In our study, Clear Petra Ureteral Access Sheath with a separate drainage lumen was used. Essentially, we tried more than 20 Retrograde intrarenal surgery (RIRS) surgeries with the Clear Petra Ureteral Access Sheath prior to conducting the study.

In cases where we use vacuum support in our surgeries, as you mentioned, we observed that even though drainage increases, there is deterioration in image quality due to rapid decrease in intrapelvic pressure, and more irrigation fluid is used to increase image quality. In addition, we found that this situation made it difficult for the laser to focus and break up the stone. Although it minimized the vacuum settings, these factors affecting this surgical process did not change. For these reasons, we preferred passive drainage from the lumen instead of active vacuum drainage in our.

Although passive drainage is used, in our study, lower KIM-1 levels were detected compared to the standard UAS even without vacuum support. This kidney made us think that Clear Petra might have a positive effect on kidney damage. However, this difference was reported as similar, since it was not statistically significant [1].

In the light of ex vivo studies on this subject [2, 3], in future studies, we would like to clearly demonstrate the effect of Ureteral Access Sheath on intrarenal pressure by measuring intrarenal pressure with a urodynamic catheter-like catheter in RIRS patients with vacuum-assisted ureteral Access sheath.

Thank you.
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