

Title	Assessment of robot-assisted partial and total nephrectomy
Agency	HAS, French National Authority for Health (Haute Autorité de santé) 5 avenue du Stade de France – F 93218 La Plaine Cedex, France Tel: +33 (0)1 55 93 70 00, contact.seap@has-santé.fr , www.has-sante.fr
Reference	Link to full report: https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/p_3103989/fr/evaluation-de-la-nephrectomie-totale-ou-partielle-assistee-par-robot-rapport-d-evaluation

Aim

The objective of this work is to assess the efficacy and safety of robot-assisted nephrectomy, compared to open surgery and conventional laparoscopic surgery, in view of determining the appropriateness of its inclusion, or non-inclusion, in the joint classification of medical procedures (CCAM) for reimbursement by the French National Health Insurance.

It is the second indication for robotic surgery to be assessed, the first being radical prostate surgery.

It covers three different clinical contexts which are partial nephrectomy for kidney cancer, total nephrectomy for kidney cancer and total nephrectomy for kidney transplant.

Conclusions and results

Regardless of the purpose of the robot-assisted nephrectomy studied, or the comparison made (vs. open surgery or conventional laparoscopic surgery), the analysis of the available literature has not identified comparative prospective studies reporting robust results with relevant outcome measures, collected within an appropriate follow-up period.

Questioning the stakeholders involved confirmed this analysis, which shows that the available data do not fulfil the conditions set out by the HAS for authorising an assessment of robot-assisted nephrectomy (see Methods).

As a result, the HAS cannot conclude on the expected clinical benefit (ECB) or on the improvement in expected clinical benefit (IECB) for robot-assisted nephrectomy compared to open surgery or conventional laparoscopic surgery.

Methods

In accordance with the conclusions of the first assessment of robotic surgery (in radical prostate surgery), this new assessment was governed by the availability of comparative clinical studies with good quality methodology. The work therefore consisted of determining the quantity and quality of the available data, taken from a systematic literature review. The stakeholders working in the technique were also consulted in addition to the analysis of the literature.

Written by

Irena Guzina, HAS (French National Authority for Health - Haute Autorité de santé), France.