Blind-Ended Bifid Ureter: Case Report

Kör Sonlanan Bifid Üreter

ABSTRACT Blind-ended bifid ureter is a rare congenital ureteral anomaly that is mostly asymptomatic. Premature branching of ureteral bud cause incomplete interaction between newly formed ureteral bud and metanephric mesenchyme causing a blind-ending ureter without a functional renal unit. There are nearly 200 cases reported in literature and most of the patients were diagnosed with invasive radiological techniques. This anomaly is more frequently diagnosed at third and fourth decade with female predominance. Although, most of the patients are asymptomatic, recurrent urinary tract infections, poorly defined abdominal or flank pain, incontinence, hematuria and renal colicky pain can be seen at symptomatic patients. In this case, we reported an asymptomatic blind-ended bifid ureter in which a non-invasive, radiation free radiological technique had been used for diagnosis of this rare anomaly.
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CASE REPORT

A 45 years old female patient was consulted to our clinic by internal medicine, because of microscopic hematuria detected in routine evaluation of di-
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abetes. There was no clinical abnormality in the history of the patient and her physical examination was totally normal. She was using oral antidiabetic and antihyperlipidemic medication for her primary diseases. There was only microscopic hematuria on urinalysis and her urine culture was sterile. Biochemical evaluations including blood urea nitrogen and blood creatinine levels were normal. We performed a direct urinary system graphy for the evaluation of hematuria, which demonstrated a 0.9 cm. opacity located in the right lower portion of the pelvic grim (Figure 1a). As there was no abnormality in urinary system ultrasonography, we performed an intravenous pyelography for the differential diagnosis of ureter stone. As the opacity observed out of urinary system, we surprisingly detected a blind-ending bifid ureter located in the middle portion of right ureter with its blind end extending cranially (Figure 1b). After the detection of blind-ending bifid ureter we re-questioned the patient about the possible symptoms that can be related with this embryological anomaly and found that patient was totally asymptomatic. To determine the anatomic properties of blind-ending bifid ureter, we performed magnetic resonance urography (MRU) (Figure 1 c,d). In this radiological evaluation we were able to distinguish the blind-ending bifid ureter extending from middle ureter to the level of upper ureter. It was easily seen that both ureter share the same ureteral sheet. As the patient was asymptomatic, we performed semirigid ureteroscopy and pneumatic lithotripsy for lower ureteric stone and followed the patient conservatively. Patient was asymptomatic at the third and sixth month of follow-up, without microscopic hematuria.

DISCUSSION

Blind-ended bifid ureter is an ureteral pathology related with an embryological development anomaly. Ureteric bud appears as an epithelial protrusion of the Wolffian duct in 28th day of embryological life. As it moves cranially, it reaches metanephric mesenchyme forming ureter, renal pelvis, calices and collecting tubules. At this period, glomeruli, proximal tubules, Henle loop and distal tubules develop from metanephric mesenchymal part of this interaction. If premature branching of ureteral bud occurs, this may cause incomplete interaction between newly formed ureteral bud and metanephric mesenchyme causing a blind-ending ureter without a functional renal unit. From histomorphological aspect, Culp defined the blind-ended bifid ureter as; it has the same histological properties of normal ureter, its length is greater than twice of its diameter and it joins to the native ureter with a sharp angle. Congenital diverticulum was thought to be different entity from blind-ended bifid ureter, but Rank et al. showed that they may arise from the same embryological anomaly in their histological study.

Although, nearly 200 cases had been reported, blind-ending ureter is thought to be more frequent. From the data reported in the literature, these congenital anomalies were diagnosed three times more frequently in women. Anatomically they were seen twice as common on the right side, mostly originating from middle and distal ureter.
Even it was mostly diagnosed in 3. and 4. decades of life, there were also some reported cases detected in childhood. According to age of diagnosis and anatomic properties of the blind-ended bifid ureter, our patient was consistent with the literature.

Most of the patients with blind-ending bifid ureter are asymptomatic. However recurrent urinary tract infections, poorly defined abdominal or flank pain, incontinence, hematuria and renal colicky pain can be seen at symptomatic patients. Abdominal and flank pain can be related with the reflux to blind-ended ureter from native ureter because of asynchronous peristalsis. Stone formation in a blind ending ureter, even the presence of transitional cell carcinoma had been reported in the literature. In our patient there was no symptom except microscopic hematuria detected incidentally. As microscopic hematuria disappeared during follow-up, our patient became totally asymptomatic.

Our patient was incidentally documented to have blind-ended bifid ureter during the evaluation of microscopic hematuria. A lower ureteric stone was diagnosed at the ipsilateral of blind-ended bifid ureter. An ureteroscopy and pneumatic lithotripsy was performed without any complication. Ureter stone with bifid ureter is not a rare combination. Even the presence of ureteric stone can be a cornerstone for incidental diagnosis of this congenital anomaly. It may cause colicky pain and recurrent urinary tract infection. Reflux from the main ureter to the blind ended section was proposed to lead a urinary retention and may cause loin pain, urinary tract infection and stone formation. Asynchronous peristalsism in the two ureteric limbs may be another explanation for urinary retention and stone formation. Microscopic hematuria due to ureteric stone was the reason of incidental diagnosis of blind-ended bifid ureter and the stone was successfully treated without any problem.

In some cases, intravenous pyelography may not be enough for diagnosis and further evaluation may be warrant. Retrograde pyelography, which is an invasive technique, is preferred for further radiological evaluation of these patients. However, Chang et al. reported that CT urography can be used for the diagnosis of bifid ureter as a non-invasive technique. We performed MRU to our patient. By this non-invasive and radiation-free method, we were able to evaluate the anatomical properties of blind-ended bifid ureter in our patient. Magnetic resonance urography has the potential to revolutionize imaging of the urinary tract because of its ability to provide anatomic information and quantitative functional evaluation of each kidney. It enables the assessment of obstructive uropathy. It has the potential to noninvasively obtain multiplanar detailed images and provides a comprehensive overview of the urinary system. Additionally, it is a beneficial imaging technique in the patients with a history of adverse reaction to iodinated contrast material and it does not use ionizing radiation. The limitation of the system is the lower spatial resolution compared with CT and radiography. In the current case, MRU was performed as an incremental modality to differentiate a bifid ureter and duplex ureter as well as to locate the bifurcation point accurately. We suggest that MRU may be sufficient in diagnosis of such cases and it may decrease the need for an invasive procedure.

Surgical excision is required in symptomatic patients. Although open surgical technique had been used for the excision of blind-ended double ureter, Adam et al. reported that laparoscopy can safely be used for this surgery. It should be noted that, both blind-ended and native ureter proceed in the same Waldeyer’s sheath and supplied by the same arterial source. So excision should be performed without disturbing the blood supply to the native ureter. For this purpose, it is recommended to start dissection from cranial region of bifid ureter. As our patient was asymptomatic, surgical excision was not performed.
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