

Congenital Unilateral Absence of the Vas Deferens as an Incidental Finding During Radical Prostatectomy – Case Report Literature Review and Recommendations for Clinical Management

Johannes Linxweiler*, Martin Janssen, Sven Rügge, Kai A Probst, Carsten H Ohlmann, Stefan Siemer, Michael Stöckle and Matthias Saar

Department of Urology, Saarland University Medical Center, Homburg/Saar, Germany

*Corresponding author: Johannes Linxweiler, Department of Urology, Saarland University Medical Center, Homburg/Saar, Germany, Tel: +4968411624700; Fax: +4968411624795; E-mail: johannes.linxweiler@uks.eu

Received date: January 06, 2017; Accepted date: January 23, 2017; Published date: January 27, 2017

Copyright: © 2016 Linxweiler J, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Congenital unilateral absence of the vas deferens (CUAVD) is a disorder affecting up to 1% of males. As these patients are often asymptomatic the diagnosis is usually made incidentally in the context of imaging studies performed for other indications or during urologic surgical procedures like vasectomy or radical prostatectomy. Besides a potential clinical manifestation in terms of infertility due to obstructive azoospermia, CUAVD gains clinical importance because of its association with renal anomalies as well as mutations of the *CFTR* gene. Here we describe the case of a patient who was diagnosed with CUAVD during radical prostatectomy, review the currently available literature and give recommendations on the clinical management of patients with CUAVD.

Keywords: CUAVD; Prostatectomy; Vasectomy; *CFTR*-mutation; Infertility; Renal agenesis

Case Report

A 74 year-old man diagnosed with organ-confined prostate cancer presented to our department for laparoscopic, robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. The patient's medical history included hypertension, cholelithiasis as well as a congenital solitary kidney on the right side. Due to a relatively low PSA level (4.5 ng/ml) and a Gleason-Score of 3+4=7a in only two biopsy cores, no preoperative staging was performed. During the surgery neither a ductus deferens nor a seminal vesicle could be identified on the left side despite thorough preparation. Histopathological examination of the resected specimen showed a complete lack of the semen-transporting anatomical structures (ductus deferens, seminal vesicle, ejaculatory ducts) on the left side leading to the diagnose of CUAVD associated with a solitary kidney on the ipsilateral side. The patient reported no complaints regarding erectile or ejaculatory functions. CUAVD is a disorder affecting up to 1 in 100 males [1]. It was first described by John Hunter in 1737 [2] while Reverdin was the first one to observe an association between absence of the vas deferens and ipsilateral renal agenesis in 1870 [3]. Since then several case series have been published analyzing the clinical and genetic characteristics of this disease [4-9]. As CUAVD is a well-known abnormality often associated with hetero- or homozygous mutations of the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator gene (*CFTR*), it was plausible to also look for the *CFTR*-status in CUAVD patients. In one of the largest studies comprising 21 CUAVD patients, Mickle et al. [5] observed heterozygous *CFTR* mutations in 8 cases (38%). Notably, all of these 8 patients had non-iatrogenic occlusion of the contralateral vas deferens at either the inguinal or pelvic level. Renal anomalies were present in 5 patients (24%; 4 ipsilateral renal agenesis, 1 ipsilateral pelvic renal ectopy) – all of them showing *CFTR* wild-type in genetic testing. Similarly, Schlegel et al. [6] described ipsilateral renal agenesis in 26% and heterozygous *CFTR* mutations in 25% of CUAVD patients. Again,

all patients that had accompanying renal agenesis were negative for *CFTR* mutations while all those with *CFTR* mutations had normal renal anatomy. The results of these reports were confirmed by Kolettis and Sandlow [7] as well as Schwarzer and Lane [8-10] in recent studies. Based on these findings one can assume that there are two distinct subpopulations of CUAVD patients with different genetic and etiological backgrounds [5,7]: The first subgroup comprises patients with heterozygous mutations in the *CFTR* gene as the underlying pathophysiologic mechanism, which do not show accompanying renal anomalies. However, these patients may become clinically symptomatic due to obstructive azoospermia causing infertility. In the second subgroup of patients a hitherto unknown genetic event (not involving the *CFTR* gene) leads to an abnormal development of the entire mesonephric duct at a very early stage in embryonic development. Consequently these patients often show ipsi- or (in rare cases) contralateral renal agenesis in addition to CUAVD while being mostly asymptomatic. Other congenital anomalies like renal ectopy have also been described [5]. Taking the above mentioned pathophysiologic mechanisms and clinical features of the disease into consideration, all patients with a newly diagnosed CUAVD should undergo imaging of the upper urinary tract-primarily by sonography. If there is no evidence for variations of renal anatomy, genetic testing for *CFTR*-mutations might be reasonable especially for patients of reproductive age due to the potential risk of transmission of renal anomalies and *CFTR* mutations [7].

Acknowledgments

The authors have no financial grants, other fundings, industrial links or affiliations to acknowledge.

References

1. Klapproth HJ, Young IS (1973) Vasectomy, vas ligation and vas occlusion. *Urology* 1: 292-300.

2. Hunter J (1737) on the glands called vesiculae seminales, in Palmer JF (ed): Complete Works. Longman, Reese, Orm, Brown, Green and Longman, London 4: 1-23.
3. (1870) Reverdin Absence of kidney, laurater, canal deferent, and seminal vesicle on the left side: Existence of the two testicles in the bursa. *Bull Soc Anat Paris* 65: 325.
4. Donohue RE, Fauver HE (1969) Unilateral absence of the vas deferens – a useful clinical sign. *JAMA* 261: 1180-1182.
5. Mickle J, Milunsky A, Amos JA, Oates RD (1995) Congenital unilateral absence of the vas deferens: a heterogenous disorder with two distinct subpopulations based upon aetiology and mutational status of the cystic fibrosis gene. *Hum Reprod* 10: 1728-1735.
6. Schlegel PN, Shin D, Goldstein M (1996) Urogenital anomalies in men with congenital absence of the vas deferens. *J Urol* 155: 1644-1648.
7. Kolettis PN, Sandlow JI (2002) Clinical and genetic features of patients with congenital unilateral absence of the vas deferens. *Urology* 60: 1073-1076.
8. Schwarzer JU, Schwarz M (2012) Significance of CFTR gene mutations in patients with congenital aplasia of vas deferens with special regard to renal aplasia. *Andrologia* 44: 305-307.
9. Lane VA, Scammell S, West N, Murthi GV (2014) Congenital absence of the vas deferens and unilateral renal agenesis: implications for patients and family. *Pediatr Surg Int* 30: 733-736.
10. McCallum T, Milunsky J, Munarriz R, Carson R, Sadeghi-Nejad H, et al. (2001) Unilateral renal agenesis associated with congenital bilateral absence of the vas deferens: phenotypic findings and genetic considerations. *Hum Reprod* 16: 282-288.