



Laparoscopic Versus Open Partial Nephrectomy: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis of Surgical, Oncological, and Functional Outcomes

Chengyu You[†], Yuelin Du[†], Hui Wang, Lei Peng, Tangqiang Wei, Xiaojun Zhang, Xianhui Li and Anguo Wang^{*}

Department of Urology, Nanchong Central Hospital, The Second Clinical College, North Sichuan Medical College (University), Nanchong, China

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Marco Scarpa, University Hospital of Padua, Italy

Reviewed by:

Antonio Simone Laganà, University of Insubria, Italy Massimo lafrate, University Hospital of Padua, Italy

*Correspondence:

Anguo Wang wanganguo2019@163.com

⁺These authors have contributed equally to this work

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Surgical Oncology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Oncology

Received: 16 July 2020 Accepted: 24 September 2020 Published: 29 October 2020

Citation:

You C, Du Y, Wang H, Peng L, Wei T, Zhang X, Li X and Wang A (2020) Laparoscopic Versus Open Partial Nephrectomy: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis of Surgical, Oncological, and Functional Outcomes. Front. Oncol. 10:583979. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2020.583979 **Purpose:** To summarize and analyze the current evidence about surgical, oncological, and functional outcomes between laparoscopic partial nephrectomy (LPN) and open partial nephrectomy (OPN).

Materials and Methods: Through a systematical search of multiple scientific databases in March 2020, we performed a systematic review and cumulative meta-analysis. Meanwhile, we assessed the quality of the relevant evidence according to the framework in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.

Results: A total of 26 studies with 8095 patients were included. There was no statistical difference between the LPN and OPN in the terms of operation time (p=0.13), intraoperative complications (p=0.94), recurrence (p=0.56), cancer-specific survival (p=0.72), disease-free survival (p=0.72), and variations of estimated glomerular filtration rate (p=0.31). The LPN group had significantly less estimated blood loss (P<0.00001), lower blood transfusion (p=0.04), shorter length of hospital stay (p<0.00001), lower total (p=0.03) and postoperative complications (p=0.02), higher positive surgical margin (p=0.005), higher overall survival (p<0.00001), and less increased serum creatinine (p=0.002). The subgroup analysis showed that no clinically meaningful differences were found for T1a tumors in terms of operation time (p=0.11) and positive surgical margin (p=0.23). In addition, the subgroup analysis also suggested that less estimated blood loss (p<0.0001) and shorter length of hospital stay (p<0.0001) and shorter length of hospital stay (p<0.0001) and shorter length of hospital survives surgical margin (p=0.02). The subgroup analysis showed that no clinically meaningful differences were found for T1a tumors in terms of operation time (p=0.11) and positive surgical margin (p=0.23). In addition, the subgroup analysis also suggested that less estimated blood loss (p<0.0001) and shorter length of hospital stay (p<0.00001) were associated with the LPN group for T1a tumors.

Conclusions: This meta-analysis revealed that the LPN is a feasible and safe alternative to the OPN with comparable surgical, oncologic, and functional outcomes. However, the results should be applied prudently in the clinic because of the low quality of evidence. Further quality studies are needed to evaluate the effectiveness LPN and its postoperative quality of life compared with OPN.

Keywords: kidney neoplasm, laparoscopy, nephrectomy, surgical procedures, treatment outcomes

INTRODUCTION

For T1 (\leq 7 cm) renal masses, partial nephrectomy (PN) is the preferred surgical treatment, which is suggested by guidelines (1–3). On the one hand, PN is similar to radical nephrectomy in oncological safety (4, 5). On the other hand, PN protects kidney function better and reduces the incidence of cardiovascular diseases (4, 6). Although laparoscopic PN (LPN) is an enormous technical challenge and has a steep learning curve, it is obviously becoming a feasible alternative to open PN (OPN) with less blood loss, fewer complications, and comparable oncologic and functional outcomes (7–11).

With the development of laparoscopic techniques, the robotic technique has been frequently reported (12, 13). However, the robotic technology has not been fully popularized because of the limitations of economics or cognitions. Recently, hybrid transvaginal note nephrectomy also brought about widespread attention due to the superiority of sexual function, especially in the female population, but it needs further verification (14, 15). Therefore, the LPN is the first choice for primarily experienced centers because of better cost-efficacy (16).

There is always a lack of systemic evidence for LPN versus OPN even though the numbers of studies on it have increased recently. It is high time to perform a meta-analysis of outcomes for LPN versus OPN even though there are no randomized studies. Consequently, we conducted a systemic review and meta-analysis for LPN versus OPN, including surgical, oncological, and functional outcomes.

METHODS

The protocol of this review was registered prospectively (CRD42020178120) in the PROSPERO database (University of York, York, United Kingdom). The study was performed according to the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement (17).

Literature Search and Study Selection

In April 2020, a comprehensively systematic literature search was conducted by using PubMed, the Cochrane Library, and Embase databases. The different search strategies were used for corresponding research engines, respectively. Search terms combined participant terms (kidney or renal neoplasm, kidney or renal cancer, kidney or renal carcinoma, kidney or renal tumor), intervention terms (partial nephrectomy or nephronsparing surgery), and comparison terms (laparoscopic or laparoscopy, open). What is more, additional records were identified through manually searching references in the selected manuscripts or in the review articles. Literature searching imposed restrictions including being published in the English language and published from 2000 to 2020.

The studies focused on patients with kidney cancer and comparing surgical, oncological and functional outcomes between LPN and OPN were included. The studies involving patients with kidney tumor >7 cm were excluded to minimize the

differences caused by the size of tumor. To eliminate discrepancies from the surgical approach, only the patients who underwent LPN were included. The studies that reported hand-assisted or robot-assisted laparoscopic technology were excluded. Meanwhile, letters, cases, reviews, conference abstracts, and studies that are irrelevant to the theme or lack complete data were excluded in order to enhance the feasibility and quality of the conclusions.

All included studies were assessed according to the methodological index for nonrandomized studies (MINORS) with a total of 24 points, which involves 12 items (18). In addition, the level of evidence of each study was assessed by the Oxford Centre of Evidence Based Medicine criteria (19). In addition, the risk of bias of each study included was independently assessed using the Risk of Bias in Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions tool (ROBINS-I) for comparative studies (20).

In addition, a subgroup analysis was performed in the patients with clinical T1a stage tumor to compare the two surgical techniques simply because the size of tumor is associated with surgical outcomes.

Data Extraction

All outcomes of interest were collected in a piloted form, including the characteristics of selected studies, surgical, oncological, and functional outcomes. For the characteristics, the following items were included: author's name, study design, number of patients, mean age, gender ratio, tumor location, tumor pathology, tumor size, and follow-up duration. The surgical outcomes included operation time, estimated blood loss (EBL), blood transfusion, length of hospital stay (LOS), and complications (total, intraoperative, and postoperative). The oncological outcomes contained positive surgical margin (PSM); recurrence; and survival results, including overall survival (OS), cancer-specific survival (CSS), and disease-free survival (DFS). The items of variations of estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) and serum creatinine (sCr) were recorded for the functional outcomes. For survival data, we excavated data from Kaplan-Meier curve using Engauge Digitizer version 4.1 (http:// digitizer.sourceforge.net/) for the studies without direct survival data.

The above two steps (literature search and data extraction) were completed by three of us (CY, YD, HW) independently. All disagreements were resolved by a senior author (AW) after public discussion.

Data Analysis

The Review Manager software (RevMan) version 5.3 (the Cochrane Collaboration) was used for statistical analysis in our study. The mean difference (MD) and odds ratio (OR) were calculated for continuous and dichotomous variables, respectively, with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). In addition, the hazard radio (HR) with 95% CIs was used for CSS and DFS. We used special statistical methods for studies that presented merely continuous data as median and range values (21). The heterogeneity between studies was assessed by using the chi-squared and I- squared test. Random-effects models were used

for cumulative analyses, which had high heterogeneity ($I^2>90\%$). Otherwise, fixed-effects models were used for analyses. Finally, *P* values of <0.05 were considered as a statistical significance for the meta-analysis.

What is more, the level of evidence for the outcomes was assessed using the framework in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (22). A funnel plot was used to assess the risk of publication bias for outcomes that included at least 10 statistically significant studies.

RESULTS

Initially, a total of 1406 studies were identified by our search strategy. First, 478 records were excluded because of duplication. Second, 863 studies were excluded that were irrelevant to our inclusion criteria by screening records. Third, 39 records of the remaining 65 were excluded by reading the full text (13 included irrelevant patients, 8 without reporting outcomes, 9 reviewers, 7 without complete data, and 2 duplicate publication). Finally, the remaining 26 studies were included with 8095 patients in our meta-analysis (**Figure 1**).

The characteristics of the included studies are shown in **Supplementary Table 1**. All the included studies—6 prospective

studies (23–28) and 20 retrospective studies (22, 29–47)—were cohort observational studies with no randomization. There were 3292 and 4803 patients in the LPN and OPN groups, respectively. The mean ages ranged from 49.3 to 63.7 years and from 46.2 to 65 years in LPN and OPN, respectively. The mean MINORS scores of all the included studies were 11.9 (from 6 to 18). Twelve included studies (22, 27, 29, 31, 33, 36–38, 40, 42, 43, 46) were found to have a high risk of bias because of the selection of patients, performance bias, and observer bias of outcomes according to the ROBINS-I tool. The others had a moderate risk of bias (in **Supplementary Table 2**).

Surgical Outcomes

There was no statistical difference between LPN and OPN for operation time (p=0.13, MD: 11.15 min, 95% CI: -3.27, 25.57, **Figure 2A**). Meanwhile, no clinically meaningful differences were found when T1a (p=0.11, MD=20.06 min, 95% CI: -4.75, 44.87, **Figure 2B**) was analyzed in subgroup analyses. The quality of evidence was low because of high heterogeneity and the potential of performance biases.

Less EBL was associated with the LPN group in the total analysis (P<0.00001, MD: -66.16 mL, 95% CI: -74.56, -57.77, **Figure 2C**) and subgroup analysis (p<0.0001, MD: -51.79 mL, 95% CI: -74.88, -28.71, **Figure 2D**), respectively. Similarly, a



Study or Subgrou Beasley 2004	o Mean	LPN SD	Total		OPN SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C	1	Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI	
	210	76	27	144	24	22	4.1%	66.00 [35.63, 96.37]			
Becker 2014	188.7	55.8	82		52.3	211	4.8%	13.70 [-0.29, 27.69]			
Bravi 2019	119	46.8	625	125.7	40.9	682	5.0%	-6.70 [-11.48, -1.92]			
Chang 2018	241.9	90	122	172.5	64	122	4.6%	69.40 [49.80, 89.00]			
Gill 2003	180	45.1			49.6	100	4.9%	-51.20 [-64.34, -38.06]		-	
Gong 2008	225.1	63.8	76		62.9	77	4.6%	32.10 [12.02, 52.18]			
Jeon 2012	203.5	72.6	31		63.6	102	4.2%	42.50 [14.12, 70.88]			_
Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014	160 227	39.3 53	22 48	120 163	27.7 35	41 23	4.7% 4.6%	40.00 [21.52, 58.48]			
Liu 2013	94.3	53 19.8	48 115		35 22.6	23 97	4.6% 5.0%	64.00 [43.28, 84.72] -23.30 [-29.07, -17.53]		-	
Lucas 2012	195	66.7	15		47.4	54	3.9%	48.00 [11.96, 84.04]			
Luciani 2016	186	49	70	145	59	73	4.7%	41.00 [23.25, 58.75]		—	
Marszalek 2009	86.7	26.3			43.6	100	5.0%	-67.30 [-77.28, -57.32]			
Minervini 2013	143	56.9	140		58.1	140	4.9%	11.80 [-1.67, 25.27]		<u>+</u>	
Park 2010	221	84	273	184	68	279	4.9%	37.00 [24.23, 49.77]			_
Permpongkosol 200		85.1	85		80.7	58	4.3%	-51.00 [-78.54, -23.46]	-		
Porpiglia 2016	129.7	30.4	57	138.3	45	133	4.9%	-8.60 [-19.59, 2.39]			
Rezaeetalab 2016 Romero 2008	180 181.1	61.8 62.4	34 56	127 248.9	61.8 45	31 28	4.2% 4.5%	53.00 [22.92, 83.08] -67.80 [-91.14, -44.46]		-	
Springer 2012	145.3	45.4	170		45 35.6	170	4.5%	-9.90 [-18.57, -1.23]			
Xu 2014		141.2	42	126.2		187	3.4%	27.90 [-16.76, 72.56]			
Xu 2015	142.1	74.6	19	126.6	28.1	18	3.9%	15.50 [-20.47, 51.47]			
Total (95% CI)			2309				100.0%	11.15 [-3.27, 25.57]			
Heterogeneity: Tau				df = 21	(P < 0	.00001)	; I ² = 969	%	-100 -50	0 0	50 100
Test for overall effe	ct: Z = 1.52	(P = 0.1	13)							LPN OPN	
в		LPN		0	PN			Mean Difference		Mean Difference	
Study or Subgrou			Total	-		Total \	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C		IV. Random, 95% CI	
Beasley 2004	210	76	27	144	24	22	12.9%	66.00 [35.63, 96.37]			_
Becker 2014	188.7		82	175			15.2%	13.70 [-0.29, 27.69]		-	
Gong 2008	225.1		76		62.9		14.5%	32.10 [12.02, 52.18]			
Minervini 2013		56.9		131.2			15.2%	11.80 [-1.67, 25.27]		—	
Park 2010 Rezaeetalab 2016	221	84 61.8	273 34	184 127	68		15.3% 12.9%	37.00 [24.23, 49.77] 53.00 [22.92, 83.08]			
Romero 2008	181.1			248.9	45	28	14.0%	-67.80 [-91.14, -44.46]		I	
Total (95% CI)			688			788 1	100 09/				
								20.06 [-4.75, 44.87]			
Heterogeneity: Tau				df = 6 (P < 0.				-200 -10		100 200
Heterogeneity: Tau Test for overall effe				df = 6 (P < 0.				-200 -10	00 0 LPN OPN	100 200
Test for overall effe	ect: Z = 1.58	6 (P = 0						6	-200 -10	LPN OPN	100 200
Test for overall effe	ect: Z = 1.58	(P = 0.	.11) Total I	0 Mean	PN SD		l² = 92%	Mean Difference	CI		100 200
Test for overall effe	ect: Z = 1.58 Mean 241	(P = 0. LPN <u>SD</u> 201	.11) <u>Total I</u> 182	0 <u>/lean</u> 379	PN SD 357	00001); <u>Total V</u> 805	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6%	Mean Difference <u>IV, Fixed, 95%</u> -138.00 [-176.22, -99.78	CI B] ←	LPN OPN Mean Difference	100 200
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019	ect: Z = 1.58 Mean 241 165	(P = 0. LPN <u>SD</u> 201 137.5	.11) Total 182 625	0 <u>Mean</u> 379 200 1	PN SD 357 48.6	00001); <u>Total V</u> 805 682	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.77 -35.00 [-50.51, -19.45	CI B] ← 9]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	100 200
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018	ect: Z = 1.58 Mean 241 165 196.1	(P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2	0 <u>Mean</u> 379 200 1 206.4	PN 357 48.6 135	00001); Total V 805 682 122	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.74 -35.00 [-50.51, -11.44 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.47	CI B] ← 9] 7]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	H 100 200
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019	ect: Z = 1.58 Mean 241 165	(P = 0. LPN <u>SD</u> 201 137.5	.11) Total 182 625 122 2 100 2	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1	PN SD 357 48.6	00001); <u>Total V</u> 805 682	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.74 -35.00 [-50.51, -19.44 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.43 -125.00 [-164.70, -85.33	CI B] ← 9] 7] ←	LPN OPN Mean Difference	H H 100 200
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003	ect: Z = 1.58 Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7	(P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2	.11) Total 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1	00001); Total V 805 682 122 100	Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.74 -35.00 [-50.51, -11.44 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.47	CI B] J] J] J] J] J] J]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	100 200
Test for overall effe C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gili 2003 Jeon 2012 Katal 2020 Klaassen 2014	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163	(P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179	.11) Total 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 440.6 3 512.5 367	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23	I ² = 92% <u>Veight</u> 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, 99.7' -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4' -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4' -125.00 [-164.70, -85.3' -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9' -87.50 [-260.06, 85.0' -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6'	CI B] 7] 7] 9] 9] 1] 2] CI 2] CI 2] CI 2] CI 2] CI 2] CI 2] CI 2] 2] 2] 2] 2] 2] 2] 2]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	100 200
Test for overall effe C Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9	s (P = 0. SD 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 312.5 367 232.3	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7/ -35.00 [-50.51, -194] -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.70, -86.3] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.99 -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -77.65] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5]	CI B] ← D] ←	LPN OPN Mean Difference	<u> </u>
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100	F (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2100 21 22 48 115 25 15	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 512.5 367 232.3 250 2	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7i -35.00 [-50.51, -194. -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4i -125.00 [-164.70, -85.3i -87.50 [-260.06, 85.0i -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6i -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -155.00 [-231.68, -88.3i	CI B] (LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciari 2016	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316	s (P = 0. SD 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 70	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 440.6 3 512.5 367 232.3 250 2 275	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2% 0.7%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.77, 9.76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -260.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -155.00 [-231.69, -68.3] -155.00 [-231.69, -68.3]	CI B]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2018 Permpongkosol 2000	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9	F (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 70	0 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 512.5 367 232.3 250 2 275 427.7 2	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50.51, -194 -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.70, -65.3] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9] -47.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -766. -150.00 [-231.69, -68.3] -150.00 [-231.69, -68.3] -41.00 [-88.85, 150.8] -202 [-105.94, 124.3]	CI B) () () () () () () () () () (LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucasi 2018 Permpongkosol 200 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5	E (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 2 70 85 4 57 170 2	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 512.5 367 232.3 250 2 275 127.7 2 200 1 240.2 1	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170	I ² = 92% <u>Veight</u> 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 10.7%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7/ -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4/ -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.99 -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -150.00 [-231.69, -68.3] -41.00 [-68.85, 150.8] -9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -3.30 [-65.52, -1.0] -8.270 [-110.21, -55.11]	CI B) +	LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucaini 2016 Permpongkosol 2000 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100	E (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7	.11) Total I 182 625 122 31 48 115 22 48 115 70 85 7 170 2 31 31 3 3 3 3 4 3 5 7 170 2 3 3 3 3 4 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 312.5 367 232.3 250 2 275 275 275 275 275 275 200 1 240.2 1 383.3 3	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 10.7% 0.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176 22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50 1, -19.4 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-50 1, -19.4 +45.40 [-167.79, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.0 -260.00 [-31.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27], -86.5 -150.00 [-231.69, -83.3] -41.00 [-68.85, 150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-65.52, -1.0] -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1]	CI 3]	LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Permpongkosol 200 Porpigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1	E (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 70 85 7 170 2 31 2 42 2	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 440.6 3 367 232.3 250 2 275 2275 427.7 2 200 1 240.2 1 383.3 3 231.5 2	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187	I ² = 929 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 10.7% 0.3% 0.3% 2.3%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7/ -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4/ -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.99 -87.50 [-260.06, 65.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -150.00 [-231.68, -150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-65.52, -1.00 -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1] 283.30 [-43.76, -125.5]		LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucaini 2016 Permpongkosol 2000 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100	E (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 70 85 7 170 2 31 2 42 2	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 140.6 3 312.5 367 232.3 250 2 275 275 275 275 275 275 200 1 240.2 1 383.3 3	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21	I ² = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 22.8% 1.2% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 10.7% 0.3%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176 22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50 1, -19.4 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-50 1, -19.4 +45.40 [-167.79, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.0 -260.00 [-31.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27], -86.5 -150.00 [-231.69, -83.3] -41.00 [-68.85, 150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-65.52, -1.0] -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1]		LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucani 2018 Permpongkosol 200 Porpigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1	E (P = 0. LPN 201 137.5 142 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166 108.2	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 15 70 85 7 170 2 31 2 42 2	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 1 440.6 3 367 232.3 250 2 275 2275 427.7 2 200 1 240.2 1 383.3 3 231.5 2	PN SD 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.3% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 1.1%	Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7/ -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4/ -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -10.30 [-450.7, 24.4] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.99 -87.50 [-260.06, 65.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -150.00 [-231.68, -150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-65.52, -1.00 -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1] 283.30 [-43.76, -125.5]	CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effe C Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Permpongkosol 200 Porpigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Chi ²	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1 96.1	E (P = 0. SD 201 137.5 142 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166 108.2 15 (P <	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 170 2 37 4 57 170 2 31 2 19 2 1734	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 140.6 3612.5 367 232.3 250 255 2250 200 1 240.2 383.3 231.5 2223.3	PN SD 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.3% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 1.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997] -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.77, 97, 69 -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -33.30 [-458.5], -10.0 -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1] -23.30 [-438.76, -127.8] -40.40 [-99.88, 19.00 -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5]		LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effe C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI)	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1 96.1	E (P = 0. SD 201 137.5 142 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166 108.2 15 (P <	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 170 2 37 4 57 170 2 31 2 19 2 1734	O Mean 379 200 1 206.4 266.7 140.6 3612.5 367 232.3 250 255 2250 200 1 240.2 383.3 231.5 2223.3	PN SD 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.3% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 1.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997] -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.77, 97, 69 -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -33.30 [-458.5], -10.0 -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1] -23.30 [-438.76, -127.8] -40.40 [-99.88, 19.00 -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5]	CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Test for overall effect	<pre>kct: Z = 1.56 Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1 96.1 = 93.38, df = t: Z = 14.87</pre>	Image: Product of the system SD 201 137.5 142 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166 108.2 15 (P < 0.00)	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 170 2 37 4 57 170 2 31 2 19 2 1734	O O 379 379 2001 1 2064 1 2064 1 140.6 3 312.5 367 2205 2 2205 2 2001 1 440.2 1 4883.3 3 2213.3 1 1)1); I² = { 1	PN SD 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 84%	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18	I ² = 92% 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.3% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 0.7% 0.3% 1.2% 1.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176 22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50 51, -19.44 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-50 51, -19.44 -45.40 [-167.79, 76.99 -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-31.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27], -86.5 -150.00 [-231 60, -68.3] -41.00 [-68.85, 150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-43.65.22, -10 -82.70 [-110.21, -55.1] -82.30 [-143.67, -127.8 -40.40 [-99.88, 19.00 -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35		LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucas 2012 Lucas 2012 Lucas 2012 Lucas 2014 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneily: Chi ² Total (95% Cl)	mean 2411 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 168.7 1000 191.1 96.1 = 93.38, df = t: Z = 14.87	ICP = 0. LPN SD 201 137.5 142 277 288 179 41.8 111.1 179.4 307 430.3 76 123.1 166 108.2 15 (P < 0.0 LPN	.11) Total I 182 625 122 1 122 1 100 2 31 4 115 2 15 70 31 4 48 115 15 70 31 42 19 2 17734 <0.00000	O 4 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 52.7 84% PN	000001); Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 123 97 54 133 170 187 18 2686 1	2 = 92% 5.6% 5.6% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.6% 0.3% 0.4% 0.	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -105.00 [-164.77, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-105.4] -20.7 [-110.21, -55.1] -20.7 [-110.21, -55.1] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference	CI B) D) D) D) CI D) D) D) D) D) D) D) D) D) D)	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Test for overall effect	mean 2411 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 6 436.9 168.7 1000 191.1 96.1 = 93.38, df = t: Z = 14.87	Image: Provide the system Image: Provide the system <td>.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 170 2 37 4 57 170 2 31 2 19 2 1734</td> <td>O 4 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2</td> <td>PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 52.7 84% PN</td> <td>Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18</td> <td>IP = 92% Veight 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 0.7% 0.3% 2.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weight</td> <td>Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.70, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, 30.3], -76.6; -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.30 [-43.67, -127.8 -40.40 [-98.88, 150.0] -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%</td> <td>CI</td> <td>LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI</td> <td></td>	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 31 4 22 6 48 115 2 170 2 37 4 57 170 2 31 2 19 2 1734	O 4 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	PN 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 52.7 84% PN	Total V 805 682 122 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18	IP = 92% Veight 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 0.7% 0.6% 7.8% 0.7% 0.3% 2.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weight	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4 -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.70, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, 30.3], -76.6; -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.30 [-43.67, -127.8 -40.40 [-98.88, 150.0] -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%	CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucasi 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2018 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP	Mean 241 165 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 3169 6436.9 165.7 100 316.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1 96.1 = 93.38, df = t: Z = 14.87 > Mean	Image: Provide the system SD 201 137.5 201 137.5 227 288 111.1 307 430.3 76 108.2 1123.1 77.7 166 108.2 CPN SD 250	.11) Total I 182 625 122 1 100 2 31 4 115 2 15 70 31 5 42 15 170 2 19 2 1734 <0.0000	O Mean 379 200 1 200 1 200 4 266.7 1 367 322.3 250 2 275 277 2 200 1 275 2275 2275 2275 2275 2273 1 383.3 3 231.5 2 223.3 1)1); I ² = 4 O O Mean 334	PN SD 357 48.6 135 88.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 362 352.4 57.8 52.7 84% PN SD	Total V 805 682 122 102 100 97 54 73 170 54 133 170 21 18 2686 1 Total 1 7 24 187 18 2686 1 Total 1 22 2	2 = 92% 5.6% 5.6% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.3% 0.5% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.6% 0.3% 0.4% 0.	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -105.00 [-164.77, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-105.4] -20.7 [-110.21, -55.1] -20.7 [-110.21, -55.1] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference	CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Chang 2018 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Permpongkosol 200 Porpigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: Chi ² Test for overall effect D Study or Subgroup Beasley 2004 Choi 2019 Gong 2008	Mean 241 165 196.1 194.1 165 196.1 120.9 100 316.7 166. 196.1 96.1 98.38, df = ±t Z = 14.87 250 164.8 211.9	(P = 0. SD 201 137.5 201 142 75.2 297 2142 75.2 297 41.8 307 430.3 76 123.1 77.7 166 108.2 15 (P < 0.0	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 48 115 2 2 6 4 8 115 2 7 0 8 5 7 17 0 2 17 3 1 2 17 3 4 2 2 17 3 1 2 7 7 7 6 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	O 4ean 379 200 1 2064 466.7 1 406.7 1 312.5 250 2 275 2 200 1 227.7 2 200 1 227.7 2 200 1 227.7 2 200 1 227.3 1 11); l ² = 8 Mean 334 173 1 335.4 2	PN SD 357 48.6 135 404 27.9 404 286 68.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 52.7 84% PN SD 343 343 343	Total V Total V 805 682 102 101 100 102 41 23 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18 2 2686 1 Total 22 285 77	P = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 0.6% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 0.6% 0.3% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 0.6% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 0.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weight 1.8% 61.1% 7.8%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176 22, -99.7] -35.00 [-50 51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -12.500 [-50 51, -19.4] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.0] -264.00 [-31.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27], -86.5 -150.00 [-231.69, -68.3] -41.00 [-68.85, 150.8] 9.20 [-105.94, 124.3] -33.30 [-43.67, -127.8 -40.40 [-99.88, 19.00 -127.20 [-212.89, -41.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35 -84.00 [-255.57, 87.5] -8.20 [-37.72, 21.3] -8.20 [-37.72, 71.5] -8.20 [-37.72, 71.5] -8.20 [-37.72, 71.5] -8.20 [-37.72, 71.5]	CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucain 2016 Porrigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChiP Test for overall effect D Study or Subgroup Beasley 2004 Choi 2019 Gong 2008 Park 2010		(P = 0. SD 201 137.5 137.5 142 75.2 288 179 287 288 179 288 179 288 179 288 111.1 307 123.1 108.2 CPN SD SD 250 122.6 2251.3 223	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 22 6 48 115 2 15 70 48 57 22 6 48 57 19 2 1734 c 0.0000 00001) Total 1 27 96 76 273	O Mean 379 200 1 2064 1 2064 1 2057 2 250 2 275 2 200 1 332.3 250 2 277 2 200 1 1 227,7 2 200 1 227,7 2 200 1 1 227,7 2 200 1 1 20,4 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5	PN SD 357 48.6 135 48.7 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 49.9 35.4 49.9 35.4 49.9 35.4 49.9 35.4 49.9 35.7 84% PN SD 343 343 343 343 343 370 370 370 370 370 370 370 37	Total V Total V 805 682 682 122 100 102 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18 22856 77 279	P = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.5% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weight 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 20.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.77, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] -84.00 [-256.19, -90.8] -172.50 [-256.19, -90.8] -172.50 [-256.19, -90.8] -725.00 [-175.48, -74.1]	CI B) CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2018 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Test for overall effect D Study or Subgroup Beasley 2004 Choi 2019 Gong 2008 Park 2016 Rezzeelalab 2016		(P = 0. SD 2011 137.5 142 75.2 288 179 41.8 307 430.3 76 287 179 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 108.2 ED SD 122.6 250 122.6 221.6	.11) Total I 182 625 122 100 22 625 122 122 131 48 57 15 57 170 231 15 57 170 231 15 57 170 22 19 21 19 27 196 27 196 27 1734 1754 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	O 379 379 200 1 266.7 1 212.5 232.3 247.5 232.3 247.5 275 277.2 200 1 232.3 367 232.3 247.5 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 27	PN SD 357 48.6 135 48.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 404 40.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 34% PN SD 343 343 343 343 343 27.0 370 22.1 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 370 27.9 370 370 370 27.9 370 370 370 370 370 370 370 370	Total V 805 682 122 100 100 102 41 23 97 54 133 170 21 18 2686 1 222 285 77 279 31 31	P = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 5.1% 0.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 6.6% 7.8% 00.0% Weightt 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 20.6% 4.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.1, -19.4, -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4]; -125.00 [-104.70, 26.1, -78.6]; -87.50 [-260.06, -83.3]; -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9]; -87.50 [-260.06, -88.3]; -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5]; -105.40 [-124.28]; -105.40 [-26.88, 150.0]; -107.20 [-10.24]; -108.35 [-77.36, -59.35]; -84.00 [-255.57, 87.5]; -84.00 [-256.19, -90.8]; -125.00 [-175.84, -74.1]; -14.00 [-172.84, -74.1]; -14.00 [-172.84, -74.1]; -14.00 [-127.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-172.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-172.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-127.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-147.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-147.86, 93.8]; -14.00 [-147.86, 9	$\begin{array}{c} CI \\ \\ B \\ P \\$	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucain 2016 Porrigila 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChiP Test for overall effect D Study or Subgroup Beasley 2004 Choi 2019 Gong 2008 Park 2010		(P = 0. SD 2011 137.5 142 75.2 288 179 41.8 307 430.3 76 287 179 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 108.2 ED SD 122.6 250 122.6 221.6	.11) Total I 182 625 122 100 22 625 122 122 131 48 57 15 57 170 231 15 57 170 231 15 57 170 22 19 21 19 27 196 27 196 27 1734 1754 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	O Mean 379 200 1 2064 1 2064 1 2057 2 250 2 275 2 200 1 332.3 250 2 277 2 200 1 1 227,7 2 200 1 227,7 2 200 1 1 227,7 2 200 1 1 20,4 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5 20,5	PN SD 357 48.6 135 48.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 404 40.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 34% PN SD 343 343 343 343 343 27.0 370 22.1 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 370 27.9 370 370 370 27.9 370 370 370 370 370 370 370 370	Total V Total V 805 682 682 122 100 102 97 54 73 58 133 170 21 187 18 22856 77 279	P = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.5% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.7% 0.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weight 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 20.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% -138.00 [-176.22, -997, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4] -125.00 [-164.77, 76.9] -87.50 [-260.06, 85.00 -204.00 [-331.38, -76.6] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] -84.00 [-256.19, -90.8] -172.50 [-256.19, -90.8] -172.50 [-256.19, -90.8] -725.00 [-175.48, -74.1]	$\begin{array}{c} CI \\ \\ B \\ P \\$	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartat 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucasi 2018 Lucasi 2018 Pormpongkosol 200 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneily: ChP Total (95% Cl) Heterog		(P = 0. SD 2011 137.5 142 75.2 288 179 41.8 307 430.3 76 287 179 111.1 307 430.3 76 123.1 108.2 ED SD 122.6 250 122.6 221.6	.11) Total I 182 625 122 2 100 2 22 48 115 2 15 70 85 4 15 7170 31 1 42 19 1734 <0.0000000001)	O 379 379 200 1 266.7 1 212.5 232.3 247.5 232.3 247.5 275 277.2 200 1 232.3 367 232.3 247.5 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 27	PN SD 357 48.6 135 48.1 27.9 404 286 86.7 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 22.2 362 404 40.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 34% PN SD 343 343 343 343 343 27.0 370 22.1 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 27.9 375 370 27.9 370 370 370 27.9 370 370 370 370 370 370 370 370	000001); Total V 805 682 122 100 122 100 122 100 122 123 123 124 133 170 187 187 187 187 187 187 187 187	P = 92% Seight 5.6% 33.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weightt 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 0.1.8% 4.6% 4.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4, -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4, -125.00 [-164.70, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, -85.3] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, -86.3] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -20.105.41, 24.3 -33.30 [-45.52, -1.01, -42.70 [-110.21, -55.1] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -84.00 [-25.57, 87.5] -82.0 [-37.22, 13] -173.50 [-266.19, -008, -142.00 [-27.86, -33.8] -131.50 [-246.16, -16.8]	$\begin{array}{c} CI \\ \\ B \\ \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 7 \\ \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Chang 2018 Chang 2018 Chang 2018 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2018 Lucas 2012 Luciani 2018 Permpongkosol 200 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneily: ChP Test for overall effect D Study or Subgroup Beasley 2004 Choi 2019 Gong 2008 Park 2010 Rezaeetalab 2016 Romero 2008 Total (95% CI)	Mean 241 165 196.1 196.1 141.7 395.2 525 163 126.9 100 316 64 436.9 166.7 157.5 100 191.1 96.1 96.1 = 93.38, df = t: Z = 14.87 > Mean 250 164.8 211.9 211.9 293 310 280.9	(P = 0. SD 201 137.5 142 297 288 75.2 297 288 179 41.8 111.1 307 430.3 76 108.2 115.1 250 250 250 251.3 221.6 202.1	.11) Total I 182 625 122 100 22 4 8 7 7 8 5 7 15 2 2 15 2 2 4 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 8 5 7 7 7 8 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	O 379 200 1 2004 140.63 371 2005 2005 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 27	PN SD 357 48.6 88.1 135 88.1 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 84% PN SD 343 343 343 370 221.6 274.6	000001); Total V 805 682 122 100 122 100 122 100 122 123 123 124 133 170 187 187 187 187 187 187 187 187	P = 92% Veight 5.6% 33.7% 6.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 5.1% 0.7% 5.1% 0.5% 22.8% 0.7% 6.6% 7.8% 00.0% Weightt 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 20.6% 4.6%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95%. -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.1, -19.4, -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4]; -125.00 [-104.70, 26.1, -78.6]; -87.50 [-260.06, -83.3]; -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9]; -87.50 [-260.06, -88.3]; -105.40 [-124.27, -86.5]; -105.40 [-124.28]; -105.40 [-26.88, 150.0]; -107.20 [-10.24]; -108.35 [-77.36, -59.35]; -84.00 [-255.57, 87.5]; -84.00 [-256.19, -90.8]; -125.00 [-175.84, -74.1]; -14.00 [-172.84, -934]; -14.00 [-172.84, -93	$\begin{array}{c} CI \\ \\ BI \\ PI \\ PI \\ PI \\ PI \\ PI \\ PI \\$	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	
Test for overall effet C Study or Subgroup Adamy 2010 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Jeon 2012 Kartat 2020 Klaassen 2014 Liu 2013 Lucas 2012 Lucasi 2018 Lucasi 2018 Pormpongkosol 200 Porpiglia 2016 Springer 2012 Webb 2015 Xu 2014 Xu 2015 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneily: ChP Total (95% Cl) Heterog		$\begin{array}{l} (P=0,\\ \text{SD}\\ 201\\ 137.5\\ 142\\ 297\\ 297\\ 297\\ 297\\ 298\\ 111.1\\ 307\\ 76.2\\ 297\\ 129\\ 1179\\ 137.5\\ 123\\ 111.1\\ 307\\ 76.2\\ 297\\ 123.1\\ 77.7\\ 166\\ 108.2\\ 215\\ 108.2\\ 225\\ 225\\ 225\\ 225\\ 225\\ 225\\ 225\\ 2$.11) Total I I 182 625 122 1 100 2 115 2 15 57 170 2 19 2 19 2 1734 <0.0000	O 379 200 1 2004 140.63 371 2005 2005 275 275 275 275 275 275 275 27	PN SD 357 48.6 88.1 135 88.1 22.2 362 71.7 49.9 35.4 57.8 22.5 52.7 84% PN SD 343 343 343 370 221.6 274.6	000001); Total V 805 682 122 100 122 100 122 100 122 123 123 124 133 170 187 187 187 187 187 187 187 187	P = 92% Seight 5.6% 33.7% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.5% 0.7% 0.3% 1.1% 00.0% Weightt 1.8% 61.1% 7.8% 0.1.8% 4.6% 4.1%	Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, -138.00 [-176.22, -99.7, -35.00 [-50.51, -19.4, -10.30 [-45.07, 24.4, -125.00 [-164.70, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, -85.3] -45.40 [-167.79, 76.9; -87.50 [-260.06, -86.3] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -105.40 [-24.27, -86.5] -20.105.41, 24.3 -33.30 [-45.52, -1.01, -42.70 [-110.21, -55.1] -68.35 [-77.36, -59.35] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% -84.00 [-25.57, 87.5] -82.0 [-37.22, 13] -173.50 [-266.19, -008, -142.00 [-27.86, -33.8] -131.50 [-246.16, -16.8]	$\begin{array}{c} CI \\ \\ B \\ \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 7 \\ \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$	LPN OPN Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI	

lower blood transfusion rate was found in the LPN group (p=0.04, OR: 0.75, 95% CI: 0.57-0.99, **Figure 3A**). The quality of evidence for EBL and transfusion both were moderate.

For LOS, there was a statistically significant difference between the two surgical techniques (p<0.00001, MD: -2.01 days, 95% CI: -2.58, -1.45, **Figure 3B**). Moreover, subgroup analysis showed that a shorter LOS was related to LPN (p<0.00001, MD: -2.03 days, 95% CI: -2.43, -1.63, **Figure 3C**) for the clinical stage of T1a. The quality of evidence was judged to be moderate according to the Cochrane Handbook.

No clinically meaningful differences were found between two groups for term of intraoperative complications (p=0.94, OR: 1.01, 95% CI: 0.69, 1.49, **Figure 4B**). However, fewer complications were found in terms of both total (p=0.03, OR: 0.80, 95% CI: 0.66, 0.98, **Figure 4A**) and postoperative complications (p=0.02, OR: 0.75, 95% CI: 0.59, 0.96, **Figure 4C**). The quality of evidence was graded as low because of no classification of complications and the potential of performance, detection, and attrition biases influencing the estimate of effect.

Α	LPN		OPN			Odds Ratio	Odds R		
Study or Subgroup			Events T			M-H. Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed	. 95% Cl	
Bravi 2019	33	625			32.0%	0.87 [0.54, 1.40]			
Gong 2008	9	76	12	77	9.1%	0.73 [0.29, 1.84]	-	_	
Jeon 2012	2	31	12	102	4.5%	0.52 [0.11, 2.45]		_	
Kartal 2020	2	22	0	41	0.3% 1	0.12 [0.46, 220.70]			
Klaassen 2014	1	48	1	23	1.1%	0.47 [0.03, 7.83]			
Liu 2013	5	115	3	97	2.7%	1.42 [0.33, 6.12]			
Luciani 2016	15	70	16		10.6%	0.97 [0.44, 2.15]		_	
Park 2010	26	273			36.3%	0.52 [0.31, 0.87]			
Springer 2012	2	170		170	3.4%	0.49 [0.09, 2.73]			
Opringer 2012	2	170	-	170	0.470	0.40 [0.00, 2.70]			
Total (95% CI)		1430		544 10	00.0%	0.75 [0.57, 0.99]	•		
Total events	95		136						
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	6.81, df = 8	(P = 0)	56); l ² = 0 ⁴	6			0.005 0.1 1	10	200
Test for overall effect	: Z = 2.04 (P	= 0.04)				LPN C	OPN	200
В	LPN		OPN			Mean Difference	Mean Dif		
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD					IV, Random, 95% (m, 95% Cl	
Beasley 2004	2.9 1.5	27	6.4 1.8	22	5.6%	-3.50 [-4.44, -2.56]			
Chang 2018	6.9 4.3	122	6.1 3.2	122	5.6%	0.80 [-0.15, 1.75]	ı †		
Gill 2003	2.3 0.8	100	5.7 1.5	100	6.4%	-3.40 [-3.73, -3.07	-		
Gong 2008	2.5 2.1	76	5.6 3	77	5.8%	-3.10 [-3.92, -2.28			
Jeon 2012	4.7 1.8	31	7.3 2	102	5.9%	-2.60 [-3.34, -1.86			
Kartal 2020	4.5 1	22	7 3.2	41	5.3%	-2.50 [-3.56, -1.44			
Klaassen 2014	1.9 1.7	48	3 1.8	23	5.7%	-1.10 [-1.98, -0.22]			
Liu 2013	8.3 2.3	115	12.1 5.2	97	5.2%	-3.80 [-4.92, -2.68]			
Luciani 2016	8 3	70	9 5	73	4.8%	-1.00 [-2.35, 0.35		-	
Marszalek 2009	5.3 0.8	100	7 1.5	100	6.4%	-1.70 [-2.03, -1.37	-		
Minervini 2013	5 3	140	6 3	140	6.0%	-1.00 [-1.70, -0.30			
Permpongkosol 2006	3.3 1.6	85	5.4 2.3	58	6.0%	-2.10 [-2.78, -1.42			
Rezaeetalah 2016	4.6 2.3	.34	4.1 2.3	31	5.2%	0.50 [-0.62, 1.62]	i —	-	
Romero 2008	3.2 1.6	56	6.3 2.8	28	5.2%	-3.10 [-4.22, -1.98			
Springer 2012	4.5 2.1	170	6.6 3.8	170	6.1%	-2.10 [-2.75, -1.45			
Webb 2015	2 1.6	31	4.3 2.4	21	5.1%	-2.30 [-3.47, -1.13			
Xu 2014	8.5 3.1	42	9.3 3.8	187	5.3%	-0.80 [-1.88, 0.28		-	
Xu 2015	5.3 2.1	19	8.7 2.8	18	4.3%	-3.40 [-5.00, -1.80			
Total (95% CI)		1288			100.0%	-2.01 [-2.58, -1.45]	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =				0.0000	1); l² = 90	%	-4 -2 0	2	4
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.99 (P <	0.0000	1)				LPN		-
с	LPN		OPI	4		Mean Difference	Mean Diff	ference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total	Mean S		Weigh				
Beasley 2004	2.9 1.5	27	6.4 1.				_		
Gong 2008	2.5 1.0	76	5.6						
Minervini 2013	5 3	140	6				_ 		
Rezaeetalab 2016	4.6 2.3	34	4.1 2.					-	
Rezaeetalab 2016 Romero 2008	4.6 2.3	34 56	6.3 2.						
Rumero 2000	3.2 1.0	50	0.3 2.	5 28	12.0%	5 -3.10 [-4.22, -1.98]			
Total (95% CI)		333			100.0%	-2.03 [-2.43, -1.63]	•		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	47.30, df = 4	(P < 0.	00001); l² =	92%			-4 -2 0	2	4
Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.94 (P <	< 0.000	01)				-4 -2 0 LPN		4
rescior overall effect.									

Oncological Outcomes

The higher PSM was in connection with the LPN (p=0.005, OR: 1.51, 95% CI: 1.13, 2.01, **Figure 5A**). Nonetheless, no statistically significant difference was found in subgroup analysis (p=0.23, OR: 1.49, 95% CI: 0.78, 2.85, **Figure 5B**). The quality of evidence was judged to be low because of selection bias and inconsistency of results from populations.

There was no clinically meaningful differences for recurrence between the LPN and OPN (p=0.56, OR: 1.12, 95% CI: 0.76, 1.67, **Figure 5C**). The quality of evidence was moderate.

For survival outcomes, there was a statistically significant difference between the two surgical techniques regarding OS (p<0.00001, OR: 2.45, 95% CI: 1.79, 3.37, **Figure 5D**). The quality of evidence was graded as very low because of the potential of selection bias and circumstantial evidence. Yet, no significant difference was found for terms of CSS (p=0.72, HR: 1.13, 95% CI: 0.58, 2.18, **Figure 5E**) and DFS (p=0.72, HR: 1.14, 95% CI: 0.56, 2.36, **Figure 5F**). The quality of evidence was low because of the small sample size, the potential of performance, and detection biases, respectively.

Functional Outcomes

No statistically significant difference between the two surgical techniques regarding eGFR (p=0.31, MD: -1.60 mL/min/1.73m², 95% CI: -4.71, 1.51, **Figure 6A**). There was a clinically meaningful difference between the two groups for term of sCr (p=0.002, MD: -0.08 mg/dL, 95% CI: -0.14, -0.03, **Figure 6B**). The quality of evidence was low because of high heterogeneity and the potential of performance bias, respectively.

Publication Bias

We analyzed possible publication bias generating funnel plots used for the evaluated comparisons of outcomes. There was apparent publication bias in most of the outcomes. For example, we present the funnel plot of PSM showing the obvious asymmetry (**Figure 7**).

DISCUSSION

We believed that there is a different effect on surgical, oncological, and functional outcomes between LPN and OPN.



Due to lack of systematic evidence, we performed a meta-analysis and found several significant results after a systematic review of the literatures.

First, the results of surgical outcomes show that no significant difference was found pertaining to the operative time with high heterogeneity. Even so, some experienced centers report that shorter operative time has something to do with the LPN, which proves that the LPN has a great potential to transcend the OPN in terms of operative time for experienced centers (25, 39, 42, 43). Fu et al. prove that the retroperitoneal LPN has significantly less

operating time the transperitoneal LPN (48). No subgroup analysis was performed because lack of sufficient data. Therefore, the tumor size, initial experience, and peritoneal access play main roles in the high heterogeneity. In addition, a lower volume (66.16 ml) of EBL is associated with LPN, which is not necessarily of clinical significance unless the total blood loss is sufficient to transfuse. Hence, we further analyzed the difference in intraoperative blood transfusion rate between the two surgical techniques and found that 15% risk of transfusion was reduced by LPN. It is pneumoperitoneum and superior

Becker 2014 Bravi 2019 Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Gong 2008 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Lane 2010 Liu 2013	2 56 5 3	57 625 122	3 48		2.0%	1.83 [0.30, 11.25]					
Chang 2018 Gill 2003 Gong 2008 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Lane 2010	5 3				54.8%	1.30 [0.87, 1.94]					
Gong 2008 Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Lane 2010			2		2.5%	2.56 [0.49, 13.48]					
Jeon 2012 Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Lane 2010		100	1	100	1.3%	3.06 [0.31, 29.95]					
Kartal 2020 Klaassen 2014 Lane 2010	1 3	76 23	1 0	77 75	1.3% 0.3%	1.01 [0.06, 16.50] 25.78 [1.28, 519.43]					→
Lane 2010	2	22	2	41	1.7%	1.95 [0.26, 14.89]			+ • •		
	3 5	48 499	0	23	0.8%	3.62 [0.18, 72.96] 3.85 [0.74, 19.90]					_ '
	5	499 115	2 0	762 97	2.1% 0.7%	2.55 [0.10, 63.43]			· · ·		
Lucas 2012	0	15	1	54	0.9%	1.15 [0.04, 29.68]			· · ·		— .
Luciani 2016 Marszalek 2009	3	70 100	0 2	73 100	0.6% 2.5%	7.62 [0.39, 150.30] 2.04 [0.37, 11.41]			· ·		
Minervini 2013	4	140	5	140	6.4%	0.79 [0.21, 3.02]			<u> </u>		
Park 2010	12	273	7		8.7%	1.79 [0.69, 4.61]				-	
Permpongkosol 2006 Porpiglia 2016	2	85 57	1 9		1.5% 7.0%	1.37 [0.12, 15.51] 0.25 [0.03, 1.99]			<u> </u>		
Rezaeetalab 2016	3	34	1		1.2%	2.90 [0.29, 29.49]			+ · ·		
Springer 2012	2	170	3	170	3.9%	0.66 [0.11, 4.02]			<u> </u>		
Total (95% CI)		2631	3	3171 10	0.0%	1.51 [1.13, 2.01]			•		
Total events	112		88								
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1				0%			0.05	0.2	1	5	20
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.80 (P	= 0.005)					LPN	OPN		
B	LPN		OPN			Odds Ratio			ls Ratio		
Study or Subgroup			Events			M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fi	xed. 95% (
Becker 2014 Gong 2008	2 1	57 76	3 1	154 77	10.4% 6.5%	1.83 [0.30, 11.25] 1.01 [0.06, 16.50]			-		
Minervini 2013	4	140	5		32.4%	0.79 [0.21, 3.02]					
Park 2010	12	273	7		44.2%	1.79 [0.69, 4.61]			+		
Rezaeetalab 2016	3	34	1	31	6.4%	2.90 [0.29, 29.49]					-
Total (95% CI)		580		681 1	00.0%	1.49 [0.78, 2.85]			-		
Total events	22		17							,	
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =				0%			0.01	0.1	1	10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.20 (I	P = 0.23)					LPN	I OPN		
C Study of Subaroun	LPN		OPN			Odds Ratio			s Ratio		
Study of Subgroup			Events			M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fix	ced, 95% C	-	
Chang 2018 Choi 2019	6 0	122 96	4 10	122 285	8.4% 11.6%	1.53 [0.42, 5.55] 0.14 [0.01, 2.34]	←		<u> </u>		
Jeon 2012	2	31	3	102	2.9%	2.28 [0.36, 14.28]			· · ·		
Lane 2010	27	499	27		44.4%	1.56 [0.90, 2.69]					
Liu 2013 Marszalek 2009	2 3	115 100	1 4	97 100	2.3% 8.5%	1.70 [0.15, 19.03] 0.74 [0.16, 3.41]			<u> </u>		
Park 2010	4	273	9		0.5% 19.3%	0.45 [0.14, 1.47]			+		
Permpongkosol 2006	2	85	1	58	2.6%	1.37 [0.12, 15.51]			· ·		
Total (95% CI)		1321		1805 1	00.0%	1.12 [0.76, 1.67]					
Total events	46	1021	59	1000 1	00.070	1.12 [0.10, 1.07]			ſ		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =			13); I² = 0	%			0.02	0.1	1	10	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.58 (F	P = 0.56)							OPN		
Datation	LPN		OPN			Odds Ratio			s Ratio		
Study or Subgroup			Events					M-H, Fix	ced, 95% C	1	
Chang 2018 Kartal 2020	121 21	122 22	116 38	122 41	1.8% 2.2%	6.26 [0.74, 52.79] 1.66 [0.16, 16.96]			· · ·	· · · ·	
Lane 2010	639	672	829		62.5%	2.69 [1.80, 4.01]			-		
Marszalek 2009	96	100	85	100	6.3%	4.24 [1.35, 13.25]					
Park 2010 Permpongkosol 2006	269 83	273 85	276 55	279 58	7.4% 2.8%	0.73 [0.16, 3.30] 2.26 [0.37, 13.99]					
Springer 2012	160	170	156		17.0%	1.44 [0.62, 3.33]		-			
Total (95% CI) Total events	1389	1444	1555	1714 1	00.0%	2.45 [1.79, 3.37]			-		
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5		6 (P = 0.4		%						10	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 5.54 (F	o < 0.000	001)				0.01	0.1 LPN	I OPN	10	100
_					F	lazard Ratio		Hazard			
E Study or Subgroup	loq[Ha	azard Ra	atio] S	E Weig		V. Fixed, 95% Cl		IV, Fixed			
Chang 2018			0 1.9			.00 [0.02, 45.69]					_
Kartal 2020			1.72 2.5			8 [0.04, 860.15]					
Permpongkosol 2006	5		0.34 0.9			1.40 [0.22, 9.04]			<u> </u>	-	
Springer 2012		(0.06 0.3	7 82.8	5%	1.06 [0.51, 2.19]		- T			
Total (95% CI)				100.	0% 1	1.13 [0.58, 2.18]					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =				0%		⊢ 0.0	01	0.1 1		10	100
Test for overall effect:	: Z = 0.36	(P = 0.72	2)			0.0	51	LPN	OPN	10	100
_						lazard Ratio		Hazard	Ratio		
F Study or Subgroup	log[Ha	azard Ra	atio] SI	E Weig		V. Fixed, 95% CI		IV, Fixed			
Chang 2018			.59 2.4			.20 [0.00, 22.95]				-	
Choi 2019			0.41 1.44	4 6.6	% C	.66 [0.04, 11.16]			_		
Jeon 2012			0.94 0.74			2.56 [0.60, 10.92]					
Kartal 2020 Liu 2013			1.44 2.97).31 3.81			0.24 [0.00, 79.93] 🔸 6 [0.00, 2386.21] 🔶					
Marszalek 2009).81 3.8).82 1.85			0.44 [0.01, 16.54]	-				
Park 2010		-0	0.02 0.53	3 48.4	%	0.98 [0.35, 2.77]			-		
Permpongkosol 2006			0.23 1.09			.26 [0.15, 10.66]			-		
Total (95% CI)				100.0	1%	1.14 [0.56, 2.36]					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	2.48. df =	7 (P = 0	.93): I² =						-		
Test for overall effect:						0.0	001	0.1 1 LPN	0PN 10		1000





vision that contribute to reduce blood loss providing precise dissection (23, 25, 34). A lower transfusion rate is associated with postoperative survival in patients with renal cell carcinoma after nephrectomy and reduces potential risk factors, such as hemolysis in the clinic (49, 50). What is more, results of LOS are 2.01 days shorter for LPN than OPN with high heterogeneity because of lower complications, smaller wounds, and more rapid recovery (23, 34, 44). We believe that the discharge criteria, postoperative care management, and characteristics of patients are associated with high heterogeneity. Due to the lack of

scientific and strict classification of complications in most included studies and the lack of sufficient data, we only analyzed the complications classified into total, intraoperative, and postoperative complications according to the time of occurrence. Our cumulative analysis showed lower total and postoperative complications were related to the LPN compared with the OPN and showed no clinically meaningful differences were found for term of intraoperative complications. Marszalek et al. and Rezaeetalab et al. believe that shorter anesthesia and ischemia times are attributed to the lower perioperative complications, respectively (25, 28). On the other hand, some series thought the small difference in mean tumor size and tumor location were associated with fewer complications (26, 34, 35, 41). The fewer complications are beneficial to improve postoperative recovery and quality of life, which is more popular in the clinic.

Second, the analysis of oncological outcomes indicated that a higher PSM was found in the group of LPN. Subgroup analysis showed no significantly meaningful differences in term of PSM between two groups for T1a stage tumor. We believe that tumor size and learning curve play an important role in the discrepancy because the limited operation range of the laparoscope and less complete excision than open surgery was associated with high PSM for larger tumors. Current research suggests that a higher PSM is closely related to a higher incidence of local relapses, especially in large RCC, poorly differentiated, and/or more centrally located (51-53). However, the LPN and OPN accessed yield comparable in terms of recurrence, CSS, and DFS. It may be related to differences in pathological stage and follow-up time. In addition, we found that a high OS was associated with the LPN. Lane et al. thought that it had something to do with the renal functional outcomes (38). However, there is no clinical significance because of too many influences, such as underlying diseases and accidents.

Third, our results notably reveal that significant differences were found for postoperative change in sCr but not for postoperative changes in eGFR with moderate and high heterogeneity, respectively. The differences of patients' characteristics, ischemia technique, and time are associated with heterogeneity. Marszalek et al. believe that the functional outcomes were closely related to intraoperative renal perfusion, caused by either arterial clamping or capnoperitoneum or capnoretroperitoneum (25). In addition, Bravi et al. suggest that surgical manipulation and suture/hemostatic techniques may affect early postoperative renal function (23). In addition, ischemia technique and time are related to postoperative renal function (26, 28). Subgroup analysis was not possible due to the lack of data. Recently, a systematic review proved that functional outcomes had something to do with ischemia technique, but none of the available ischemia techniques could be recommended over the other (54). Yet, a 0.08 mg/dL less increased sCr has no significant difference in the clinic.

Few studies focused on quality of life after PN. Becker et al. report that LPN and OPN were equivalent with postoperative quality of life, which needs further argument (31). For cost, current studies suggested that LPN is more cost-effective than OPN because of shorter LOS (55).

REFERENCES

- Ljungberg B, Albiges L, Bensalah K, Bex A, Giles RH, Hora M, et al. EAU Guidelines on Renal Cell Carcinoma 2020. In: European Association of Urology Guidelines 2020 Edition. presented at the EAU Annual Congress Amsterdam 2020. Arnhem, The Netherlands: European Association of Urology Guidelines Office (2020).
- Campbell S, Uzzo RG, Allaf ME, Bass EB, Cadeddu JA, Chang A, et al. Renal Mass and Localized Renal Cancer: AUA Guideline. J Urol (2017) 198(3):520– 9. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2017.04.100

Although we performed this meta-analysis with the rigorous methodology of review and quantitative synthesis, some inherent limitations cannot be avoided. First, there were no prospective randomized controlled studies, which reduced the quality of evidence. Second, results should be applied carefully in clinical practice because of great heterogeneity in terms of operative time, LOS, and variations of eGFR. Third, some data were unsuitable to evaluate oncologic outcomes, including recurrence, OS, CSS, and DFS, because of insufficient follow-up period. Finally, there was evidence of the apparent publication bias. Computer-based literature searching could not include all relevant studies. Gray literature also could not be included.

CONCLUSIONS

This meta-analysis revealed that the LPN is a feasible and safe alternative to the OPN with comparable surgical, oncologic, and functional outcomes. However, the results should be applied prudently in the clinic because of the low quality of evidence. Further quality studies are needed to evaluate effectiveness of LPN and its postoperative quality of life compared with OPN.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All datasets presented in this study are included in the article/ Supplementary Material.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceived and designed the experiments: AW. Analyzed the data: CY, YD, LP, and HW. Contributed reagents/materials/ analysis: YD, LP, TW, and XZ. Wrote the manuscript: CY and YD. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fonc.2020. 583979/full#supplementary-material

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE 1 | Characteristics and quality assessment of included studies.

- Tae JH, Pyun JH, Shim JS, Cho S, Kang SG, Ko YH, et al. Oncological and functional outcomes of robot-assisted radical cystectomy in bladder cancer patients in a single tertiary center: Can these be preserved throughout the learning curve? *Invest Clin Urol* (2019) 60(6):463–71. doi: 10.4111/icu.2019.60.6.463
- MacLennan S, Imamura M, Lapitan MC, Omar MI, Lam TB, Hilvano-Cabungcal AM, et al. Systematic review of perioperative and quality-of-life outcomes following surgical management of localised renal cancer. *Eur Urol* (2012) 62(6):1097–117. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2012.07.028
- 5. Van Poppel H, Da Pozzo L, Albrecht W, Matveev V, Bono A, Borkowski A, et al. A prospective, randomised EORTC intergroup phase 3 study comparing

the oncologic outcome of elective nephron-sparing surgery and radical nephrectomy for low-stage renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* (2011) 59 (4):543–52. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2010.12.013

- Huang WC, Elkin EB, Levey AS, Jang TL, Russo P. Partial nephrectomy versus radical nephrectomy in patients with small renal tumors-is there a difference in mortality and cardiovascular outcomes? *J Urol* (2009) 181(1):55– 61; discussion -2. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2008.09.017
- Gill IS, Kavoussi LR, Lane BR, Blute ML, Babineau D, Colombo JRJr., et al. Comparison of 1,800 laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomies for single renal tumors. J Urol (2007) 178(1):41–6. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2007.03.038
- Pierorazio PM, Patel HD, Feng T, Yohannan J, Hyams ES, Allaf ME. Roboticassisted versus traditional laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: comparison of outcomes and evaluation of learning curve. *Urology* (2011) 78(4):813–9. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2011.04.065
- Feder MT, Patel MB, Melman A, Ghavamian R, Hoenig DM. Comparison of open and laparoscopic nephrectomy in obese and nonobese patients: outcomes stratified by body mass index. J Urol (2008) 180(1):79–83. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2008.03.023
- Ghani KR, Sukumar S, Sammon JD, Rogers CG, Trinh QD, Menon M. Practice patterns and outcomes of open and minimally invasive partial nephrectomy since the introduction of robotic partial nephrectomy: results from the nationwide inpatient sample. J Urol (2014) 191(4):907–12. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2013.10.099
- Reifsnyder JE, Ramasamy R, Ng CK, Dipietro J, Shin B, Shariat SF, et al. Laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy: complication comparison using the Clavien system. *JSLS* (2012) 16(1):38–44. doi: 10.4293/108680812X 13291597716942
- Choi JE, You JH, Kim DK, Rha KH, Lee SH. Comparison of perioperative outcomes between robotic and laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol* (2015) 67(5):891–901. doi: 10.1016/ j.eururo.2014.12.028
- Patel MN, Bhandari M, Menon M, Rogers CG. Robotic-assisted partial nephrectomy. *BJU Int* (2009) 103(9):1296–311. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2009.08584.x
- Buttice S, Sener TE, Lucan VC, Lunelli L, Lagana AS, Vitale SG, et al. Hybrid Transvaginal NOTES Nephrectomy: Postoperative Sexual Outcomes. A Three-center Matched Study. Urology (2017) 99:131–5. doi: 10.1016/ j.urology.2016.09.023
- Kallidonis P, Panagopoulos V, Kyriazis I, Vasilas M, Liatsikos E. Transvaginal specimen removal in minimally invasive surgery. *World J Urol* (2016) 34 (6):779–87. doi: 10.1007/s00345-016-1770-1
- Zhao PT, Richstone L, Kavoussi LR. Laparoscopic partial nephrectomy. Int J Surg (2016) 36(Pt C):548–53. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2016.04.028
- Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* (2015) 350:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
- Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. ANZ J Surg (2003) 73:712–6. doi: 10.1046/j.1445-2197.2003.02748.x
- Brassetti A, Cacciamani G, Anceschi U, Ferriero M, Tuderti G, Miranda G, et al. Long-term oncologic outcomes of robot-assisted radical cystectomy (RARC) with totally intracorporeal urinary diversion (ICUD): a multicenter study. *World J Urol* (2019) 38(4):837–43. doi: 10.1007/s00345-019-02842-3
- Sterne JAC, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *Bmj* (2016) 355:i4919. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i4919
- Hozo SP, Djulbegovic B, Hozo I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. *BMC Med Res Methodol* (2005) 5:13. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-5-13
- Klaassen Z, Kohut RM, Patel D, Terris MK, Madi R. A Single Surgeon's Experience with Open, Laparoscopic, and Robotic Partial Nephrectomy. *Int Scholarly Res Notices* (2014) 2014:1–5. doi: 10.1155/2014/430914
- 23. Bravi CA, Larcher A, Capitanio U, Mari A, Antonelli A, Artibani W, et al. Perioperative Outcomes of Open, Laparoscopic, and Robotic Partial Nephrectomy: A Prospective Multicenter Observational Study (The

RECORd 2 Project). Eur Urol Focus (2019) S2405-4569(19)30335-9. doi: 10.1016/j.euf.2019.10.013

- Luciani LG, Chiodini S, Mattevi D, Cai T, Puglisi M, Mantovani W, et al. Roboticassisted partial nephrectomy provides better operative outcomes as compared to the laparoscopic and open approaches: results from a prospective cohort study. *J Robot Surg* (2017) 11(3):333–9. doi: 10.1007/s11701-016-0660-2
- Marszalek M, Meixl H, Polajnar M, Rauchenwald M, Jeschke K, Madersbacher S. Laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy: a matchedpair comparison of 200 patients. *Eur Urol* (2009) 55(5):1171–8. doi: 10.1016/ j.eururo.2009.01.042
- Minervini A, Siena G, Antonelli A, Bianchi G, Bocciardi AM, Cosciani Cunico S, et al. Open versus laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for clinical T1a renal masses: a matched-pair comparison of 280 patients with TRIFECTA outcomes (RECORd Project). World J Urol (2014) 32(1):257–63. doi: 10.1007/s00345-013-1155-7
- Porpiglia F, Mari A, Bertolo R, Antonelli A, Bianchi G, Fidanza F, et al. Partial Nephrectomy in Clinical T1b Renal Tumors: Multicenter Comparative Study of Open, Laparoscopic and Robot-assisted Approach (the RECORd Project). Urology (2016) 89:45–51. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2015.08.049
- Rezaeetalab GH, Karami H, Dadkhah F, Simforoosh N, Shakhssalim N. Laparoscopic Versus Open Partial Nephrectomy for Stage T1a of Renal Tumors. Urol J (2016) 13(6):2903–7. doi: 10.22037/uj.v13i6.3572
- Adamy A, Favaretto RL, Nogueira L, Savage C, Russo P, Coleman J, et al. Recovery of renal function after open and laparoscopic partial nephrectomy. *Eur Urol* (2010) 58(4):596–601. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2010.05.044
- Beasley KA, Al Omar M, Shaikh A, Bochinski D, Khakhar A, Izawa JI, et al. Laparoscopic versus open partial nephrectomy. *Urology* (2004) 64(3):458–61. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2004.04.028
- 31. Becker A, Pradel L, Kluth L, Schmid M, Eichelberg C, Ahyai S, et al. Laparoscopic versus open partial nephrectomy for clinical T1 renal masses: no impact of surgical approach on perioperative complications and long-term postoperative quality of life. *World J Urol* (2015) 33(3):421–6. doi: 10.1007/ s00345-014-1318-1
- 32. Chang KD, Abdel Raheem A, Kim KH, Oh CK, Park SY, Kim YS, et al. Functional and oncological outcomes of open, laparoscopic and robot-assisted partial nephrectomy: a multicentre comparative matched-pair analyses with a median of 5 years' follow-up. *BJU Int* (2018) 122(4):618–26. doi: 10.1111/bju.14250
- 33. Choi SY, Jung H, You D, Jeong IG, Song C, Hong B, et al. Robot-assisted partial nephrectomy is associated with early recovery of renal function: Comparison of open, laparoscopic, and robot-assisted partial nephrectomy using DTPA renal scintigraphy. J Surg Oncol (2019) 119(7):1016–23. doi: 10.1002/jso.25429
- 34. Gill IS, Matin SF, Desai MM, Kaouk JH, Steinberg A, Mascha E, et al. Comparative analysis of laparoscopic versus open partial nephrectomy for renal tumors in 200 patients. J Urol (2003) 170(1):64–8. doi: 10.1097/ 01.ju.0000072272.02322.ff
- Gong EM, Orvieto MA, Zorn KC, Lucioni A, Steinberg GD, Shalhav AL. Comparison of Laparoscopic and Open Partial Nephrectomy in Clinical T1a Renal Tumors. J Endourol (2008) 22(5):953–8. doi: 10.1089/end.2007.0300
- 36. Jeon HG, Choi KH, Kim KH, Rha KH, Yang SC, Han WK. Comparison of Video-Assisted Minilaparotomy, Open, and Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy for Renal Masses. Yonsei Med J (2012) 53(1):151-7. doi: 10.3349/ymj.2012.53.1.151
- Kartal I, Karakoyunlu N, Cakici C, Karabacak O, Sagnak L, Ersoy H. Oncological and functional outcomes of open versus laparoscopic partial nephrectomy in T1b tumors: A single-center analysis. *Int Braz J Urol* (2020) 46(3):341–50. doi: 10.1590/S1677-5538.IBJU.2018.0865
- Lane BR, Gill IS. 7-year oncological outcomes after laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy. J Urol (2010) 183(2):473–9. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2009.10.023
- 39. Liu Z, Wang P, Xia D, Lou Y-F, Pan H-F, Wang S. Comparison between laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy: Surgical, oncologic, and functional outcomes. *Kaohsiung J Med Sci* (2013) 29(11):624–8. doi: 10.1016/j.kjms.2013.01.021
- Lucas SM, Mellon MJ, Erntsberger L, Sundaram CP. A comparison of robotic, laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy. *JSLS* (2012) 16(4):581–7. doi: 10.4293/108680812X13462882737177
- 41. Park H, Byun SS, Kim HH, Lee SB, Kwon TG, Jeon SH, et al. Comparison of laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomies in t1a renal cell carcinoma: a

korean multicenter experience. *Korean J Urol* (2010) 51(7):467-71. doi: 10.4111/kju.2010.51.7.467

- 42. Permpongkosol S, Bagga HS, Romero FR, Sroka M, Jarrett TW, Kavoussi LR. Laparoscopic versus open partial nephrectomy for the treatment of pathological T1N0M0 renal cell carcinoma: a 5-year survival rate. *J Urol* (2006) 176(5):1984–8; discussion 8-9. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2006.07.033
- Romero FR, Rais-Bahrami S, Muntener M, Brito FA, Jarrett TW, Kavoussi LR. Laparoscopic partial nephrectomy in obese and non-obese patients: comparison with open surgery. *Urology* (2008) 71(5):806–9. doi: 10.1016/ j.urology.2007.11.047
- 44. Springer C, Hoda MR, Fajkovic H, Pini G, Mohammed N, Fornara P, et al. Laparoscopic vs open partial nephrectomy for T1 renal tumours: evaluation of long-term oncological and functional outcomes in 340 patients. *BJU Int* (2013) 111(2):281–8. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2012.11280.x
- Webb CM, Kamel M, Eltahawy E, Faramawi MF, Shera AL, Davis R, et al. A comparative study of open, laparoscopic and robotic partial nephrectomy in obese patients. Urol Ann (2015) 7(2):231–4. doi: 10.4103/0974-7796.152023
- 46. Xu H, Ding Q, Jiang HW. Fewer complications after laparoscopic nephrectomy as compared to the open procedure with the modified Clavien classification system–a retrospective analysis from southern China. *World J Surg Oncol* (2014) 12:242. doi: 10.1186/1477-7819-12-242
- Xu B, Wang JJ, Mi Y, Zhou LQ, Jin J, Zhang Q. Laparoscopic versus open partial nephrectomy for multilocular cystic renal cell carcinoma: a direct comparison based on single-center experience. Urol Int (2015) 94(1):83–7. doi: 10.1159/000363606
- Fu J, Ye S, Ye H-J. Retroperitoneal Versus Transperitoneal Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Chin Med Sci J* (2015) 30(4):239–44. doi: 10.1016/s1001-9294(16)30007-4
- 49. Seon DY, Kwak C, Kim HH, Ku JH, Kim HS. Impact of perioperative blood transfusion on oncologic outcomes in patients with nonmetastatic renal cell carcinoma treated with curative nephrectomy: A retrospective analysis of a large, single-institutional cohort. *Invest Clin Urol* (2020) 61(2):136–45. doi: 10.4111/icu.2020.61.2.136

- Delaney M, Wendel S, Bercovitz RS, Cid J, Cohn C, Dunbar NM, et al. Transfusion reactions: prevention, diagnosis, and treatment. *Lancet* (2016) 388(10061):2825–36. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)01313-6
- Marchinena PG, Tirapegui S, Gonzalez IT, Jurado A, Gueglio G. Positive surgical margins are predictors of local recurrence in conservative kidney surgery for pT1 tumors. *Int Braz J Urol* (2018) 44(3):475–82. doi: 10.1590/ S1677-5538.IBJU.2017.0039
- 52. Tellini R, Antonelli A, Tardanico R, Fisogni S, Veccia A, Furlan MC, et al. Positive Surgical Margins Predict Progression-free Survival After Nephronsparing Surgery for Renal Cell Carcinoma: Results From a Single Center Cohort of 459 Cases With a Minimum Follow-up of 5 Years. *Clin Genitourin Cancer* (2019) 17(1):e26–31. doi: 10.1016/j.clgc.2018.08.004
- Steinestel J, Steffens S, Steinestel K, Schrader AJ. Positive surgical margins in nephron-sparing surgery: risk factors and therapeutic consequences. World J Surg Oncol (2014) 12:252. doi: 10.1186/1477-7819-12-252
- Greco F, Autorino R, Altieri V, Campbell S, Ficarra V, Gill I, et al. Ischemia Techniques in Nephron-sparing Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Surgical, Oncological, and Functional Outcomes. *Eur Urol* (2019) 75(3):477–91. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2018.10.005
- Mir SA, Cadeddu JA, Sleeper JP, Lotan Y. Cost comparison of robotic, laparoscopic, and open partial nephrectomy. J Endourol (2011) 25(3):447– 53. doi: 10.1089/end.2010.0510

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2020 You, Du, Wang, Peng, Wei, Zhang, Li and Wang. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.