Data Extraction Form

Clinical effectiveness of robotic prostatectomy versus laparoscopic prostatectomy in the treatment of localised prostate cancer

Reviewer ID: D	Data extraction date:			
Study ID (Author, year): Lang	uage if non-English:			
Publication status: full-text papers / conference abstract / personal commu	nication / other unpublished reports (specify)			
Study IDs of any linked reports:				
Study design				
Aim of the study:				
Study design:				
RCT Non-randomised comparative study	Registry report			
Case Series Prospective Retrospective Unclear For comparative studies, comparison: Robotic prostatectomy versus laparoscopic prostatectomy Robotic prostatectomy versus open prostatectomy Laparoscopic prostatectomy versus open prostatectomy Other comparison, specify: Number of study centres: Single centre / multicentre (specify number of centre / setting: hospital / other (specify) Study start – end dates: Duration of study	Country:			
For non-RCTs and case series, was patient recruitment consecutive: Yes /No / not reported				
Length of follow-up:				
Source of funding:				
Additional information on study design:				
Prospective/retrospective/not reported				
For comparative studies, patients in the groups were recruited during the s	ame period/different period/not reported			

Patients

Inclusion criteria:

Exclusion criteria:

Baseline Patient Characteristics				
	Intervention 1: Robotic	Intervention 2: Laparoscopic	Intervention 3: Open	Total
Number of patients enrolled				
Randomised (RCTs only)				
Withdrew/lost to follow-up, with reasons				
Number analysed				
Age (Mean/median, SD/range)				
BMI (Mean/median, SD/range)				
Co-morbidities, including previous abdominal or pelvic surgery, previous pelvic radiotherapy, n/N (%), specify				
Disease severity				
PSA level, ng/ml, n, mean(SD) / median (range) /categorical				
Clinical stage, T1/T2/T3, specify staging method, e.g. digital rectal examination, MRI				
Biopsy Gleason Score ≤ 6, n 7, n 8-10, n				
Prostate size, ml, mean (SD) / median (range)				
Erectile dysfunction, n/N (%), specify measure and validated or not:				

Intervention			
Intervention 1: Robotic prostatectomy			
Trade name and manufacturer	of robot:		
da Vinci system by In	ntuitive Surgical Inc., Sunnyv	ale, California, USA	
Other, specify:		Not rep	orted
Model number(s):			
Surgical approaches:			
Intra-peritoneal	Extra-peritoneal	Not reported	
Location of the operator conso	le:		
In the same room	An adjacent room	Off-site, specify	Not reported
Nerve sparing for erectile funct	tion:		
Unilateral, n/N	Bilateral, n/N:	Non- nerve sparing	Not reported
Lymph node dissection:			
No No	Yes, details:		Not reported
Additional information:			
Intervention 2: Laparoscopic	prostatectomy		
Trade name, manufacturer, an	d model number of laparosc	opic equipment:	
Surgical approaches:			
Intra-peritoneal	Extra-peritoneal	Not reported	
Nerve sparing for erectile function	tion:		
Unilateral, n/N	Bilateral, n/N:	Non- nerve sparing	Not reported
Lymph node dissection:			
□ No	Yes, details:		Not reported
Additional information:			
Intervention 3: Open prostate	ctomy		
Nerve sparing for erectile function	tion:		
Unilateral, n/N	Bilateral, n/N:	Non- nerve sparing	Not reported
Lymph node dissection:			
No No	Yes, details:		Not reported
Additional information:			

Safety outcomes				
Peri-operative	Timing, e.g. 6wks, 1mo, 3mo, 1 year after surgery	Intervention 1: robotic	Intervention 2: laparoscopic	Intervention 3: open
Equipment failure, n/N (%)				
Converted to other intervention, e.g. open operation, n/N (%), specify the route				
Blood transfusion requirement, n/N (%)				
Operating time, minutes, n, mean (SD) / median (range) Hospital stay (recovery time), days, n,				
mean (SD) /median (range) Re-admission, days, n, mean (SD)				
/median (range) Need critical care, number of patients (n/N),also number of days, mean (SD) /median (range) Bladder neck stenosis / anastomotic stricture, n/N (%)				
Duration of catheterisation, days, n, mean (SD) /median (range)				
Anastomotic leak, n/N (%)				
Hernia into port sites or incision sites, n/N (%) Infection, n/N (%), specify site				
Organ injury, e.g. bowel, blood vessels, n/N (%), specify Ileus, n/N (%)				
Deep vein thrombosis, n/N (%)				
Pulmonary embolism, n/N (%)				
Other peri-operative outcomes, n/N (%), specify:				
Dysfunction				
Any dysfunction including urinary, faecal, or erectile, n/N (%)				
Urinary incontinence > 1 thin pad per day, n/N (%)				
Other measures, e.g. subjective measure, specify				
Erectile dysfunction, International Index of Erectile Dysfunction Other measures, specify, and validated or not				
Faecal incontinence, n/N (%), specify measure and validated or not:				

Efficacy outcomes				
	Timing, e.g. 6wks, 1mo, 3mo, 1 year after surgery	Intervention 1: robotic	Intervention 2: laparoscopic	Intervention 3: open
Positive margin in resected specimen, n/N (%), specify definition:				
Pathology stage, pT1/pT2/pT3, specify staging method, e.g. digital rectal examination, MRI				
Pathological Gleason Score ≤ 6, n 7, n 8-10, n				
PSA recurrence, n/N (%), specify definition, e.g. two successive PSA levels ≥ 0.4 ng/ml):				
Local recurrence, n/N (%)				
Port site recurrence, n/N (%)				
Metastatic disease, n/N (%)				
Required further treatment & death				
Further cancer treatment, n/N (%) in total				
Curative treatment, n/N (%)				
Resolved or died, n/N (%)				
Palliative treatment, n/N (%)				
Resolved or died, n/N (%)				
Curative and palliative treatment, n/N (%)				
Resolved or died, n/N (%)				
Treatment of urinary incontinence, n/N (%)	**			
Resolved or persistent, n/N (%)				
Treatment of faecal incontinence, n/N (%)				
Resolved or persistent, n/N (%)				
Treatment of erectile dysfunction, n/N (%)				
Resolved or persistent, n/N (%)				
Death in total, n/N (%), specify causes				
Quality of life outcomes				
Time to return to full activity, n, mean (SD) / median (range)				
Quality of life (QoL): Generic QoL, specify measure (validated) used: Disease-specific QoL, specify measure (validated) used: Other validated measures specify:				

Procedural outcomes						
	Intervention 1: robotic	Intervention 2: laparoscopic	Intervention 3: open			
Procedures done in the centre each year, mean (SD) / median (range)						
Surgeon competence (learning curve), by surgeon and by centre						
Number of surgeons						
Number of procedures conducted before this study						
Number of procedures conducted during this study						
Time taken to perform the procedure at the end this study, minutes, mean (SD) / median (range)						
Additional information, e.g. description about the experience of the surgeons	ne study					
Conclusion as reported by the authors of the	ne study					
Additional information and comments						