

Linda M. Huynh\*, Douglas Skarecky, Orange, CA, Timothy Wilson, Santa Monica, CA, Clayton Lau, West Covina, CA, Christian Wagner, Gronau, Germany, James Porter, Seattle, WA, Jorn H. Witt, Gronau, Germany, Thomas Ahlering, Orange, CA

#### **1. Introduction**

Erectile dysfunction (ED) post-radical prostatectomy of significant impact to patient quality of life. In 2018 introduced the percent erection fullness score as a qualitative adjunct to the IIEF-5. While patients repo 25-100% percent erection fullness at 90-days reliably recovered potency by 2 years, patients reporting 0-2 fullness were approximately 6 times more likely to s from long-term impotence.

The present study seeks to internally and externally validate the 90-day percent erection fullness scale in prospective, multi-center patient populations.

### 2. Materials and Methods

- Previous % fullness model [Huynh, BJUI 2018] wa re-developed with a 1-year potency endpoint.
- Potency was defined as affirmative answers to er sufficient for intercourse (ESI).
- The model was then applied to a multi-center col 91 patients across 5 surgeons for external validat
- Only % fullness tertile was significantly associated potency recovery (AUC=0.875) in internal validati



## Internal and External Validation of a 90-Day Percentage Erection Fullness Model Predicting Potency **Recovery following Robot-assisted Radical Prostatectomy**

	Table 1: Baseline Characteristics of Validation Cohort							
y (RP) is .8, we orting ly 24% suffer	<b>Table 1</b> : Baseline characteristics of training and validation set							
		Training Set (N=203)		Internal Validation (N = 96)		External Validation (N = 91)		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
	Age (years)	58.34	7.11	59.38	6.35	60.58	9.53	
	PSA (ng/mL)	24.55 5.52	0.88 3.53	6.73	5.74	24.15 9.29	7.61	
	BMI (kg/m²)	26.7	3.21	27.05	3.00	27.01	4.75	
n a		Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	
	Clinical Stage							
	T1	149	74.5%	64	68.8%	38	42.7%	
	T2	50	25.0%	28	30.1%	51	57.3%	
	Т3	1	0.5%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	
as	pGS							
	≤3+3	118	58.1%	29	30.2%	31	34.1%	
rections ohort of	3+4	44	21.7%	46	47.9%	28	30.8%	
	4+3	18	8.9%	16	16.7%	21	23.1%	
	≤4+4	23	11.3%	5	5.2%	11	12.1%	
tion.	Nerve-sparing							
d with tion.	None	1	0.5%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	
	Unilateral	27	11.8%	12	12.5%	17	18.7%	
	Bilateral	178	87.7%	83	86.5%	74	81.3%	
	LN Dissection	75	37.0%	30	31.3%	25	27.5%	

#### Figure 1: ROC Curve Analysis of 90-Day Percent Fullness

Figure 1a: (24 month potency) a 25% fullness threshold has sensitivity and specificity of 97.3% and 87.3, AUC=0.870.



Figure 1b: (12 month potency) a 25% fullness threshold has sensitivity and specificity 97.3% and 88.1%, AUC=0.801.



### Table 2: Logistic Regression of Factors Predicting Long-Term Potency

#### Age (cont.)

Nerve-sparing [uni-vs. bi-% fullness [<25% vs. 25-10 Preoperative IIEF-5 (cont.) Preoperative PSA (cont.) C-stage [cT1 vs. cT2/3] Constant

**Table 2b**: Multivariate analysis of factors contributing to potency at <u>12 months</u>, after controlling for covariates (AUC=0.895)

# Age (cont.)

Nerve-sparing [uni-vs. bi-% fullness [<25% vs. 25-10 Preoperative IIEF-5 (cont.) Preoperative PSA (cont.) C-stage [cT1 vs. cT2/3] Constant

The mean ± SD predicted probability of 1-year potency recovery was 39.7% ± 3.2%, compared to an actual 36.26% patients recovering potency at 1 year. Since the actual proportion fell within one standard deviation of the models' predicted proportion the model shows good predictability.

# post-RP EF recovery.

Overall, percentage erection fullness at 3 months post-RP discriminates well between patients with a low or a high probability of recovery of EF, which can facilitate identification of need for early EF rehabilitation.





## **Table 2a**: Multivariate analysis of factors contributing to potency at 24 months, after controlling for covariates (AUC=0.887)

	В	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	OR	95% C.I.	
						Low	High
	-0.035	0.038	0.852	0.356	0.965	0.895	1.041
-]	0.370	0.734	0.255	0.614	1.448	0.344	6.105
0%]	1.767	0.583	9.175	0.002	5.854	1.866	18.36
	-0.047	0.285	0.027	0.869	0.954	0.546	1.667
	-0.029	0.049	0.349	0.554	0.971	0.882	1.070
	-0.647	0.553	1.372	0.241	0.523	0.177	1.546
	1.371	7.804	0.031	0.861	3.940		

	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	OR	95% C.I.	
						Low	High
	-0.044	0.036	1.460	0.227	0.957	0.892	1.028
-]	0.494	0.702	0.494	0.482	1.639	0.414	6.491
0%]	1.800	0.556	10.50	0.001	6.049	2.036	17.97
	0.007	0.288	0.001	0.981	1.007	0.573	1.769
	-0.021	0.042	0.256	0.613	0.979	0.902	1.063
	-0.403	0.516	0.609	0.435	0.668	0.243	1.838
	0.981	7.713	0.016	0.899	2.666		

#### 4. Conclusions

We present internal and external validation of a 90-day percentage erection fullness score, confirming that the metric is a robust predictor of



UC Irvine Health Department of Urology