgery prior to performing urethroplasty.²⁶

OPERATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

Before proceeding with surgical management of a urethral stricture, the physician should provide an appropriate antibiotic to reduce surgical site infections. Preoperative urine cultures are recommended to guide antibiotic choice, and active UTIs must be treated before urethral stricture intervention. Prophylactic antibiotic choice and duration should follow AUA Best Practice Policy Statement.²⁷ To avoid bacterial resistance, antibiotics should be discontinued after a single dose or within 24 hours. Antibiotics can be extended in the setting of an active UTI or if there is an existing indwelling catheter.²⁷ In the setting of endoscopic urethral stricture management, oral fluoroquinolones are more cost effective than intravenous cephalosporins.²⁷ Antimicrobial prophylaxis is recommended at the time of urethral catheter removal in patients with certain risk factors.²⁷

Positioning of the extremities should be careful to avoid pressure on the calf muscles, peroneal nerve, and ulnar nerve when using the lithotomy position. Use of sequential compression devices is recommended to reduce deep venous thromboembolism and nerve compression injuries. Perioperative parenteral deep venous thromboembolism prophylaxis is a consideration in select circumstances for open reconstruction.

Urethral Stricture Disease

POSTOPERATIVE CARE

A urinary catheter should be placed following urethral stricture intervention to divert urine from the site of intervention and prevent urinary extravasation. Either urethral catheter or suprapubic (SP) cystostomy is a viable option; a urethral catheter is thought to be optimal as it may serve as a stent around which the site of urethra intervention can heal. The length of urinary catheterization is widely variable, with a shorter recommended time for endoscopic interventions than open urethral reconstruction.²⁸

Urethrography or voiding cystography is typically performed two to three weeks following open urethral reconstruction to assess for complete urethral healing. Replacement of the urinary catheter is recommended in the setting of a persistent urethral leak to avoid tissue inflammation, urinoma, abscess, and/or urethrocutaneous fistula. A urethral leak will heal in almost all circumstances with a longer duration of catheter drainage.^{29, 30}

COMPLICATIONS

Erectile dysfunction (ED), as measured by the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF) may occur transiently after male urethroplasty with resolution of nearly all reported symptoms approximately six months postoperatively.³¹⁻³⁵ Meta-analysis has demonstrated the risk of new onset ED following anterior urethroplasty to be ~1%.³⁶ Erectile function following urethroplasty for PFUI does not appear to significantly change as a result of surgery. ED in this cohort may be related to the initial pelvic trauma rather than the subsequent urethral reconstruction.³⁷

Ejaculatory dysfunction manifested as pooling of semen, decreased ejaculatory force, ejaculatory discomfort, and decreased semen volume has been reported by up to 21% of men following bulbar urethroplasty.³⁸ Urethroplasty technique may play a role in the occurrence of ejaculatory dysfunction but the exact etiology remains uncertain.³⁹⁻⁴¹ Conversely, some patients, as measured by the Men's Sexual Health Questionnaire, will notice an improvement in ejaculatory function following bulbar urethroplasty, particularly those with pre-operative ejaculatory dysfunction related to obstruction caused by the stricture.³⁸ Data on ejaculatory function in men undergoing penile urethroplasty or urethroplasty for PFUI is limited.



FOLLOW UP

Successful treatment for urethral stricture (endoscopic or surgical) is most commonly defined as no further need for surgical intervention or instrumentation.⁴²⁻⁵⁴ Some studies use the absence of postoperative or post-procedural patient reported obstructive voiding symptoms and/or peak uroflow >15m/sec as a benchmark for successful treatment.⁵⁵⁻⁶⁰ Additional measures of success that have been used alone or in combination include urethral patency assessed by urethro-cystoscopy, absence of recurrent stricture on urethrography, PVR urine <100mL, "unobstructed" flow curve shape on uroflowmetry, absence of UTI, ability to pass a urethral catheter, and patient-reported improvement in LUTS.⁶¹⁻⁶⁵ Consensus has not been reached on the optimal postoperative surveillance protocol to identify stricture recurrence following urethral stricture treatment.

Guideline Statements

DIAGNOSIS

1. **Clinicians should include urethral stricture in the differential diagnosis of patients who present with decreased urinary stream, incomplete emptying, dysuria, urinary tract infection, and after rising post-void residual.** (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

The physical examination should include an abdominal and pelvic examination noting masses, tenderness, and presence of hernias. The pelvic examination should include palpation of the external genitalia, bladder base in females, and urethra in both sexes. The pelvic floor muscles in both sexes should be palpated for locations of tenderness and trigger points. The pelvic support for the bladder, urethra, vagina, and rectum should be documented. A focused evaluation to rule out vaginitis, urethritis, tender prostate, urethral diverticulum, or other potential sources of pain or infection is important. For a more detailed discussion, please see Weiss 2001.⁷³ A trial of antibiotic therapy is appropriate when infection is suspected; if symptoms resolve a course of antibiotic suppression may be considered to allow for full recovery. A brief neurological exam to rule out an occult neurologic problem and an evaluation for incomplete bladder

Urethral Stricture Disease

emptying to rule out occult retention should be done on all patients.

The basic laboratory examination includes a urinalysis and urine culture. A proper hematuria workup should be performed for patients with unevaluated hematuria, and considered for patients with tobacco exposure given the high risk of bladder cancer in smokers.⁷⁴ Urine culture may be indicated even in patients with a negative urinalysis in order to detect lower levels of bacteria that are clinically significant but not readily identifiable with a dipstick or on microscopic exam.

2. **After performing a history, physical examination, and urinalysis, clinicians may use a combination of patient reported measures, uroflowmetry, and ultrasound post-void residual assessment in the initial evaluation of suspected urethral stricture.** (*Clinical Principle*)

A number of self-report instruments, including the AUASI and UDI-6⁷⁷ have been used to evaluate men and women for LUTS. Individual questions from these instruments may be used to detect symptoms consistent with stricture disease.

If symptoms and signs suggest the presence of a stricture, noninvasive measures such as uroflowmetry may definitively delineate low flow, which is typically considered to be <12 mL/second.^{19, 20} Similarly, ultrasonographic PVR measurement may detect poor bladder emptying. The presence of voiding symptoms as described above, in combination with reduced peak flow rate for age, place patients at higher probability for urethral stricture, therefore indicating definitive evaluation such as cystoscopy, RUG, VCUG, or ultrasound urethrography.

3. **Clinicians should use urethro-cystoscopy, retrograde urethrography, voiding cystourethrography, or ultrasound urethrogram to make a diagnosis of urethral stricture.** (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

Endoscopy and/or radiological imaging of the urethra is essential for confirmation of the diagnosis, assessment of stricture severity (e.g., staging), and procedure selection. History, physical examination, and adjunctive measures



(Statements 1 and 2) cannot definitively confirm a urethral stricture. Urethroscopy identifies and localizes urethral stricture and allows evaluation of the distal caliber, but the length of the stricture and the urethra proximal to the urethral stricture cannot be assessed in most cases. When flexible cystoscopy does not allow visual assessment proximal to the urethral stricture, small caliber cystoscopy with a ureteroscope or flexible hysteroscope can be useful adjuncts. MRI can provide important detail in select cases (i.e., PFUI, diverticulum, fistula, cancer). In women, imaging of the urinary tract using endourethral MRI, ultrasonogram, and CT scan can confirm presence of periurethral fibrosis⁷⁶ and exclude associated abnormalities.⁷¹

RETROGRADE URETHROGRAPHY

RUG, with or without VCUG, remains the study of choice for delineation of stricture length, location, and severity in men.^{23, 24, 78} However, the image quality and accuracy of RUG is operator-dependent; surgical planning should be based on high quality images generated by experienced practitioners or the surgeon him/herself.⁷⁹

The modestly invasive nature of RUG reflects the potential risks, including patient discomfort, UTI, hematuria, and contrast extravasation. UTI is rare and contrast extravasation is very rare in expert hands. Exposure to the contrast puts the patient at risk for a contrast reaction, should there be an allergy. The risk is very low in the absence of inadvertent extravasation and may be mitigated by pre-medication with oral corticosteroids and histamine blockers. Complete or near complete occlusion of the urethra may make the assessment of the urethra proximal to the stricture difficult. In this instance, RUG may be combined with antegrade VCUG or other methods to define the extent of the stricture.

VOIDING CYSTOURETHROGRAPHY

VCUG performed by passing a small catheter proximal to the stricture, by retrograde filling of the bladder during RUG, or by antegrade filling via a SP tube, allows visualization of the urethra but is not always sufficient to completely delineate the distal extent of an urethral stricture. When used in conjunction with urodynamics to assess complex voiding dysfunction, elevated detrusor voiding pressures and urethral narrowing on VCUG indicate a clinically significant urethral stricture or other obstructive process.⁸⁰

Urethral Stricture Disease

ULTRASOUND URETHROGRAPHY

Ultrasound urethrography may serve to diagnose the presence of urethral stricture as well as describe the location, length, and severity of narrowing of strictures. It has a high sensitivity and specificity in the male anterior urethra but shares the drawbacks of RUG, including patient discomfort and dependence on a skilled ultrasonographer.²⁵ One study in women reported that the technique appeared to identify and characterize female urethral strictures adequately.⁸¹ Some advocate the use of urethral sonography (ultrasound urethrography) to define the extent of spongiositis and absolute length of the urethral stricture,⁸²⁻⁹⁵ although this is not strictly required and is not used by a majority of stricture experts.⁹⁶

4. Clinicians planning non-urgent intervention for a known stricture should determine the length and location of the urethral stricture. (*Expert Opinion*)

Determination of urethral stricture length and location allows the patient and urologist to engage in an informed discussion about treatment options, perioperative expectations, and expected outcomes following urethral stricture therapy. In addition, preoperative planning permits operative and anesthetic planning.

5. Surgeons may utilize urethral endoscopic management (e.g., urethral dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy) or immediate suprapubic cystostomy for urgent management of urethral stricture, such as discovery of symptomatic urinary retention or need for catheterization prior to another surgical procedure. (*Expert Opinion*)

When urethral strictures are identified at the time of catheter placement for another surgical procedure, assessment of the need for catheterization should be made. Urethral catheter placement may not be required for surgical procedures that are short in duration. If catheterization is deemed necessary, the primary consideration should be safe urinary drainage. Urethral strictures may be dilated in this setting to allow catheter insertion, and dilation over a guidewire is recommended to prevent false passage formation or rectal injury.



Alternatively, internal urethrotomy may be performed, particularly if the stricture is too dense to be adequately dilated. SP cystotomy may also be performed to provide urinary drainage at the time of surgery if these initial maneuvers are unsuccessful, or when subsequent definitive treatment for urethral stricture is planned in the near future.

6. Surgeons may place a suprapubic cystostomy to promote “urethral rest” prior to definitive urethroplasty in patients dependent on an indwelling urethral catheter or intermittent self-dilation. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Proper evaluation of a urethral stricture may require a period of “urethral rest,” without urethral instrumentation to determine the true severity of the stricture including its degree of narrowing. Men with a urethral stricture who have been managed with either an indwelling urethral catheter or self-dilation should generally undergo SP cystostomy placement prior to imaging. Experts agree that urethral rest via SP cystostomy promotes a safe transition strategy for patients with unstable strictures being referred for urethroplasty. Tissue recovery and stricture maturation can be expected in 4-6 weeks, which allows the stricture to mature and enables accurate radiographic and/or endoscopic identification in preparation for definitive management. If a patient can forgo clean intermittent catheterization (CIC) without acute urinary retention, a SP tube may be omitted during urethral rest.⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹ This allows the full length of the stricture to develop and accurate determination of definitive treatment options to be made. This is thought to maximize success by not underestimating the length of stricture and degree of spongiosclerosis. A similar period of observation is recommended before reassessing a stricture after failure or dilation or DVIU.

DILATION/INTERNAL URETHROTOMY/URETHROPLASTY

7. Surgeons may offer urethral dilation, direct visual internal urethrotomy, or urethroplasty for the initial treatment of a short (<2cm) bulbar urethral stricture. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Urethral Stricture Disease

Short bulbar urethral strictures may be treated by dilation, DVIU, or urethroplasty. Urethral dilation and DVIU have similar long-term outcomes in short strictures, with success ranging from 35-70%.¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰² The success of endoscopic treatment depends on the location and length of the stricture, with the highest success rates found in those with bulbar urethral strictures <1cm.¹⁰³⁻¹⁰⁵ Conversely, success rates for dilation or DVIU of strictures >2cm are very low.^{101, 105} Drug coated balloons have not been assessed in RCTs for first-time treatment of anterior urethral stricture.

Urethroplasty has a higher long-term success rate than endoscopic treatment, ranging from 80-95%. Urethroplasty may be offered as the initial treatment for a short bulbar urethral stricture, but the higher success rate of this treatment compared to endoscopic treatment must be weighed against the increased anesthesia requirement and higher morbidity of urethroplasty.

In patients with a short (<2cm) bulbar urethral stricture, non-transecting substitution urethroplasty results in fewer penile complications (e.g., poor glans filling, penile shortening) compared to transecting urethroplasty.¹⁰⁶ However, there appears to be no difference in ED measured by IIEF at 12 months with transecting compared to non-transecting urethroplasty.¹⁰⁶⁻¹⁰⁹

8. Surgeons may perform either dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy when performing endoscopic treatment of a urethral stricture. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Dilation and DVIU have similar success and complication rates and can be used interchangeably for the initial treatment of short urethral strictures. Few studies exist that compare different methods of performing DVIU, but cold knife and laser incision of the stricture scar appear to have similar success rates and may be used interchangeably.^{110, 111} Other methods of incision may be used experimentally, such as PlasmaKinetic incision.⁶¹ A small experimental study suggests that holmium: YAG laser urethrotomy may have higher success rates in iatrogenic strictures.¹¹⁰

Clinicians may endoscopically inject pharmacological agents into a urethral stricture at the time of DVIU to reduce risk of stricture recurrence. The few studies available showed a generally consistent lower stricture



recurrence rate when steroids were added to DVIU, although the findings did not reach statistical significance and follow up was relatively short.^{112, 113} Mitomycin C injected at the time of DVIU has also been shown to reduce stricture recurrence rate, although data is limited regarding long term follow up.¹¹⁴

9. Surgeons may safely remove the urethral catheter within 72 hours following uncomplicated dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

The reported length of catheterization after dilation or DVIU is highly variable in the literature, ranging from one to eight days.^{101, 105, 110, 115-119} There is no evidence that leaving the catheter longer than 72 hours improves safety or outcome, and catheters may be removed after 24-72 hours. Catheters may be left in longer for patient convenience or if in the surgeon's judgment early removal will increase the risk of complications.

10. In patients who are not candidates for urethroplasty, clinicians may recommend self-catheterization after direct visual internal urethrotomy to maintain temporary urethral patency. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Studies using varying self-catheterization schedules after DVIU, ranging from daily to weekly, have demonstrated that stricture recurrence rates were significantly lower among patients performing self-catheterization (RR: 0.51; 95% CI: 0.32-0.81; p = 0.004).^{116, 120-123} The optimal protocol for DVIU plus self-catheterization remains uncertain. However, data suggests that performing self-catheterization for greater than 4 months after DVIU reduced recurrence rates compared to performing self-catheterization for less than 3 months.^{116, 120-125} Even though the risk of UTI does not appear to be increased in patients performing self-catheterization after DVIU, the ability to continue with self-catheterization may be limited in some patients by manual dexterity or pain with catheterization.^{116, 125, 126}

11 a. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty, instead of repeated endoscopic management for recurrent anterior urethral strictures following failed

Urethral Stricture Disease

dilation or direct visual internal urethrotomy. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

11 b. Surgeons may offer urethral dilation, or direct visual internal urethrotomy, combined with drug-coated balloons, for recurrent bulbar urethral strictures <3cm in length. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade B)

Urethroplasty, even in the setting of failed endoscopic management, offers success rates in the range of 80-90%.¹²⁷ Urethral strictures that have been previously treated with dilation or DVIU are unlikely to be successfully treated with another endoscopic procedure,¹¹⁷ with failure rates of >80%.¹²⁸ Repeated endoscopic treatment may cause longer strictures and may increase the complexity of subsequent urethroplasty.¹²⁹ In patients who are unable to undergo, or who prefer to avoid, urethroplasty, repeated endoscopic procedures or intermittent self-catheterization may be considered as palliative measures.

The recent OPEN¹³⁰ and ROBUST III¹³¹ trials provide new insights into the evolving role for endoscopic management in the treatment of recurrent bulbar urethral stricture. If replicated in additional patient populations at longer follow-up, the two RCTs taken together suggest that future patients will face a wider range of treatment options for recurrent bulbar urethral stricture and that a shared decision-making approach to counseling may be advisable.

Using a patient-centered approach, the multicenter OPEN pragmatic trial used patient reported voiding symptoms as the primary outcome in a randomized superiority comparison of endoscopic urethrotomy versus open urethroplasty in men with recurrent bulbar urethral stricture <2cm in length. There was not a statistically significant difference in urethral stricture specific PRMs between the two groups over the 24-month study period: impact on daily activities and satisfaction with sexual function between the two groups was equivalent. Notably, participants who underwent urethroplasty were at a 48% reduced risk for reintervention (HR: 0.52; 95% CI: 0.31-0.89).¹³² Of those who received urethrotomy, 39% experienced a recurrence versus 19% in the urethroplasty group (p=0.001). Furthermore, participants in the urethroplasty group had 2.6 times greater odds of experiencing an improvement in their maximum flow rate



at 12-24 months than the participants in the urethrotomy group (OR: 2.6; 95% CI: 1.1–6.1; p= 0.024).^{130, 132}

The ROBUST III multicenter RCT used urethral patency at 6 months and freedom from retreatment at 1 year as the primary and secondary outcomes in a comparison of endoscopic treatment of the stricture combined with paclitaxel-coated urethral balloon versus DVIU/dilation in patients with recurrent anterior urethral strictures <3cm in length. Those who underwent endoscopic treatment combined with the drug-coated balloon had improved freedom from intervention at 1 year compared to DVIU/dilation alone (83.2% versus 21.7%).¹³¹ The 3-year outcomes for the same drug-coated balloon from the Robust I trial demonstrated a 67% functional success.¹³³

Although the device is approved by the FDA for anterior urethral strictures, because the trial was not powered to assess results in the subset of participants with penile urethra strictures, which constituted only 10% of the overall cohort, this panel's recommendation for use of drug-coated balloons is restricted to recurrent bulbar urethral strictures. Furthermore, the efficacy of repeated use of the drug coated balloon has not been ascertained and is not recommended. Most side effects were similar across treatment arms in ROBUST III, except hematuria and dysuria, which were more common after drug coated balloon treatment (11% versus 2% for both events). Significant levels of paclitaxel were measured in semen; it is recommended that men receiving this treatment utilize contraception through 6 months posttreatment if their partner has child-bearing potential.¹³¹

The findings of these two studies, highlight the importance of a patient centered approach to recurrent urethral strictures, challenges inherent in the evidence reviewed in support of this guideline, and opportunities for future directions. As individual studies without replication, both OPEN and ROBUST III are at greater risk for bias. The design of ROBUST III, with features of an efficacy study in a highly selected population, may not easily generalize to anterior urethral stricture patients broadly. In contrast, the pragmatic design of OPEN and performance at 50 sites across the UK National Health Service should assure greater generalizability. Further, each trial used a different conceptual choice of primary outcome. The investigators of the OPEN study emphasized that symptoms are likely to be the central concern for patients with bulbar urethral strictures and the reason why they look for treatment. ROBUST III used patency (ability to

Urethral Stricture Disease

pass a flexible cystoscope) and repeat intervention, rigorous and ascertainable endpoints that value freedom from reintervention over symptoms.

12. Surgeons who do not perform urethroplasty should refer patients to surgeons with expertise. (*Expert Opinion*)

When evaluating a patient with a recurrent urethral stricture, a physician who does not perform urethroplasty should consider referral to a surgeon with experience in this technique due to the higher rate of successful treatment compared to repeat endoscopic management. The relationship between surgical volume and quality is an area for future investigation. There are cases series that suggest that better outcomes following urethroplasty are associated with greater surgeon experience.¹³⁴

13. Surgeons may initially treat meatal or fossa navicularis strictures with either dilation or meatotomy. (*Clinical Principle*)

First time presentation of an uncomplicated urethral stricture confined to the meatus or fossa navicularis can be treated with simple dilation or meatotomy, with or without guidewire placement, as long as it is not associated with previous hypospadias repair, prior failed endoscopic manipulation, previous urethroplasty, or LS.⁴⁹

Strictures related to hypospadias and LS require unique treatment strategies.¹³⁵ However, in the setting of LS there is some evidence that extended meatotomy in conjunction with high-dose topical steroids may decrease the risk of recurrence as compared to meatotomy alone.¹³⁶ Additionally, no evidence exists on the optimal caliber of dilation or the need to implement a post dilation CIC regimen to reduce stricture recurrence.

14. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty to patients with recurrent meatal or fossa navicularis strictures. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

Meatal and fossa navicularis strictures refractory to endoscopic procedures are unlikely to respond to further endoscopic treatments.^{100, 101, 105, 117, 119, 137, 138} Furthermore, urethroplasty is the best option for completely obliterated strictures or strictures associated



with hypospadias or LS. Some patients may opt for repeat endoscopic treatments or intermittent self-dilation in lieu of more definitive treatment such as urethroplasty. Similar to other types of stricture exact delineation of length and etiology is important for guiding treatment.

Urologists have a variety of options at their disposal for the surgical treatment of meatal and fossa strictures, including meatoplasty, extended meatotomy, and several variations of urethroplasty. It is important to consider both aesthetic and functional outcomes when reconstructing strictures involving the glanular urethra. Simple reconfiguration of the meatus can be performed using a variety of techniques but is best suited to non-obiterated strictures confined to the meatus.¹³⁵ In this setting, there is an approximate 75% chance of success.¹³⁵ Meatotomy and extended meatotomy have also been employed with success rates up to 87%.^{49, 135}

Reconstruction of the fossa navicularis can be achieved using a variety of techniques and tissue sources without possible negative cosmetic and functional consequences of meatotomy. One-stage urethroplasty for recurrent meatal and fossa navicularis strictures has been reported with acceptable outcomes.^{49, 139-142} Strictures related to LS are less likely to be reconstructed successfully using genital skin transfer given that LS is a condition of the genital skin.¹⁴³ In these instances, the success of oral mucosal grafts has been reported between 83%-100%.^{139, 140, 144}

In the setting of failed hypospadias surgery, no single technique can be recommended, although the absence of adjacent skin for transfer increases the likelihood of requiring a staged oral mucosa graft urethroplasty.¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁴⁹

15. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty to patients with penile urethral strictures given the expected high recurrence rates with endoscopic treatments. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Strictures involving the penile urethra are more likely to be related to hypospadias, LS, or iatrogenic etiologies when compared to strictures of the bulbar urethra. These strictures are unlikely to respond to dilation or urethrotomy, except in select cases of previously untreated short strictures.^{100, 101, 105, 117, 119} Given the low likelihood of success with endoscopic treatments, most patients with penile urethral strictures should be offered

urethroplasty at the time of diagnosis, avoiding repeated endoscopic treatments. When compared to bulbar urethral strictures, penile urethral strictures are more likely to require tissue transfer and/or a staged approach.^{143, 150}

When performing single-stage urethroplasty, penile fasciocutaneous flaps and oral mucosal grafts have been used in differing configurations.^{49, 55, 151-157} Success rates in penile urethroplasty for properly selected patients appear similar regardless of tissue and technique used.^{154, 158, 159}

16. Surgeons should offer urethroplasty as the initial treatment for patients with long ($\geq 2\text{cm}$) bulbar urethral strictures given the low success rate of direct visual internal urethrotomy or dilation. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Longer strictures are less responsive to endoscopic treatment, with success rates of only 20% for strictures $>4\text{cm}$ in the bulbar urethra.¹⁰² The success rate for buccal mucosa graft urethroplasty for strictures of this length is greater than 80%.^{43, 160, 161}

Given the low efficacy of endoscopic treatment, urethroplasty should be offered to patients with long urethral strictures. Urethroplasty may be performed using a variety of techniques based on the experience of the surgeon, most often through substitution or augmentation of the narrowed segment of the urethra.

17. Surgeons may reconstruct long multi-segment strictures with one-stage or multi-stage techniques using oral mucosal grafts, penile fasciocutaneous flaps, or a combination of these techniques. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Multi-segment strictures (frequently referred to as panurethral strictures) are most commonly defined as strictures $>10\text{cm}$ spanning long segments of both the penile and bulbar urethra. These strictures are particularly complex to treat surgically.⁴⁷ Several treatment options exist including long-term endoscopic management, urethroplasty, or perineal urethrostomy. Clinicians should be aware that panurethral strictures are very unlikely to be treated successfully with endoscopic means, which



offer only temporary relief of obstruction.^{26, 100, 101, 105, 117, 119, 137} However, urethroplasty in these instances is also more complicated, time-consuming, and has a higher failure rate as compared to urethroplasty for less complicated strictures.^{47, 162, 163} Thus, some patients may choose repeat endoscopic treatments, with or without a self-dilation protocol, or a perineal urethrostomy, in order to avoid complex urethral reconstructive surgery.

Reconstruction of panurethral strictures should be addressed with all of the tools in the reconstructive armamentarium including fasciocutaneous flaps, oral mucosal grafts, or other ancillary tissue sources, and may require a combination of these techniques.^{47, 156, 164} These labor intensive and technically challenging surgeries are best performed at established high volume reconstructive centers. Several tissue sources have been reported including oral mucosal grafts, various skin grafts, and genital fasciocutaneous flaps.^{47, 156, 164, 165} Regardless of technique and combinations, success rates appear similar in all of these small series. Superior efficacy of “double graft” procedures has not yet been demonstrated and these techniques are typically applied to select instances of urethral obliteration.^{29, 45, 55, 63, 144, 166-168} Staged procedures may offer a conservative approach suited to the most complex strictures such as those related to failed hypospadias surgery.^{145-149, 169}

- 18 a. Surgeons may offer perineal urethrostomy as a long-term treatment option to patients as an alternative to urethroplasty. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)**
- 18 b. Surgeons should offer perineal urethrostomy as a long-term treatment option to patients as an alternative to urethroplasty in patient populations at high risk for failure of urethral reconstruction. (Expert Opinion)**

Perineal urethrostomy can be used as a staged or permanent option for patients with anterior urethral strictures in order to establish unobstructed voiding and improve QoL.^{170, 171} Reasons to perform perineal urethrostomy (Table 3) include recurrent or primary complex anterior stricture, medical co-morbidities precluding extended operative time, extensive LS, numerous failed attempts at urethroplasty, and patient choice.^{49, 172-174}

Urethral Stricture Disease

Table 3: Considerations in Decision Making for Perineal Urethrostomy

Recurrent strictures failing prior reconstructions
Accustomed to seated voiding
Buried penis
Multiple comorbidities
Complex penile strictures, including reoperative hypospadias
Lichen Sclerosus
Poor access to urologic care
Urinary continence status

Patients undergoing perineal urethrostomy have reported high QoL, although surgical revision may be necessary to maintain patency over long term follow up.^{172, 173} Successful treatment with perineal urethrostomy has been reported in both traumatic and LS strictures.¹⁷²⁻¹⁷⁴ There are no data demonstrating that a specific surgical technique is associated with a higher patient QoL or long term patency rate.

- 19 a. Surgeons should use oral mucosa as the first choice when using grafts for urethroplasty. (Expert Opinion)**
- 19 b. Surgeons may use either buccal or lingual mucosal grafts as equivalent alternatives. (Strong Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade A)**

Oral mucosa is the preferred graft for substitution urethroplasty. Patient satisfaction is higher for oral mucosa due to less post-void dribbling and penile skin problems.^{40, 60}

Oral mucosa may be harvested from the inner cheeks (buccal), which provide the largest graft area, the undersurface of the tongue (lingual), or the inner lower lip (labial). Lingual mucosa is thinner than buccal mucosa, and thus may provide an advantage in reconstructive procedures of the distal urethra and meatus by causing less restriction of the urethral lumen. Harvest of buccal mucosa from the inner cheek results in fewer complications and better outcomes as compared to a lower lip donor site.¹⁷⁵ A meta-analysis of 12 published studies found no difference in the success rate of buccal



and lingual mucosal grafts when the donor sites were compared (RR:1.03; 95% CI:0.96-1.10).¹⁷⁶ The same meta-analysis found no significant difference between mucosal sites for risk of stricture complications or risk of fistula/wound dehiscence. However, buccal mucosal grafts carried a higher risk of donor site swelling, oral numbness, and difficulty with mouth opening, while patients undergoing lingual mucosal grafts demonstrated higher risk of difficulty with speech and difficulty with tongue protrusion.

When harvesting buccal mucosa from the inner cheek, the donor site may safely be left open to heal by secondary intention or closed primarily.¹⁷⁷ A meta-analysis of five RCTs found no difference between closure and non-closure procedures when focusing on oral pain, need for secondary oral procedures, cosmetic defects, oral numbness, salivary problems, or impaired mouth opening.¹⁷⁸ Ultimately the decision to close the donor site primarily or leave it open is at the discretion of the surgeon; large grafts required for staged urethroplasty often create defects that cannot be closed.

20. Surgeons should not perform substitution urethroplasty with allograft, xenograft, or synthetic materials except under experimental protocols. (*Expert Opinion*)

Use of non-autologous grafts may be indicated in the patient who has failed a prior urethroplasty and has no tissue available for reoperative substitution urethroplasty. However, experience to date is limited and the long term success rates are unknown.^{53 179-182} Such patients should be considered for referral to a center involved in clinical trials using allograft, xenograft, engineered or synthetic materials.

21. Surgeons should not perform a single-stage tubularized graft urethroplasty. (*Expert Opinion*)

Tubularized urethroplasty consists of a technique in which a graft or flap is rolled into a tube over a catheter to completely replace a segment of urethra. This approach, when attempted in a single stage, has a high risk of restenosis and should be avoided. This is distinct from a tubularized graft that is supported in its entirety by a suitable graft bed (e.g., 1-stage tubularized buccal mucosa graft of the fossa navicularis urethra supported

Urethral Stricture Disease

by corpus spongiosum of glans). When no alternative exists, a tubularized flap can be performed with results that are inferior to onlay flaps.^{183, 184} Currently, available alternatives include combined tissue transfer (e.g., a dorsal buccal graft combined with a ventral skin flap in a single stage), combined dorsal and ventral grafts (e.g., a dorsal graft in the technique of Asopa and a ventral onlay graft), or staged urethroplasty with local skin flaps or oral mucosa grafts.

22. Surgeons should not use hair-bearing skin for substitution urethroplasty. (*Clinical Principle*)

The use of hair-bearing skin for substitution urethroplasty may result in urethral calculi, recurrent UTI and a restricted urinary stream due to hair obstructing the lumen, and therefore should be avoided except in rare cases where no alternative exists.¹⁸⁵ Intraurethral hair should be suspected in patients who report these symptoms and have a history of prior tubularized urethroplasty or surgery for proximal hypospadias, in which scrotal skin may have been incorporated into the repair and demonstrate later hair growth.

URETHRAL RECONSTRUCTION AFTER PELVIC FRACTURE URETHRAL INJURY

23. Clinicians should use retrograde urethrography with voiding cystourethrogram and/or retrograde + antegrade cystoscopy for preoperative planning of delayed urethroplasty after pelvic fracture urethral injury. (*Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C*)

Pre-operative evaluation of the distraction defect after PFUI should include RUG, VCUG, and/or retrograde urethroscopy. The VCUG may include a static cystogram to determine the competency of the bladder neck mechanism and the level of the bladder neck in relation to the symphysis pubis. Other adjunctive studies may include antegrade cystoscopy, with or without fluoroscopy, and pelvic CT or MRI to assess the proximal extent of the injury, degree of malalignment of the urethra, and length of the defect.



24. Surgeons should perform delayed urethroplasty instead of delayed endoscopic procedures after urethral obstruction/obliteration due to pelvic fracture urethral injury. (Expert Opinion)

The acute treatment of PFUI includes endoscopic primary catheter realignment or insertion of a SP tube. The resulting distraction defect, stenosis, or obliteration should be managed with delayed perineal anastomotic urethroplasty. Repeated endoscopic maneuvers including CIC should be avoided because they are not successful in the majority of PFUI, increase patient morbidity, and may delay the time to anastomotic reconstruction. Clinicians should avoid blind "cut to the light" procedures in the obliterated PFUI since they are rarely successful in long term follow up.

Anastomotic reconstruction is performed through a perineal approach. Excision of the scar tissue and wide spatulation of the anastomosis is required. Several methods to gain urethral length and reduce tension can be employed when necessary including mobilization of the bulbar urethra, crural separation, inferior pubectomy, and supracrural rerouting, but in most cases the latter two maneuvers are not required. In rare cases, trans abdominal or transpubic techniques may be required. In order to potentially decrease the potential for vascular compromise to the urethra, a bulbar artery sparing approach has been described. No comparative study has yet shown any definitive benefit. Clinicians should refer patients to appropriate tertiary care centers for reconstruction when necessary.

25. Definitive urethral reconstruction for pelvic fracture urethral injury should be planned only after major injuries stabilize and patients can be safely positioned for urethroplasty. (Expert Opinion)

The timing of urethral reconstruction in PFUI is highly dependent on patient factors. No optimal time to perform urethral reconstruction has been established, with studies reporting a wide range of times from 6 weeks to 4 years.¹⁸⁶ Reconstruction should occur when patient factors allow the surgery to be performed, usually within 3 to 6 months after the trauma. Patient positioning in the lithotomy (standard, high, or exaggerated) may be limited until orthopedic and lower extremity soft tissues injuries have resolved.

FEMALE URETHRAL RECONSTRUCTION

26. Surgeons may reconstruct female urethral strictures using oral mucosal grafts, vaginal flaps, or a combination of these techniques. (Moderate Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Given the low efficacy of endoscopic treatment, urethroplasty should be offered to patients with female urethral strictures.⁷¹ Urethroplasty may be performed using a variety of techniques based on the experience of the surgeon. Multiple studies have demonstrated similar outcomes for oral mucosa grafts (dorsal and ventral), vaginal flaps, or a combination of these techniques, with success rates between 69-95%.^{71, 72, 187-191}

BLADDER NECK CONTRACTURE/ VESICOURETHRAL STENOSIS

27. Surgeons may perform a dilation, bladder neck incision, or transurethral resection for bladder neck contracture after endoscopic prostate procedure. (Expert Opinion)

Treatment of bladder neck contractures following endoscopic prostate procedures can be performed with either a bladder neck incision or bladder neck resection depending on surgeon preference, with comparable outcomes expected. Repeat endoscopic treatment may be necessary for successful outcomes. No studies exist that compare the different treatment strategies for bladder neck contractures after endoscopic prostate procedures.

28. Surgeons may perform a dilation, vesicourethral incision, or transurethral resection for post-prostatectomy vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

Treatment of first-time vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis is successful in about 50-80% of cases, with all techniques having similar success rates.¹⁹²⁻¹⁹⁶ Success appears to be lower in cases with prior pelvic radiation; however, prospective cohort studies including radiated and nonradiated patients are lacking. Repeat endoscopic treatment may be necessary for successful treatment.



There is conflicting data about the utility of Mitomycin-C for the treatment of recurrent vesicourethral stenosis, with further study necessary to validate its use.^{197, 198} Patients should be made aware of the risk of incontinence after any of these procedures.

29. Surgeons may perform robotic or open reconstruction for recalcitrant stenosis of the bladder neck or post-prostatectomy vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis. (Conditional Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade C)

The treatment of recalcitrant vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis (VUAS) or bladder neck contracture must be tailored to the preferences of the patient, taking into consideration prior radiotherapy and the degree of urinary incontinence. Reconstruction is challenging and may cause significant urinary incontinence requiring subsequent artificial urinary sphincter implantation. VUAS or bladder neck reconstruction can be performed robotically or open. Robotic-assisted reconstruction patency rates range from 72.7-75%.^{199, 200} In patients who were preoperatively continent, 82% were continent post-operatively.¹⁹⁹ Open VUAS or bladder neck reconstruction can be performed retropubically or perineally with patency rates ranging from 70-100%.²⁰¹⁻²⁰³ In patients continent of urine pre-operatively who had a retropubic approach, 10% were incontinent post-operatively, while those who had a perineal reconstruction had an 83.3% incontinence rate post-operatively.^{201, 202} Success rates are lower after radiation.

For the patient who does not desire urethroplasty, repeat urethral dilation, incision, or resection of the stenosis is appropriate. Intermittent self-dilation with a catheter may be used to prolong the time between operative interventions. SP diversion is an alternative.

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

30. In men who require chronic self-catheterization (e.g., neurogenic bladder), surgeons may offer urethroplasty as a treatment option for urethral stricture causing difficulty with intermittent self-catheterization. (Expert Opinion)

In men with neurogenic bladder (NGB) urethral pathology may include stricture, diverticulum, fistula, and erosion.

Urethral Stricture Disease

Bladder function must be considered prior to urethroplasty as significant underlying detrusor dysfunction it may alter the course of treatment. It is unclear if anterior urethroplasty in this setting has higher rates of complications, stricture recurrence, or reoperation when compared to men with anterior urethral stricture and intact bladder function.^{204, 205} There is some evidence to suggest that urethral reconstruction, if offered at an early stage in men with stricture and NGB, can achieve outcomes comparable to men without NGB.²⁰⁴ It is not definitively known if resumption of CIC following anterior urethroplasty impacts the risk of stricture recurrence.

LICHEN SCLEROSUS

LS is a chronic inflammatory, scar forming dermatologic disease that predominately affects the genitalia. In women, urethral stricture is not a common feature of LS.²⁰⁶ In men, LS has a wide spectrum of disease presentation and severity, and thus warrants particular attention from urologists. Patients with LS may present with penile skin scarring, adhesions to the glans, and is a frequent contributor to the development of acquired buried penis. Additionally, LS is capable of malignant transformation, progressing to squamous cell carcinoma in 2-8% of patients.^{207, 208} This is important, in that male patients presenting with acquired buried penis also have concomitant urethral strictures in 31-47% of cases, thereby requiring careful evaluation and management.²⁰⁹⁻²¹¹

Urethroplasty is challenging in this population, as patients are more likely to be active tobacco smokers, have a higher body mass index, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease, and have longer urethral strictures compared to non-LS urethral strictures.²¹²⁻²¹⁴ Urethroplasty often requires multiple oral mucosa grafts to reconstruct long-segment strictures, often with a lower success rate compared to non-LS urethral strictures, and thus a comprehensive discussion of the various management strategies is warranted.

31. Clinicians may perform biopsy for suspected lichen sclerosus and must perform biopsy if urethral cancer is suspected. (Clinical Principle)

The external manifestations of LS in males can range in severity from mild to aggressive. It is most commonly



found in the genital region and may be associated with urethral strictures.^{207, 215, 216} LS may mimic many other skin diseases; therefore, biopsy is the best method for definitive diagnosis. The rate of squamous cell carcinoma in male patients with LS has been reported to be 2-8.6%, further indicating the need for biopsy in selected cases both to confirm the diagnosis as well as to exclude malignant or premalignant changes.^{208, 216-218}

32. In lichen sclerosus-proven urethral stricture, surgeons should not use genital skin for reconstruction. (Strong Recommendation; Evidence Level: Grade B)

Goals of management of LS should be to alleviate symptoms, prevent and treat urethral stricture disease and prevent and detect malignant transformation.²⁰⁷

Treatment of genital skin LS reduces symptoms, such as skin itching and bleeding, and may serve to prevent meatus stenosis and progression to extensive stricture of the penile urethra. Current therapies rely heavily on topical moderate- to high-potency steroid creams, such as clobetasol or mometasone creams. Calcineurin inhibitors such as tacrolimus have been shown to cause regression in external skin manifestations.²⁰⁷

Reconstruction of anterior urethral strictures associated with LS should proceed according to principles of anterior urethroplasty, with the caveat that the use of genital skin flaps and grafts should be avoided due to very high long-term failure rates.^{143, 219-221}

POST-OPERATIVE FOLLOW-UP

33. Clinicians should monitor urethral stricture patients to identify symptomatic recurrence following dilation, direct visual internal urethrotomy, or urethroplasty. (Expert Opinion)

Urethral stricture recurrence following endoscopic treatment or urethroplasty can occur at any time in the postoperative period, and, because of this, a specific regimen for postoperative follow-up cannot be reliably determined. The surgeon may consider more frequent follow-up intervals in men at an increased risk for stricture recurrence including those with prior failed treatment (multiple endoscopic procedures or previous urethroplasty), tobacco use, diabetes, increasing stricture

Urethral Stricture Disease

length, strictures related to LS, hypospadias, or a repair involving a flap or graft.^{134, 154, 162, 163, 221-229}

Surgeons can use a number of diagnostic tests to detect or screen for stricture recurrence following open or endoscopic treatment (see Statements 1 and 2); however, the use of, or combination of, urethrocystoscopy, urethral ultrasound, or RUG appears to provide the most definitive confirmation of stricture recurrence.^{82, 84, 85, 87-90, 230, 231} No specific urethral lumen diameter, determined endoscopically or radiographically, has been shown to be diagnostic of a stricture recurrence.

Although stents are not currently recommended for the treatment of urethral stricture. Patients treated with a urethral stent after dilation or internal urethrotomy should be monitored for recurrent stricture and complications. Recurrent strictures have been reported in new urethral regions outside of the stent placement as well as within the stent treated region.²³²⁻²³⁴ Patients with completely obstructed stents may require open urethroplasty and removal of the stent.²³³ Other stent complications include stent-induced hematuria, urethral pain, urinary incontinence, and chronic UTI.^{128, 232-236} Complications can occur at any time point after stent placement, so long-term monitoring with cystoscopy or urethral imaging is advised. Stents do not need to be prophylactically removed and should be followed conservatively unless associated with significant urethral or voiding symptoms.

Future Directions

Much of the literature on the topic urethral strictures consists of single surgeon or single institution case series with inconsistent definitions of stricture length, location, and etiology; success of treatment; and follow up. These inconsistencies make comparisons between studies difficult, while also providing ample opportunities for future research. To improve the quality of research, the Panel recommends the following:

- Standardize research terms to allow comparison between centers; specifically, the International Consultation on Urological Diseases nomenclature should be used. For example, the term "urethral stricture" should be applied to a narrowing of the anterior urethra that restrict the flow of urine.



- Utilization of an urethral stricture classification system that organizes the disease process, allows for improved patient counseling on expected outcomes, and better facilitates comparison of similar strictures across research studies.^{237, 238} Future urethroplasty research should include classification systems to better evaluate and compare uniform strictures.
- In studies of the treatment of urethral strictures, multiple criteria for success should be reported. When data is available, studies should report success based on several criteria: PRMs, symptoms, uroflowmetry, radiography, cystoscopy, and need for subsequent procedures. This would facilitate comparison between multiple studies. A consensus primary outcome measure should be considered for future RCT and registry studies.
- The duration of follow-up based on time of last clinic visit, telephone contact, or absence of known treatment for recurrence should be reported in all studies of urethral stricture treatment. Time-to-event analysis (Kaplan-Meier curves) should be reported.
- Multi-institutional collaboration should be formed to evaluate management of uncommon diagnoses such as PFUI, hypospadias, panurethral strictures, and LS.

Urethral stricture remains a subject of active investigation. The Panel suggests the following issues in future investigations:

- Basic science and epidemiological research into the etiology of urethral strictures.
- Continued evaluation of robotic techniques to treat posterior urethral strictures and those extending into the proximal bulbar urethra.
- Prevention of catheter associated urethral injury and traumatic strictures through educational efforts on proper technique of catheter insertion and management after insertion.
- Studies on the effectiveness of early diagnosis and treatment of LS toward prevention of disease progression and urethral stricture formation.
- Basic science and animal studies using novel graft materials for urethral reconstruction (i.e., stem cells, tissue-engineered scaffolds).
- Long-term follow-up for adults in patients who have been treated as children, such as urethral stricture in adults after hypospadias repair.
- Further evaluation of alternative sources of autologous graft material.

- The efficacy of injection or balloon-coated anti-proliferative or other pharmacological agents at time of endoscopic treatment for penile urethral stricture, previous failed urethroplasty, posterior urethral stenosis, and bladder neck contracture.
- The relationship between of urethroplasty and ED.
- Role of urethral transection in urethroplasty regarding morbidity and outcomes.
- Dissemination and implementation of optimal perioperative antibiotic strategies for urethrotomy and urethroplasty.^{239, 240}
- Determination of the ideal tissue for substitution urethroplasty.
- The optimal tissue and urethroplasty technique for urethral stricture following phalloplasty.

Urethral Stricture Disease

Abbreviations

AUA	American Urological Association
AUSAI	American Urological Association Symptom Index
CIC	Clean intermittent catheterization
DVIU	Direct visual internal urethrotomy
ED	Erectile dysfunction
IIEF	International index of erectile function
LS	Lichen sclerosus
LUTS	Lower urinary tract symptoms
NGB	Neurogenic bladder
PFUD	Pelvic fracture urethral defects
PFUI	Pelvic fracture urethral injury
PGC	Practice Guidelines Committee
PRM	Patient reported measures
PVR	Post-void residual
QoL	Quality of life
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
RUG	Retrograde urethrography
SP	Suprapubic
UTI	Urinary tract infection
VCUG	Voiding cystourethrography
VUAS	Vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis



URETHRAL STRICTURE DISEASE PANEL, CONSULTANTS, AND STAFF

Panel 2016

Hunter Wessells, MD, Co-Chair
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Richard A. Santucci, MD, Co-Chair
The Detroit Medical Center
Detroit, MI

Kenneth W. Angermeier, MD
Cleveland Clinic
Cleveland, OH

Sean P. Elliott, MD
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

Christopher M. Gonzales, MD
Northwestern Medical Faculty Foundation
Chicago, IL

Ron T. Kodama, MD
Sunnybrook Heath Sciences Centre
Toronto, ON Canada

Andrew C. Peterson, MD
Duke University Medical Center
Durham, NC

Keith Rourke, MD
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB Canada

John T. Stoffel, MD (PGC Representative)
University of Michigan Medical Center
Ann Arbor, MI

Alex Vanni, MD
Lahey Clinic Medical Center
Burlington, MA

Bryan Voelzke, MD
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Lee Zhao, MD
NYU Medical Center
New York, NY

Consultants 2016

Jonathan R. Treadwell, PhD
ECRI

Staff 2016

Heddy Hubbard, PhD, MPH, RN, FAAN
Abid Khan, MHS, MPP
Erin Kirkby, MS
Shalini Selvarajah, MD
Nenellia K. Bronson, MA
Leila Rahimi, MHS
Brooke Bixler, MPH

Amendment Panel 2023

Hunter Wessells, MD, Chair
University of Washington
Seattle, WA

Alex Vanni, MD
Lahey Clinic Medical Center
Burlington, MA

Allen Morey, MD
UT Southwestern Medical Center
Dallas, Texas

Consultants 2023

Lesley Souter, PhD
Nomadic EBM Methodology

Staff 2023

Erin Kirkby, MS
Leila Rahimi, MPH
Brooke Bixler, MPH
Sennett K. Kim
Chelsi Matthews

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES 2016

All panel members completed COI disclosures. Disclosures listed include both topic- and non-topic-related relationships.

Consultant/Advisor: Sean Elliott: American Medical Systems, GT Urological

Meeting Participant or Lecturer: Kenneth Angermeier: American Medical Systems; Sean Elliott: American Medical Systems; Ron Kodama: Journal of Urology/GURS; Andrew Peterson: American Medical



Systems, Inc.; Hunter Wessells: National Institutes of Health

Scientific Study or Trial: Ron Kodama: Journal of Urology/GURS; Andrew Peterson: American Medical Systems, Inc.; John Stoffel: Uroplasty; Hunter Wessells: National Institutes of Health

Leadership Position: Sean Elliott: Percuvision; Ron Kodama: Journal of Urology, GURS; Andrew Peterson: Society of Government Service Urologists Southeastern Section, AUA Board of Directors, GURS Board of Directors

Other: Christopher Gonzalez: American Medical Systems; Hunter Wessells: National Institutes of Health

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES 2023

All panel members completed COI disclosures. Disclosures listed include both topic- and non-topic-related relationships.

Meeting Participant or Lecturer: Allen Morey: Boston Scientific, Coloplast

Scientific Study or Trial: Alex Vanni: Boston Scientific, Ellison Foundation Grant; Hunter Wessells: NIH

2016 PEER REVIEWERS

We are grateful to the persons listed below who contributed to the Guideline by providing comments during the peer review process. Their reviews do not necessarily imply endorsement of the Guideline.

Jennifer T. Anger, MD
Noel A. Armenakas, MD
Mark S. Austenfeld, MD
Gregory T. Bales, MD

Guido Barbagli, MD
John M. Barry, MD
William W. Bohnert, MD
Timothy C. Brand, MD
Rodney H. Breau, MD
Benjamin N. Breyer, MD
Joshua A. Broghammer, MD
Jill C. Buckley, MD
Frank N. Burks, MD
Steven Eric Canfield, MD
Justin Chee, MD
Muhammad S. Choudhury, MD
Peter E. Clark, MD

John D. Denstedt, MD
Daniel David Dugi III, MD
Margit M. Fisch, MD
Brian J. Flynn, MD
Reynaldo G. Gomez, MD
Uri Gur, MD
Ty T. Higuchi, MD
James R. Jezior, MD
Melissa R. Kaufman, MD
Louis R. Kavoussi, MD
Sanjay B. Kulkarni, MD
Deborah J. Lightner, MD
Bahaa Sami Malaeb, MD
Joshua J. Meeks, MD, PhD
Douglas F. Milam, MD
Manoj Monga, MD
Raul Caesar Ordonica, MD
Craig A. Peters, MD
Robert Pickard, MD
Kevin McVary, MD
Hassan Razvi, MD
Daniel I. Rosenstein, MD
Charles L. Secrest, MD
Eila Curlee Skinner, MD
Daniel Stein, MD
Chandru P. Sundaram, MD
Ryan P. Terlecki, MD
Jeremy Brian Tonkin, MD
Ramon Virasoro, MD
J. Stuart Wolf, Jr., MD
Hadley M. Wood, MD
Guo-bing Xiong, MD

2023 PEER REVIEWERS

We are grateful to the persons listed below who contributed to the Guideline by providing comments during the peer review process. Their reviews do not necessarily imply endorsement of the Guideline.

Kenneth W. Angermeier, MD
Erin Travis Bird, MD
Stephen A. Boorjian, MD, FACS
Sam Chang, MD
John D. Denstedt, MD, FRCSC
Sean P. Elliott, MD
David A. Ginsberg, MD
Christopher M. Gonzalez, MD
Ron Kodama MD FRCSC
Gary Evan Lemack, MD
Edward M. Messing, MD, FACS
Matthew Edward Nielsen, MD
Andrew C. Peterson
Phillip M. Pierorazio
Hassan Razvi, MD
Keith Rourke



Richard A. Santucci
Angela M. Smith, MD
Thomas F. Stringer, MD
Bryan Voelzke, MD
Lee Zhao, MD

DISCLAIMER

This document was written by the Urethral Stricture Guideline Panel of the American Urological Association Education and Research, Inc., which was created in 2015. The Practice Guidelines Committee (PGC) of the AUA selected the Panel Chair. Panel members were selected by the Chair. Membership of the panel included specialists with specific expertise on this disorder. The mission of the panel was to develop recommendations that are analysis-based or consensus-based, depending on panel processes and available data, for optimal clinical practices in the diagnosis and treatment of stress urinary incontinence.

Funding of the panel was provided by the AUA. Panel members received no remuneration for their work. Each member of the panel provides an ongoing conflict of interest disclosure to the AUA.

While these guidelines do not necessarily establish the standard of care, AUA seeks to recommend and to encourage compliance by practitioners with current best practices related to the condition being treated. As medical knowledge expands and technology advances, the guidelines will change. Today these evidence-based guidelines statements represent not absolute mandates but provisional proposals for treatment under the specific conditions described in each document. For all these reasons, the guidelines do not pre-empt physician judgment in individual cases.

Treating physicians must take into account variations in resources, and patient tolerances, needs, and preferences. Conformance with any clinical guideline does not guarantee a successful outcome. The guideline text may include information or recommendations about certain drug uses ('off label') that are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), or about medications or substances not subject to the FDA approval process. AUA urges strict compliance with all government regulations and protocols for prescription and use of these substances. The physician is encouraged to carefully follow all available prescribing information about

Urethral Stricture Disease

indications, contraindications, precautions and warnings. These guidelines and best practice statements are not intended to provide legal advice about use and misuse of these substances.

Although guidelines are intended to encourage best practices and potentially encompass available technologies with sufficient data as of close of the literature review, they are necessarily time-limited. Guidelines cannot include evaluation of all data on emerging technologies or management, including those that are FDA-approved, which may immediately come to represent accepted clinical practices.

For this reason, the AUA does not regard technologies or management which are too new to be addressed by this guideline as necessarily experimental or investigational.



References

1. Higgins JPT SJ, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC: Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021): Cochrane 2022.
2. Appendix b: Quality assessment methods for drug class reviews for the drug effectiveness review project. . Oregon Health & Science University 2005;
3. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME et al: QUADAS-2: A revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. Ann Intern Med 2011; **155**: 529.
4. Faraday M, Hubbard H, Kosiak B et al: Staying at the cutting edge: A review and analysis of evidence reporting and grading; the recommendations of the American urological association. BJU Int 2009; **104**: 294.
5. Wessells H, Angermeier KW, Elliott S et al: Male urethral stricture: American urological association guideline. J Urol 2017; **197**: 182.
6. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G et al: AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ 2017; **358**: j4008.
7. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC et al: The cochrane collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ 2011; **343**: d5928.
8. Sterne JA, Hernan MA, Reeves BC et al: Robins-i: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ 2016; **355**: i4919.
9. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA et al: Grade guidelines: 1. Introduction-grade evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. J Clin Epidemiol 2011; **64**: 383.
10. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schunemann HJ et al: Grade guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011; **64**: 401.
11. Hsu C, Sandford, BA: The delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation 2019; **12**: 1.
12. Latini JM, McAninch JW, Brandes SB et al: SIU/ICUD consultation on urethral strictures: Epidemiology, etiology, anatomy, and nomenclature of urethral stenoses, strictures, and pelvic fracture urethral disruption injuries. Urology 2014; **83**: S1.
13. Stein DM, Thum DJ, Barbagli G et al: A geographic analysis of male urethral stricture aetiology and location. BJU Int 2013; **112**: 830.
14. Fenton AS, Morey AF, Aviles R et al: Anterior urethral strictures: Etiology and characteristics. Urology 2005; **65**: 1055.
15. Lumen N, Hoebeke P, Willemsen P et al: Etiology of urethral stricture disease in the 21st century. J Urol 2009; **182**: 983.
16. Nuss GR, Granieri MA, Zhao LC et al: Presenting symptoms of anterior urethral stricture disease: A disease specific, patient reported questionnaire to measure outcomes. J Urol 2012; **187**: 559.
17. Jackson MJ, Chaudhury I, Mangera A et al: A prospective patient-centred evaluation of urethroplasty for anterior urethral stricture using a validated patient-reported outcome measure. Eur Urol 2013; **64**: 777.



18. Breyer BN, Edwards TC, Patrick DL et al: Comprehensive qualitative assessment of urethral stricture disease: Toward the development of a patient centered outcome measure. *J Urol* 2017; **198**: 1113.
19. Erickson BA, Breyer BN and McAninch JW: Changes in uroflowmetry maximum flow rates after urethral reconstructive surgery as a means to predict for stricture recurrence. *J Urol* 2011; **186**: 1934.
20. Erickson BA, Breyer BN and McAninch JW: The use of uroflowmetry to diagnose recurrent stricture after urethral reconstructive surgery. *J Urol* 2010; **184**: 1386.
21. Blaivas JG and Groutz A: Bladder outlet obstruction nomogram for women with lower urinary tract symptomatology. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2000; **19**: 553.
22. Defreitas GA, Zimmern PE, Lemack GE et al: Refining diagnosis of anatomic female bladder outlet obstruction: Comparison of pressure-flow study parameters in clinically obstructed women with those of normal controls. *Urology* 2004; **64**: 675.
23. Mahmud SM, El KS, Rana AM et al: Is ascending urethrogram mandatory for all urethral strictures? *J Pak Med Assoc* 2008; **58**: 429.
24. Andersen J, Aagaard J and Jaszcak P: Retrograde urethrography in the postoperative control of urethral strictures treated with visual internal urethrotomy. *Urol Int* 1987; **42**: 390.
25. McAninch JW, Laing FC and Jeffrey RB, Jr.: Sonourethrography in the evaluation of urethral strictures: A preliminary report. *J Urol* 1988; **139**: 294.
26. Santucci RA, McAninch JW, Mario LA et al: Urethroplasty in patients older than 65 years: Indications, results, outcomes and suggested treatment modifications. *J Urol* 2004; **172**: 201.
27. Wolf JS, Jr., Bennett CJ, Dmochowski RR et al: Best practice policy statement on urologic surgery antimicrobial prophylaxis. *J Urol* 2008; **179**: 1379.
28. Al-Qudah HS, Cavalcanti AG and Santucci RA: Early catheter removal after anterior anastomotic (3 days) and ventral buccal mucosal onlay (7 days) urethroplasty. *Int Braz J Urol* 2005; **31**: 459.
29. Palminteri E, Berdondini E, Shokeir AA et al: Two-sided bulbar urethroplasty using dorsal plus ventral oral graft: Urinary and sexual outcomes of a new technique. *J Urol* 2011; **185**: 1766.
30. El-Kassaby AW, El-Zayat TM, Azazy S et al: One-stage repair of long bulbar urethral strictures using augmented russell dorsal strip anastomosis: Outcome of 234 cases. *Eur Urol* 2008; **53**: 420.
31. Anger JT, Sherman ND and Webster GD: The effect of bulbar urethroplasty on erectile function. *J Urol* 2007; **178**: 1009.
32. Dogra PN, Saini AK and Seth A: Erectile dysfunction after anterior urethroplasty: A prospective analysis of incidence and probability of recovery--single-center experience. *Urology* 2011; **78**: 78.
33. Erickson BA, Granieri MA, Meeks JJ et al: Prospective analysis of erectile dysfunction after anterior urethroplasty: Incidence and recovery of function. *J Urol* 2010; **183**: 657.
34. Erickson BA, Wysock JS, McVary KT et al: Erectile function, sexual drive, and ejaculatory function after reconstructive surgery for anterior urethral stricture disease. *BJU Int* 2007; **99**: 607.



35. Johnson EK and Latini JM: The impact of urethroplasty on voiding symptoms and sexual function. *Urology* 2011; **78**: 198.
36. Blaschko SD, Sanford MT, Cinman NM et al: De novo erectile dysfunction after anterior urethroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BJU Int* 2013; **112**: 655.
37. Feng C, Xu YM, Barbagli G et al: The relationship between erectile dysfunction and open urethroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Sex Med* 2013; **10**: 2060.
38. Erickson BA, Granieri MA, Meeks JJ et al: Prospective analysis of ejaculatory function after anterior urethral reconstruction. *J Urol* 2010; **184**: 238.
39. Andrich DE, Leach CJ and Mundy AR: The barbagli procedure gives the best results for patch urethroplasty of the bulbar urethra. *BJU Int* 2001; **88**: 385.
40. Dubey D, Kumar A, Bansal P et al: Substitution urethroplasty for anterior urethral strictures: A critical appraisal of various techniques. *BJU Int* 2003; **91**: 215.
41. Palminteri E, Berdondini E, De Nunzio C et al: The impact of ventral oral graft bulbar urethroplasty on sexual life. *Urology* 2013; **81**: 891.
42. Ahmad H, Mahmood A, Niaz WA et al: Bulbar urethral stricture repair with buccal mucosa graft urethroplasty. *J Pak Med Assoc* 2011; **61**: 440.
43. Barbagli G, Palminteri E, Guazzoni G et al: Bulbar urethroplasty using buccal mucosa grafts placed on the ventral, dorsal or lateral surface of the urethra: Are results affected by the surgical technique? *J Urol* 2005; **174**: 955.
44. Barbagli G, Palminteri E, Lazzeri M et al: Interim outcomes of dorsal skin graft bulbar urethroplasty. *J Urol* 2004; **172**: 1365.
45. Erickson BA, Breyer BN and McAninch JW: Single-stage segmental urethral replacement using combined ventral onlay fasciocutaneous flap with dorsal onlay buccal grafting for long segment strictures. *BJU Int* 2012; **109**: 1392.
46. Fu Q, Zhang J, Sa YL et al: Transperineal bulboprostatic anastomosis in patients with simple traumatic posterior urethral strictures: A retrospective study from a referral urethral center. *Urology* 2009; **74**: 1132.
47. Kulkarni SB, Joshi PM and Venkatesan K: Management of panurethral stricture disease in india. *J Urol* 2012; **188**: 824.
48. Liu Y, Zhuang L, Ye W et al: One-stage dorsal inlay oral mucosa graft urethroplasty for anterior urethral stricture. *BMC Urol* 2014; **14**: 35.
49. Morey AF, Lin HC, DeRosa CA et al: Fossa navicularis reconstruction: Impact of stricture length on outcomes and assessment of extended meatotomy (first stage johanson) maneuver. *J Urol* 2007; **177**: 184.
50. Santucci RA, Mario LA and McAninch JW: Anastomotic urethroplasty for bulbar urethral stricture: Analysis of 168 patients. *J Urol* 2002; **167**: 1715.
51. Singh A, Panda SS, Bajpai M et al: Our experience, technique and long-term outcomes in the management of posterior urethral strictures. *J Pediatr Urol* 2014; **10**: 40.
52. Wang P, Fan M, Zhang Y et al: Modified urethral pull-through operation for posterior urethral stricture and long-term outcome. *J Urol* 2008; **180**: 2479.



53. Xu YM, Fu Q, Sa YL et al: Outcome of small intestinal submucosa graft for repair of anterior urethral strictures. *Int J Urol* 2013; **20**: 622.
54. Zhou FJ, Xiong YH, Zhang XP et al: Transperineal end-to-end anastomotic urethroplasty for traumatic posterior urethral disruption and strictures in children. *Asian J Surg* 2002; **25**: 134.
55. Goel A, Goel A and Jain A: Buccal mucosal graft urethroplasty for penile stricture: Only dorsal or combined dorsal and ventral graft placement? *Urology* 2011; **77**: 1482.
56. Raber M, Naspro R, Scapaticci E et al: Dorsal onlay graft urethroplasty using penile skin or buccal mucosa for repair of bulbar urethral stricture: Results of a prospective single center study. *Eur Urol* 2005; **48**: 1013.
57. Rourke KF, McCammon KA, Sumfest JM et al: Open reconstruction of pediatric and adolescent urethral strictures: Long-term followup. *J Urol* 2003; **169**: 1818.
58. Sa YL, Xu YM, Qian Y et al: A comparative study of buccal mucosa graft and penile pedical flap for reconstruction of anterior urethral strictures. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2010; **123**: 365.
59. Sharma AK, Chandrashekhar R, Keshavamurthy R et al: Lingual versus buccal mucosa graft urethroplasty for anterior urethral stricture: A prospective comparative analysis. *Int J Urol* 2013; **20**: 1199.
60. Soliman MG, Abo Farha M, El Abd AS et al: Dorsal onlay urethroplasty using buccal mucosa graft versus penile skin flap for management of long anterior urethral strictures: A prospective randomized study. *Scand J Urol* 2014; **48**: 466.
61. Cecen K, Karadag MA, Demir A et al: Plasmakinetic™ versus cold knife internal urethrotomy in terms of recurrence rates: A prospective randomized study. *Urol Int* 2014; **93**: 460.
62. Heinke T, Gerharz EW, Bonfig R et al: Ventral onlay urethroplasty using buccal mucosa for complex stricture repair. *Urology* 2003; **61**: 1004.
63. Hudak SJ, Lubahn JD, Kulkarni S et al: Single-stage reconstruction of complex anterior urethral strictures using overlapping dorsal and ventral buccal mucosal grafts. *BJU Int* 2012; **110**: 592.
64. Qu Y, Zhang W, Sun N et al: Immediate or delayed repair of pelvic fracture urethral disruption defects in young boys: Twenty years of comparative experience. *Chin Med J (Engl)* 2014; **127**: 3418.
65. Xu YM, Feng C, Sa YL et al: Outcome of 1-stage urethroplasty using oral mucosal grafts for the treatment of urethral strictures associated with genital lichen sclerosus. *Urology* 2014; **83**: 232.
66. Seo IY, Lee JW, Park SC et al: Long-term outcome of primary endoscopic realignment for bulbous urethral injuries: Risk factors of urethral stricture. *Int Neurourol J* 2012; **16**: 196.
67. Erickson BA, Elliott SP, Voelzke BB et al: Multi-institutional 1-year bulbar urethroplasty outcomes using a standardized prospective cystoscopic follow-up protocol. *Urology* 2014; **84**: 213.
68. Gormley EA: Vaginal flap urethroplasty for female urethral stricture disease. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2010; **29 Suppl 1**: S42.
69. Nitti VW, Tu LM and Gitlin J: Diagnosing bladder outlet obstruction in women. *J Urol* 1999; **161**: 1535.
70. Hajebrahimi S, Maroufi H, Mostafaei H et al: Reconstruction of the urethra with an anterior vaginal mucosal flap in female urethral stricture. *Int Urogynecol J* 2019; **30**: 2055.



71. Sarin I, Narain TA, Panwar VK et al: Deciphering the enigma of female urethral strictures: A systematic review and meta-analysis of management modalities. *Neurourology & Urodynamics* 2021; **40**: 65.
72. Khawaja AR, Dar YA, Bashir F et al: Outcome of dorsal buccal graft urethroplasty in female urethral stricture disease (fusd); our institutional experience. *International Urogynecology Journal* 2021; **18**: 18.
73. Onol FF, Antar B, Kose O et al: Techniques and results of urethroplasty for female urethral strictures: Our experience with 17 patients. *Urology* 2011; **77**: 1318.
74. Kore RN and Martins FE: Dorsal onlay urethroplasty using buccal mucosal graft and vaginal wall graft for female urethral stricture - outcome of two-institution study. *Indian Journal of Urology* 2022; **38**: 140.
75. Petrou SP, Rogers AE, Parker AS et al: Dorsal vaginal graft urethroplasty for female urethral stricture disease. *BJU Int* 2012; **110**: E1090.
76. Sahin C and Yesildal C: Female urethral stricture: Which one is stronger? Labial vs buccal graft. *International Urogynecology Journal* 2022; **18**: 18.
77. Lane GI, Gracely A, Uberoi P et al: Changes in patient reported outcome measures after treatment for female urethral stricture. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2021; **40**: 986.
78. Babnik Peskar D and Visnar Perovic A: Comparison of radiographic and sonographic urethrography for assessing urethral strictures. *Eur Radiol* 2004; **14**: 137.
79. Bach P and Rourke K: Independently interpreted retrograde urethrography does not accurately diagnose and stage anterior urethral stricture: The importance of urologist-performed urethrography. *Urology* 2014; **83**: 1190.
80. Angermeier KW, Rourke KF, Dubey D et al: Siu/icud consultation on urethral strictures: Evaluation and follow-up. *Urology* 2014; **83**: S8.
81. Sussman RD, Kozirovsky M, Telegrafi S et al: Gel-infused translabial ultrasound in the evaluation of female urethral stricture. *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg* 2020; **26**: 737.
82. Akano AO: Evaluation of male anterior urethral strictures by ultrasonography compared with retrograde urethrography. *West Afr J Med* 2007; **26**: 102.
83. Chiou RK, Anderson JC, Tran T et al: Evaluation of urethral strictures and associated abnormalities using high-resolution and color doppler ultrasound. *Urology* 1996; **47**: 102.
84. Choudhary S, Singh P, Sundar E et al: A comparison of sonourethrography and retrograde urethrography in evaluation of anterior urethral strictures. *Clin Radiol* 2004; **59**: 736.
85. Gong EM, Arellano CM, Chow JS et al: Sonourethrogram to manage adolescent anterior urethral stricture. *J Urol* 2010; **184**: 1699.
86. Gupta N, Dubey D, Mandhani A et al: Urethral stricture assessment: A prospective study evaluating urethral ultrasonography and conventional radiological studies. *BJU Int* 2006; **98**: 149.
87. Gupta S, Majumdar B, Tiwari A et al: Sonourethrography in the evaluation of anterior urethral strictures: Correlation with radiographic urethrography. *J Clin Ultrasound* 1993; **21**: 231.
88. Heidenreich A, Derschum W, Bonfig R et al: Ultrasound in the evaluation of urethral stricture disease: A prospective study in 175 patients. *Br J Urol* 1994; **74**: 93.



89. Kochakarn W, Muangman V, Viseshsindh V et al: Stricture of the male urethra: 29 years experience of 323 cases. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2001; **84**: 6.
90. Mitterberger M, Christian G, Pinggera GM et al: Gray scale and color doppler sonography with extended field of view technique for the diagnostic evaluation of anterior urethral strictures. *J Urol* 2007; **177**: 992.
91. Morey AF and McAninch JW: Role of preoperative sonourethrography in bulbar urethral reconstruction. *J Urol* 1997; **158**: 1376.
92. Nash PA, McAninch JW, Bruce JE et al: Sono-urethrography in the evaluation of anterior urethral strictures. *J Urol* 1995; **154**: 72.
93. D'Elia A, Grossi FS, Barnaba D et al: Ultrasound in the study of male urethral strictures. *Acta Urol Ital* 1996; **10**.
94. Pushkarna R, Bhargava SK and Jain M: Ultrasonographic evaluation of abnormalities of the male anterior urethra. *Indian J Radiol Imaging* 2000; **10**: 89.
95. Samaiyer SS, Shukla RC, Dwivedi US et al: Role of sonourethrography in anterior urethral stricture. *Ind J Urol* 1999; **15**: 146.
96. Morey AF and McAninch JW: Sonographic staging of anterior urethral strictures. *J Urol* 2000; **163**: 1070.
97. Terlecki RP, Steele MC, Valadez C et al: Urethral rest: Role and rationale in preparation for anterior urethroplasty. *Urology* 2011; **77**: 1477.
98. Viers BR, Pagliara TJ, Shakir NA et al: Delayed reconstruction of bulbar urethral strictures is associated with multiple interventions, longer strictures and more complex repairs. *Journal of Urology* 2018; **199**: 515.
99. Moncrief T, Gor R, Goldfarb RA et al: Urethral rest with suprapubic cystostomy for obliterative or nearly obliterative urethral strictures: Urethrographic changes and implications for management. *J Urol* 2018; **199**: 1289.
100. Heyns CF, Steenkamp JW, De Kock ML et al: Treatment of male urethral strictures: Is repeated dilation or internal urethrotomy useful? *J Urol* 1998; **160**: 356.
101. Launonen E, Sairanen J, Ruutu M et al: Role of visual internal urethrotomy in pediatric urethral strictures. *J Pediatr Urol* 2014; **10**: 545.
102. Steenkamp JW, Heyns CF and de Kock ML: Internal urethrotomy versus dilation as treatment for male urethral strictures: A prospective, randomized comparison. *J Urol* 1997; **157**: 98.
103. Hafez AT, El-Assmy A, Dawaba MS et al: Long-term outcome of visual internal urethrotomy for the management of pediatric urethral strictures. *J Urol* 2005; **173**: 595.
104. Kumar S, Kapoor A, Ganesamoni R et al: Efficacy of holmium laser urethrotomy in combination with intralesional triamcinolone in the treatment of anterior urethral stricture. *Korean J Urol* 2012; **53**: 614.
105. Zehri AA, Ather MH and Afshan Q: Predictors of recurrence of urethral stricture disease following optical urethrotomy. *Int J Surg* 2009; **7**: 361.
106. Nilsen OJ, Holm HV, Ekerhult TO et al: To transect or not transect: Results from the scandinavian urethroplasty study, a multicentre randomised study of bulbar urethroplasty comparing excision and primary anastomosis versus buccal mucosal grafting. *European Urology* 2022; **07**: 07.



107. Haines T and Rourke KF: The effect of urethral transection on erectile function after anterior urethroplasty. *World journal of urology* 2017; **35**: 839.
108. Ekerhult TO, Lindqvist K, Peeker R et al: Low risk of sexual dysfunction after transection and nontransection urethroplasty for bulbar urethral stricture. *Journal of Urology* 2013; **190**: 635.
109. Furr JR, Wisenbaugh ES and Gelman J: Urinary and sexual outcomes following bulbar urethroplasty-an analysis of 2 common approaches. *Urology* 2019; **130**: 162.
110. Atak M, Tokgoz H, Akduman B et al: Low-power holmium:Yag laser urethrotomy for urethral stricture disease: Comparison of outcomes with the cold-knife technique. *Kaohsiung J Med Sci* 2011; **27**: 503.
111. Vicente J, Salvador J and Caffaratti J: Endoscopic urethrotomy versus urethrotomy plus nd-yag laser in the treatment of urethral stricture. *Eur Urol* 1990; **18**: 166.
112. Mazdak H, Izadpanahi MH, Ghalamkari A et al: Internal urethrotomy and intraurethral submucosal injection of triamcinolone in short bulbar urethral strictures. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2010; **42**: 565.
113. Zhang K, Qi E, Zhang Y et al: Efficacy and safety of local steroids for urethra strictures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Endourol* 2014; **28**: 962.
114. Mazdak H, Meshki I and Ghassami F: Effect of mitomycin c on anterior urethral stricture recurrence after internal urethrotomy. *Eur Urol* 2007; **51**: 1089.
115. Giannakopoulos X, Grammeniatis E, Gartzios A et al: Sachse urethrotomy versus endoscopic urethrotomy plus transurethral resection of the fibrous callus (guillemin's technique) in the treatment of urethral stricture. *Urology* 1997; **49**: 243.
116. Khan S, Khan RA, Ullah A et al: Role of clean intermittent self catheterisation (cisc) in the prevention of recurrent urethral strictures after internal optical urethrotomy. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad* 2011; **23**: 22.
117. Pansadoro V and Emiliozzi P: Internal urethrotomy in the management of anterior urethral strictures: Long-term followup. *J Urol* 1996; **156**: 73.
118. Srivastava A, Dutta A and Jain DK: Initial experience with lingual mucosal graft urethroplasty for anterior urethral strictures. *Med J Armed Forces India* 2013; **69**: 16.
119. Steenkamp JW, Heyns CF and de Kock ML: Outpatient treatment for male urethral strictures--dilatation versus internal urethrotomy. *S Afr J Surg* 1997; **35**: 125.
120. Bodker A, Ostri P, Rye-Andersen J et al: Treatment of recurrent urethral stricture by internal urethrotomy and intermittent self-catheterization: A controlled study of a new therapy. *J Urol* 1992; **148**: 308.
121. Kjaergaard B, Walter S, Bartholin J et al: Prevention of urethral stricture recurrence using clean intermittent self-catheterization. *Br J Urol* 1994; **73**: 692.
122. Matanhelia SS, Salaman R, John A et al: A prospective randomized study of self-dilatation in the management of urethral strictures. *J R Coll Surg Edinb* 1995; **40**: 295.
123. Afidi NG, Khan M, Nazeem S et al: Intermittent urethral self dilatation for prevention of recurrent stricture. *J Postgrad Med Inst* 2010; **24**: 239.



124. Tammela TL, Permi J, Ruutu M et al: Clean intermittent self-catheterization after urethrotomy for recurrent urethral strictures. *Ann Chir Gynaecol Suppl* 1993; **206**: 80.
125. Murthy PV, Gurunadha Rao TH, Srivastava A et al: Self-dilatation in urethral stricture recurrence. *Indian J Urol* 1997; **14**: 33.
126. Husmann DA and Rathbun SR: Long-term followup of visual internal urethrotomy for management of short (less than 1 cm) penile urethral strictures following hypospadias repair. *J Urol* 2006; **176**: 1738.
127. Gallegos MA and Santucci RA: Advances in urethral stricture management. *F1000Res* 2016; **5**: 2913.
128. Jordan GH, Wessells H, Secrest C et al: Effect of a temporary thermo-expandable stent on urethral patency after dilation or internal urethrotomy for recurrent bulbar urethral stricture: Results from a 1-year randomized trial. *J Urol* 2013; **190**: 130.
129. Hudak SJ, Atkinson TH and Morey AF: Repeat transurethral manipulation of bulbar urethral strictures is associated with increased stricture complexity and prolonged disease duration. *J Urol* 2012; **187**: 1691.
130. Goula B, Carnell S, Shen J et al: Surgical treatment for recurrent bulbar urethral stricture: A randomised open-label superiority trial of open urethroplasty versus endoscopic urethrotomy (the open trial). *European Urology* 2020; **78**: 572.
131. Elliott SP, Coutinho K, Robertson KJ et al: One-year results for the robust iii randomized controlled trial evaluating the optilume((r)) drug-coated balloon for anterior urethral strictures. *J Urol* 2022; **207**: 866.
132. Pickard R, Goula B, Carnell S et al: Open urethroplasty versus endoscopic urethrotomy for recurrent urethral stricture in men: The open rct. *Health Technology Assessment* 2020; **24**: 1.
133. Virasoro R, Delong JM, Estrella RE et al: A drug-coated balloon treatment for urethral stricture disease: Three-year results from the robust i study. *Research and Reports in Urology* 2022; **14**: 177.
134. Helmy TE, Sarhan O, Hafez AT et al: Perineal anastomotic urethroplasty in a pediatric cohort with posterior urethral strictures: Critical analysis of outcomes in a contemporary series. *Urology* 2014; **83**: 1145.
135. Meeks JJ, Barbagli G, Mehdiratta N et al: Distal urethroplasty for isolated fossa navicularis and meatal strictures. *BJU Int* 2012; **109**: 616.
136. Tausch TJ and Peterson AC: Early aggressive treatment of lichen sclerosus may prevent disease progression. *J Urol* 2012; **187**: 2101.
137. Stormont TJ, Suman VJ and Oesterling JE: Newly diagnosed bulbar urethral strictures: Etiology and outcome of various treatments. *J Urol* 1993; **150**: 1725.
138. Santucci R and Eisenberg L: Urethrotomy has a much lower success rate than previously reported. *J Urol* 2010; **183**: 1859.
139. Chowdhury PS, Nayak P, Mallick S et al: Single stage ventral onlay buccal mucosal graft urethroplasty for navicular fossa strictures. *Indian J Urol* 2014; **30**: 17.
140. Onol SY, Onol FF, Gumus E et al: Reconstruction of distal urethral strictures confined to the glans with circular buccal mucosa graft. *Urology* 2012; **79**: 1158.



141. Virasoro R, Eltahawy EA and Jordan GH: Long-term follow-up for reconstruction of strictures of the fossa navicularis with a single technique. *BJU Int* 2007; **100**: 1143.
142. Broadwin M and Vanni AJ: Outcomes of a urethroplasty algorithm for fossa navicularis strictures. *Canadian Journal of Urology* 2018; **25**: 9591.
143. Venn SN and Mundy AR: Urethroplasty for balanitis xerotica obliterans. *Br J Urol* 1998; **81**: 735.
144. Goel A, Goel A, Dalela D et al: Meatoplasty using double buccal mucosal graft technique. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2009; **41**: 885.
145. Al-Ali M and Al-Hajaj R: Johanson's staged urethroplasty revisited in the salvage treatment of 68 complex urethral stricture patients: Presentation of total urethroplasty. *Eur Urol* 2001; **39**: 268.
146. Kozinn SI, Harty NJ, Zinman L et al: Management of complex anterior urethral strictures with multistage buccal mucosa graft reconstruction. *Urology* 2013; **82**: 718.
147. Meeks JJ, Erickson BA and Gonzalez CM: Staged reconstruction of long segment urethral strictures in men with previous pediatric hypospadias repair. *J Urol* 2009; **181**: 685.
148. Myers JB, McAninch JW, Erickson BA et al: Treatment of adults with complications from previous hypospadias surgery. *J Urol* 2012; **188**: 459.
149. Noll F and Schreiter F: Meshgraft urethroplasty using split-thickness skin graft. *Urol Int* 1990; **45**: 44.
150. Greenwell TJ, Venn SN and Mundy AR: Changing practice in anterior urethroplasty. *BJU Int* 1999; **83**: 631.
151. Onol SY, Onol FF, Onur S et al: Reconstruction of strictures of the fossa navicularis and meatus with transverse island fasciocutaneous penile flap. *J Urol* 2008; **179**: 1437.
152. Armenakas NA, Morey AF and McAninch JW: Reconstruction of resistant strictures of the fossa navicularis and meatus. *J Urol* 1998; **160**: 359.
153. Aldaqadossi H, El Gamal S, El-Nadey M et al: Dorsal onlay (barbagli technique) versus dorsal inlay (asopa technique) buccal mucosal graft urethroplasty for anterior urethral stricture: A prospective randomized study. *Int J Urol* 2014; **21**: 185.
154. Barbagli G, Kulkarni SB, Fossati N et al: Long-term followup and deterioration rate of anterior substitution urethroplasty. *J Urol* 2014; **192**: 808.
155. Hosseini J, Kaviani A, Hosseini M et al: Dorsal versus ventral oral mucosal graft urethroplasty. *Urol J* 2011; **8**: 48.
156. Hussein MM, Moursy E, Gamal W et al: The use of penile skin graft versus penile skin flap in the repair of long bulbo-penile urethral stricture: A prospective randomized study. *Urology* 2011; **77**: 1232.
157. Mathur RK, Nagar M, Mathur R et al: Single-stage preputial skin flap urethroplasty for long-segment urethral strictures: Evaluation and determinants of success. *BJU Int* 2014; **113**: 120.
158. Mangera A and Chapple C: Management of anterior urethral stricture: An evidence-based approach. *Curr Opin Urol* 2010; **20**: 453.
159. Mangera A, Patterson JM and Chapple CR: A systematic review of graft augmentation urethroplasty techniques for the treatment of anterior urethral strictures. *Eur Urol* 2011; **59**: 797.



160. Levine LA, Strom KH and Lux MM: Buccal mucosa graft urethroplasty for anterior urethral stricture repair: Evaluation of the impact of stricture location and lichen sclerosus on surgical outcome. *J Urol* 2007; **178**: 2011.
161. Pahwa M, Gupta S, Pahwa M et al: A comparative study of dorsal buccal mucosa graft substitution urethroplasty by dorsal urethrotomy approach versus ventral sagittal urethrotomy approach. *Adv Urol* 2013; **2013**: 124836.
162. Breyer BN, McAninch JW, Whitson JM et al: Multivariate analysis of risk factors for long-term urethroplasty outcome. *J Urol* 2010; **183**: 613.
163. Kinnaird AS, Levine MA, Ambati D et al: Stricture length and etiology as preoperative independent predictors of recurrence after urethroplasty: A multivariate analysis of 604 urethroplasties. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2014; **8**: E296.
164. Mathur RK and Sharma A: Tunica albuginea urethroplasty for panurethral strictures. *Urol J* 2010; **7**: 120.
165. Sharma G, Sharma S and Parmar K: Buccal mucosa or penile skin for substitution urethroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Indian Journal of Urology* 2020; **36**: 81.
166. Gelman J and Siegel JA: Ventral and dorsal buccal grafting for 1-stage repair of complex anterior urethral strictures. *Urology* 2014; **83**: 1418.
167. Palminteri E, Manzoni G, Berdonini E et al: Combined dorsal plus ventral double buccal mucosa graft in bulbar urethral reconstruction. *Eur Urol* 2008; **53**: 81.
168. Jiang J, Zhu Y, Jiang L et al: Combined dorsal plus ventral double-graft urethroplasty in anterior urethral reconstruction. *Indian J Surg* 2015; **77**: 996.
169. Talab SS, Cambareri GM and Hanna MK: Outcome of surgical management of urethral stricture following hypospadias repair. *Journal of Pediatric Urology* 2019; **15**: 354.e1.
170. Fuchs JS, Shakir N, McKibben MJ et al: Changing trends in reconstruction of complex anterior urethral strictures: From skin flap to perineal urethrostomy. *Urology* 2018; **122**: 169.
171. Murphy GP, Fergus KB, Gaither TW et al: Urinary and sexual function after perineal urethrostomy for urethral stricture disease: An analysis from the turns. *Journal of Urology* 2019; **201**: 956.
172. Barbagli G, De Angelis M, Romano G et al: Clinical outcome and quality of life assessment in patients treated with perineal urethrostomy for anterior urethral stricture disease. *J Urol* 2009; **182**: 548.
173. Peterson AC, Palminteri E, Lazzeri M et al: Heroic measures may not always be justified in extensive urethral stricture due to lichen sclerosus (balanitis xerotica obliterans). *Urology* 2004; **64**: 565.
174. Patel CK, Buckley JC, Zinman LN et al: Outcomes for management of lichen sclerosus urethral strictures by 3 different techniques. *Urology* 2016; **91**: 215.
175. Kamp S, Knoll T, Osman M et al: Donor-site morbidity in buccal mucosa urethroplasty: Lower lip or inner cheek? *BJU Int* 2005; **96**: 619.
176. Wang A, Chua M, Talla V et al: Lingual versus buccal mucosal graft for augmentation urethroplasty: A meta-analysis of surgical outcomes and patient-reported donor site morbidity. *International Urology & Nephrology* 2021; **53**: 907.
177. Rourke K, McKinny S and St Martin B: Effect of wound closure on buccal mucosal graft harvest site morbidity: Results of a randomized prospective trial. *Urology* 2012; **79**: 443.



178. Hwang EC, de Fazio A, Hamilton K et al: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials comparing buccal mucosal graft harvest site non-closure versus closure in patients undergoing urethral reconstruction. *The World Journal of Mens Health* 2022; **40**: 116.
179. Farahat YA, Elbahnasy AM, El-Gamal OM et al: Endoscopic urethroplasty using small intestinal submucosal patch in cases of recurrent urethral stricture: A preliminary study. *J Endourol* 2009; **23**: 2001.
180. Gargollo PC, Cai AW, Borer JG et al: Management of recurrent urethral strictures after hypospadias repair: Is there a role for repeat dilation or endoscopic incision? *J Pediatr Urol* 2011; **7**: 34.
181. Palminteri E, Berdondini E, Colombo F et al: Small intestinal submucosa (sis) graft urethroplasty: Short-term results. *Eur Urol* 2007; **51**: 1695.
182. Koraitim MM: The lessons of 145 posttraumatic posterior urethral strictures treated in 17 years. *J Urol* 1995; **153**: 63.
183. Srivastava A, Vashishtha S, Singh UP et al: Preputial/penile skin flap, as a dorsal onlay or tubularized flap: A versatile substitute for complex anterior urethral stricture. *BJU Int* 2012; **110**: E1101.
184. McAninch JW and Morey AF: Penile circular fasciocutaneous skin flap in 1-stage reconstruction of complex anterior urethral strictures. *J Urol* 1998; **159**: 1209.
185. Barbagli G, De Angelis M, Palminteri E et al: Failed hypospadias repair presenting in adults. *Eur Urol* 2006; **49**: 887.
186. Scarberry K, Bonomo J and Gomez RG: Delayed posterior urethroplasty following pelvic fracture urethral injury: Do we have to wait 3 months? *Urology* 2018; **116**: 193.
187. Hampson LA, Myers JB, Vanni AJ et al: Dorsal buccal graft urethroplasty in female urethral stricture disease: A multi-center experience. *Transl Androl Urol* 2019; **8**: S6.
188. Kumaraswamy S, Mandal S, Das MK et al: Long-term follow-up and success rate of ventral inlay buccal mucosal graft urethroplasty for female urethral stricture disease. *Urology* 2022; **166**: 146.
189. Manasa T, Khattar N, Tripathi M et al: Dorsal onlay graft urethroplasty for female urethral stricture improves sexual function: Short-term results of a prospective study using vaginal graft. *Indian Journal of Urology* 2019; **35**: 267.
190. Mukhtar BMB, Spilotros M, Malde S et al: Ventral-onlay buccal mucosa graft substitution urethroplasty for urethral stricture in women. *BJU Int* 2017; **120**: 710.
191. Katiyar VK, Sood R, Sharma U et al: Critical analysis of outcome between ventral and dorsal onlay urethroplasty in female urethral stricture. *Urology* 2021; **23**: 23.
192. Borboroglu PG, Sands JP, Roberts JL et al: Risk factors for vesicourethral anastomotic stricture after radical prostatectomy. *Urology* 2000; **56**: 96.
193. Brede C, Angermeier K and Wood H: Continence outcomes after treatment of recalcitrant postprostatectomy bladder neck contracture and review of the literature. *Urology* 2014; **83**: 648.
194. Pfalzgraf D, Beuke M, Isbarn H et al: Open retropubic reanastomosis for highly recurrent and complex bladder neck stenosis. *J Urol* 2011; **186**: 1944.
195. Ramchandani P, Banner MP, Berlin JW et al: Vesicourethral anastomotic strictures after radical prostatectomy: Efficacy of transurethral balloon dilation. *Radiology* 1994; **193**: 345.



196. Surya BV, Provet J, Johanson KE et al: Anastomotic strictures following radical prostatectomy: Risk factors and management. *J Urol* 1990; **143**: 755.
197. Redshaw JD, Broghammer JA, Smith TG, 3rd et al: Intralesional injection of mitomycin c at transurethral incision of bladder neck contracture may offer limited benefit: Turns study group. *J Urol* 2015; **193**: 587.
198. Vanni AJ, Zinman LN and Buckley JC: Radial urethrotomy and intralesional mitomycin c for the management of recurrent bladder neck contractures. *J Urol* 2011; **186**: 156.
199. Kirshenbaum EJ, Zhao LC, Myers JB et al: Patency and incontinence rates after robotic bladder neck reconstruction for vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis and recalcitrant bladder neck contractures: The trauma and urologic reconstructive network of surgeons experience. *Urology* 2018; **118**: 227.
200. Shakir NA, Alsikafi NF, Buesser JF et al: Durable treatment of refractory vesicourethral anastomotic stenosis via robotic-assisted reconstruction: A trauma and urologic reconstructive network of surgeons study. *European Urology* 2021; **11**: 11.
201. Giudice CR, Lodi PE, Olivares AM et al: Safety and effectiveness evaluation of open reanastomosis for obliterative or recalcitrant anastomotic stricture after radical retropubic prostatectomy. *Int Braz J Urol* 2019; **45**: 253.
202. Vitarelli A, Vulpi M, Divenuto L et al: Prerectal-transperineal approach for treatment of recurrent vesico-urethral anastomotic stenosis after radical prostatectomy. *Asian Journal of Urology*. 2022;
203. Shamout S, Yao HHI, Mossa AH et al: Persistent storage symptoms following y-v plasty reconstruction for the treatment of refractory bladder neck contracture. *Neurourology & Urodynamics* 2022; **41**: 1082.
204. Casey JT, Erickson BA, Navai N et al: Urethral reconstruction in patients with neurogenic bladder dysfunction. *J Urol* 2008; **180**: 197.
205. Secrest CL, Madjar S, Sharma AK et al: Urethral reconstruction in spinal cord injury patients. *J Urol* 2003; **170**: 1217.
206. Christmann-Schmid C, Hediger M, Groger S et al: Vulvar lichen sclerosus in women is associated with lower urinary tract symptoms. *Int Urogynecol J* 2018; **29**: 217.
207. Pugliese JM, Morey AF and Peterson AC: Lichen sclerosus: Review of the literature and current recommendations for management. *J Urol* 2007; **178**: 2268.
208. Barbagli G, Palminteri E, Mirri F et al: Penile carcinoma in patients with genital lichen sclerosus: A multicenter survey. *J Urol* 2006; **175**: 1359.
209. Liaw A, Rickborn L and McClung C: Incidence of urethral stricture in patients with adult acquired buried penis. *Adv Urol* 2017; **2017**: 7056173.
210. Fuller TW, Pekala K, Theisen KM et al: Prevalence and surgical management of concurrent adult acquired buried penis and urethral stricture disease. *World J Urol* 2019; **37**: 1409.
211. Pariser JJ, Soto-Aviles OE, Miller B et al: A simplified adult acquired buried penis repair classification system with an analysis of perioperative complications and urethral stricture disease. *Urology* 2018; **120**: 248.
212. Erickson BA, Elliott SP, Myers JB et al: Understanding the relationship between chronic systemic disease and lichen sclerosus urethral strictures. *J Urol* 2016; **195**: 363.



213. Hofer MD, Zhao LC, Morey AF et al: Outcomes after urethroplasty for radiotherapy induced bulbomembranous urethral stricture disease. *J Urol* 2014; **191**: 1307.
214. Blaschko SD, Harris CR, Zaid UB et al: Trends, utilization, and immediate perioperative complications of urethroplasty in the united states: Data from the national inpatient sample 2000-2010. *Urology* 2015; **85**: 1190.
215. Das S and Tunuguntla HS: Balanitis xerotica obliterans--a review. *World J Urol* 2000; **18**: 382.
216. Depasquale I, Park AJ and Bracka A: The treatment of balanitis xerotica obliterans. *BJU Int* 2000; **86**: 459.
217. Nasca MR, Innocenzi D and Micali G: Penile cancer among patients with genital lichen sclerosus. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 1999; **41**: 911.
218. Powell J, Robson A, Cranston D et al: High incidence of lichen sclerosus in patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the penis. *Br J Dermatol* 2001; **145**: 85.
219. Trivedi S, Kumar A, Goyal NK et al: Urethral reconstruction in balanitis xerotica obliterans. *Urol Int* 2008; **81**: 285.
220. Kulkarni S, Barbagli G, Kirpekar D et al: Lichen sclerosus of the male genitalia and urethra: Surgical options and results in a multicenter international experience with 215 patients. *Eur Urol* 2009; **55**: 945.
221. Blaschko SD, McAninch JW, Myers JB et al: Repeat urethroplasty after failed urethral reconstruction: Outcome analysis of 130 patients. *J Urol* 2012; **188**: 2260.
222. Barbagli G, Guazzoni G and Lazzeri M: One-stage bulbar urethroplasty: Retrospective analysis of the results in 375 patients. *Eur Urol* 2008; **53**: 828.
223. Barbagli G, Morgia G and Lazzeri M: Dorsal onlay skin graft bulbar urethroplasty: Long-term follow-up. *Eur Urol* 2008; **53**: 628.
224. Figler BD, Malaeb BS, Dy GW et al: Impact of graft position on failure of single-stage bulbar urethroplasties with buccal mucosa graft. *Urology* 2013; **82**: 1166.
225. Gimbernat H, Arance I, Redondo C et al: Analysis of the factors involved in the failure of urethroplasty in men. *Actas Urol Esp* 2014; **38**: 96.
226. Hwang JH, Kang MH, Lee YT et al: Clinical factors that predict successful posterior urethral anastomosis with a gracilis muscle flap. *Korean J Urol* 2013; **54**: 710.
227. Kessler TM, Schreiter F, Kralidis G et al: Long-term results of surgery for urethral stricture: A statistical analysis. *J Urol* 2003; **170**: 840.
228. Singh BP, Andankar MG, Swain SK et al: Impact of prior urethral manipulation on outcome of anastomotic urethroplasty for post-traumatic urethral stricture. *Urology* 2010; **75**: 179.
229. Whitson JM, McAninch JW, Elliott SP et al: Long-term efficacy of distal penile circular fasciocutaneous flaps for single stage reconstruction of complex anterior urethral stricture disease. *J Urol* 2008; **179**: 2259.
230. Bircan MK, Sahin H and Korkmaz K: Diagnosis of urethral strictures: Is retrograde urethrography still necessary? *Int Urol Nephrol* 1996; **28**: 801.
231. Kostakopoulos A, Makrychoritis K, Deliveliotis C et al: Contribution of transcutaneous ultrasonography to the evaluation of urethral strictures. *Int Urol Nephrol* 1998; **30**: 85.



232. Badlani GH, Press SM, Defalco A et al: Urolume endourethral prosthesis for the treatment of urethral stricture disease: Long-term results of the north american multicenter urolume trial. *Urology* 1995; **45**: 846.
233. Hussain M, Greenwell TJ, Shah J et al: Long-term results of a self-expanding wallstent in the treatment of urethral stricture. *BJU Int* 2004; **94**: 1037.
234. Milroy E and Allen A: Long-term results of urolume urethral stent for recurrent urethral strictures. *J Urol* 1996; **155**: 904.
235. Ashken MH, Coulange C, Milroy EJ et al: European experience with the urethral wallstent for urethral strictures. *Eur Urol* 1991; **19**: 181.
236. Sertcelik N, Sagnak L, Imamoglu A et al: The use of self-expanding metallic urethral stents in the treatment of recurrent bulbar urethral strictures: Long-term results. *BJU Int* 2000; **86**: 686.
237. Erickson BA, Flynn KJ, Hahn AE et al: Development and validation of a male anterior urethral stricture classification system. *Urology* 2020; **143**: 241.
238. Kurtzman JT, Kosber R, Kerr P et al: Evaluating tools for characterizing anterior urethral stricture disease: A comparison of the lse system and the urethral stricture score. *J Urol* 2022; **208**: 1083.
239. Kim S, Cheng KC, Alsikafi NF et al: Minimizing antibiotic use in urethral reconstruction. *J Urol* 2022; **208**: 128.
240. Kim S, Cheng KC, Patell S et al: Antibiotic stewardship and postoperative infections in urethroplasties. *Urology* 2021; **152**: 142.