Urethral catheterization is rarely associated with intestinal perforation. Urethro-rectal perforation as a complication of urethral instrumentation is rarely seen. Only one case of bladder and small bowel perforation as a complication of Foley catheterization has been reported.

In patients with intestinal perforation, treatment usually consists of laparotomy and repair of perforation. In this report, we aimed to present a case of acute urethro-rectal perforation and management of it as a complication of urethral Foley catheterization. To our knowledge, this is the first documented acute urethro-rectal perforation during Foley catheterization. We think that endoscopic treatment is sufficient in early diagnosed cases without performing laparotomy. In addition, in patients who had previously undergone prostate or urethra operation, we think that the Foley catheter should not be forced and should be treated more carefully while placing the Foley.
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CASE REPORT

A 82-year-old male patient presented to the urology clinic with the complaints of inability to urinate. It was determined that 12 hours before his presentation, the patient had been admitted to the emergency department with the complaint of severe difficulty in urination and a urethral Foley catheter was attempted to be placed, but the procedure was unsuccessful. The patient had a history of open prostatectomy five years earlier and was referred to the urology clinic. The physical examination revealed the presence of a vesical globe. A 16 F Foley catheter was inserted into the urethra and confirmed to be properly placed in the bladder, but no urine was seen. Purulent fluid was observed after the irrigation of the Foley catheter. The catheter was palpated on digital rectal examination.

Considering that it was not actually positioned in the bladder, the urethral Foley catheter was withdrawn from the urethra. Retrograde urethrography revealed no transition of the contrast agent into the bladder and rectal transition from the level of the membranous urethra (urethro-rectal perforation) (Figure 1).

Contrast agent was passed down to the urethra retrogradely, and the passage of the contrast agent to the rectum from the membranous urethra was seen on the computed tomography (CT) scan (Figure 2). Cystourethroscopy and a required intervention were planned for the patient.

Routine laboratory tests revealed normal findings, except the white blood cell count and C-reactive protein (nephelometric), which were 15,810 and
was 9.2 mg/dl, respectively. The patient was treated with intravenous ceftriaxone 1g 2x1 and intravenous metronidazole 500 mg 3x1 empirically. Urethroscopy showed a posterior perforation area at the level of the membranous urethra. Severe stenosis was seen proximal to this level on urethroscopy. A guide wire was inserted from the stenotic segment to perform internal urethrotomy, and a 20 F Foley catheter was placed into the bladder.

The examination of the anorectal canal revealed a 1 cm perforation on the anterior wall of the rectum and was repaired with primary sutures by the transrectal route. No perioperative complication was observed.

The patient’s oral nutrition was stopped for three days. During the follow-up, there was no problem with bowel functions. Oral intake was started. *Escherichia coli* was detected in the urine culture. In accordance with the results of the antibiogram, ceftriaxone was discontinued and meropenem 1 g 3x1 was started, which was continued for 14 days. The control urine culture was sterile. On the postoperative 15th day, the urethral catheter was withdrawn. The control retrograde urethrography showed that the contrast medium was easily passed through the bladder and there was no fistula (Figure 3). The patient was discharged and no long-term complications occurred. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first case of urethro-rectal perforation that occurred during Foley catheterization.

Written informed consent has been obtained from the patient for publishing this case.
DISCUSSION

Urethral catheterization is rarely associated with intestinal perforation. Perforation may cause a fistula if not timely detected. The risk factors for the majority of cases of urethra–rectal perforation or fistulas include advanced age and a history of prostate or bowel operations or radiotherapy. This condition has very characteristic symptoms and signs, such as fecaluria, pneumaturia, and leakage of urine into the rectum.

The most appropriate approach in the treatment of urethra–rectal perforation or fistulas remains controversial. Although small perforation or fistula tracts may be spontaneously closed after urinary or intestinal diversion, surgical repair is required in the majority of cases. To date, many different surgical approaches have been described. Although transanal, transsphincteric, perineal (posterior) and transabdominal (anterior) approaches have been detailed in the literature, there is still no consensus on the optimal treatment method.

A detailed preoperative anatomical, functional, oncological and metabolic examination is essential for an appropriate treatment plan. The absence of a randomized and/or prospective study to assist surgeons in the treatment planning phase and the scarcity of evidence in this regard have mostly led surgeon experience in personal clinical practice to guide related decisions. In the treatment of complex fistulas, especially in cases that develop after radiotherapy, the general approach of surgeons with experience in the field appears to be the posterior transperineal approach and flap interposition.

McDowell et al. reported two cases of urethra–rectal perforation as a complication of urethral instrumentation. These patients were treated with loop colostomy and suprapubic cystostomy diversion, and no fistula formation was detected at the 24-month follow-up.

In the current case, we consider that the risk factors for urethra–rectal perforation were urethral stenosis associated with open prostatectomy performed five years earlier due to benign prostatic hyperplasia and the force applied during the attempt to insert a Foley catheter through the urethral route. Since our patient was diagnosed and treated at an early stage, we did not observe any of the typical symptoms of the condition, such as fecaluria, pneumaturia, and leakage of urine into the rectum. In the treatment of our case, endoscopic internal urethrotomy was performed, and a Foley catheter was inserted into the bladder through the urethra and the primary repair of intestinal perforation was performed using the transanal approach. No fistula formation was observed at the 12th-month follow-up.

In conclusion, utmost care must be taken not to apply any force during Foley catheterization through the urethra in patients that have previously undergone prostatic or urethral surgery. In addition, we consider that in similar cases of urethra–rectal perforation, endoscopic treatment is sufficient and laparotomy is not required.
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