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INTRODUCTION

The retrocaval ureter (RCU) is an unusual abnormality of the inferior vena cava (IVC) development and is usually diagnosed on the right side.\(^{(1,2)}\) The presence of a RCU on the left side is a very rare finding and has important clinical and surgical implications.\(^{(1,4)}\)

CASE REPORT

A 75-year-old man presented to the emergency ward with recurrent macroscopic hematuria and irritative voiding symptoms. In our diagnostic process, urinalysis, urine cytology, intravenous urography, and cystoscopy were employed. A tumor in the bladder and another one in the distal ureter were diagnosed. Transurethral resection of the bladder tumor was initially performed and the pathology diagnosis was an at least pT2b urothelial tumor. Abdominal computed tomography was subsequently performed for tumor staging, which incidentally revealed a left IVC and a RCU ipsilaterally without situs inversus (Figure 1).

The urologic history of the patient started 5 years earlier when an urothelial pT1 grade IIB tumor of the bladder was diagnosed. The treatment included transurethral resection of the lesion followed by Bacille Calmette-Guérin (BCG) intravesical instillations. The upper urinary tract had been examined that time with ultra-
sonography, which showed normal findings. Left nephroureterectomy and radical cystoprostatectomy were performed for the treatment of his urothelial malignancy. The nephroureterectomy was a laborious procedure, and accidently, an opening to the IVC was made, which was immediately recognized and corrected (Figure 2). The radical cystoprostatectomy was uncomplicated. The frozen section of the right ureteral margin was positive for urothelial malignancy and right distal ureterectomy with ileal loop diversion was performed.

The postoperative recovery was uneventful. One and a half year after the operation, no signs of tumor recurrence, distant metastasis, or renal dysfunction were identified.

DISCUSSION

In cases of a retrocaval ureter, the subcardinal vein generates the IVC, which results in a course of the ureter dorsally to this vein. The term preureteral vena cava (PUVC) is preferable to the term RCU for the vascular origin of the abnormality to be emphasized. If the subcardinal vein persists at a left vena cava system, a left PUVC (LPUVC) is encountered. Reviewing the international literature, only 6 cases have been reported so far. Recurrent abdominal pain, lumbar pain, hydronephrosis, and nephrolithiasis are the presenting symptoms of LPUVC. Traditionally, the combination of retrograde urography with cavography can identify the PUVC. The spiral computed tomography can substantially contribute towards the correct diagnosis. Should the use of intravenous radiopaque agents is contraindicated, magnetic resonance imaging can be performed instead. The left IVC and PUVC may be misdiagnosed as a retroperitoneal lymphadenopathy or a primary tumor of the retroperitoneal space. They also pose a threat for vascular or tissue damage during operations to the retroperitoneum, particularly when they are associated with situs inversus. The left renal vein has a brief course, which does not cross the aorta and subsequently, in cases of nephrectomy, living renal donor surgery, and reno-vascular surgery repair, it is difficult to be recognized and dissected from the surrounding tissues.

The treatment of PUVC is ureterotomy and relocation of the ureter anteriorly to the IVC. This operation is usually an open surgical procedure, but nowadays it can be performed laparoscopi-
Apart from hematuria, no other symptoms were described by our patient. Considering that his initial evaluation with ultrasonography five years earlier showed normal renal units and collecting systems bilaterally, it is estimated that the urothelial malignancy and not the LPUC generated a clinical evident obstruction of the left urinary tract. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first case in which the PUVC is associated with urothelial malignancy. Despite the pre-operative diagnosis, the left IVC and the abnormal ureteral course obscured the retroperitoneal structures. In our patient, an opening to the IVC was made. The surgeon must have a high index of suspicion and attention, and must be extremely meticulous during renal and ureteral dissection for any damage to the retroperitoneal organs to be avoided and a source of intra-operative complications to be prevented.
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