SAS Journal of Surgery
Abbreviated Key Title: SAS J Surg
ISSN 2454-5104
Journal homepage: https://www.saspublishers.com

OPEN ACCESS

Urology B

Evolution of PCNL: Clinical Efficacy and Safety Profiles of Modern Miniaturized Access Techniques

Mohammed Amine Elafari[1]*, Ayoub Mamad[1], Mohammed Amine Bibat[1], Pr Amine Slaoui[1], Pr Tariq Karmouni[1], Pr Abdelatif Koutani[1], Pr Khalid Elkhader[1]

[1]Urology B Department, IBN SINA Hospital, University Hospital Center IBN SINA, University Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36347/sasjs.2026.v12i04.013 | **Received:** 21.02.2026 | **Accepted:** 15.04.2026 | **Published:** 21.04.2026

***Corresponding author:** Mohammed Amine Elafari
Urology B Department, IBN SINA Hospital, University Hospital Center IBN SINA, University Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco

Abstract **Review Article**

Percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL) has undergone significant evolution through miniaturization of instruments and access tracts. This mini review compares the clinical outcomes, safety profiles, and efficacy of mini-PCNL, ultra-mini PCNL, and micro-PCNL techniques. Standard PCNL utilizes 24-30 Fr access sheaths, while miniaturized variants employ progressively smaller tracts: mini-PCNL (14-24 Fr), ultra-mini PCNL (11-13 Fr), and micro-PCNL (4.85-8 Fr). Evidence demonstrates that miniaturized techniques achieve comparable stone-free rates to standard PCNL while offering advantages in reduced blood loss, shorter hospitalization, and lower complication rates. However, these benefits come at the cost of longer operative times. The choice among miniaturized techniques depends on stone characteristics, with mini-PCNL suitable for stones 15-40 mm, ultra-mini PCNL for 10-25 mm stones, and micro-PCNL for stones 15 mm. This review synthesizes current evidence to guide clinical decision-making in the era of minimally invasive stone management.

Keywords: Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy (PCNL), Mini-PCNL, Ultra-mini PCNL, Micro-PCNL, Nephrolithiasis, Stone-free rate (SFR), Minimally invasive surgery, Lithotripsy.

INTRODUCTION

Since its introduction by Fernström and Johansson in 1976, percutaneous nephrolithotomy has become the gold standard for managing large renal calculi (20 mm). While standard PCNL (sPCNL) achieves excellent stone-free rates, it carries notable morbidity including bleeding (8%), transfusion requirements (3-6%), and postoperative sepsis (2%) [1]. The drive toward less invasive approaches has led to progressive miniaturization of PCNL instruments and access tracts over the past two decades [2-3].

The miniaturization paradigm began with mini-PCNL in 1998, initially developed for pediatric patients but subsequently adopted for adult stone management [1]. Further innovations produced ultra-mini PCNL (2013) and micro-PCNL (2011), each utilizing progressively smaller access sheaths [1,3-4]. This evolution reflects the urological community's pursuit of maintaining efficacy while minimizing procedural morbidity.

This review systematically compares mini-PCNL, ultra-mini PCNL, and micro-PCNL across key clinical parameters to provide evidence-based guidance for technique selection.

Definitions and Technical Specifications

The miniaturized PCNL family encompasses three distinct categories based on access sheath diameter:[1-2,5]

Mini-PCNL utilizes 14-24 Fr (most commonly 18-22 Fr) access sheaths with semirigid ureteroscopes or small nephroscopes. Lithotripsy typically employs pneumatic, ultrasonic, or laser energy sources [6-8].

Ultra-mini PCNL employs 11-13 Fr (most commonly 12 Fr) access sheaths with flexible ureteroscopes or specialized small-caliber scopes. High-power holmium laser lithotripsy is the preferred energy modality [8-11].

Micro-PCNL represents the smallest variant at 4.85-8 Fr, utilizing specialized all-seeing needles or micro-nephroscopes with laser lithotripsy through extremely narrow working channels.[1,3-4].

Standard PCNL, by comparison, uses 24-30 Fr access sheaths with traditional nephroscopes and various lithotripsy modalities.[6,8,12].

Stone-Free Rates and Efficacy

Stone-free rates (SFR) represent the primary efficacy endpoint for PCNL procedures. A comprehensive meta-analysis of 20 trials involving 4,953 patients found no significant difference in SFR between mini-PCNL and standard PCNL (p=0.93) [6]. A large multicenter randomized controlled trial of 1,980 patients demonstrated that mini-PCNL achieved noninferior one-session SFR compared to standard PCNL for 20-40 mm renal stones (p0.001) [12].

For ultra-mini PCNL, a prospective study of 84 patients showed comparable SFR across standard, mini, and ultra-mini techniques, with no statistically significant differences [8]. A systematic review comparing ultra-mini PCNL to retrograde intrarenal surgery (RIRS) demonstrated superior SFR for ultra-mini PCNL (OR 2.01, 95% CI 1.12-3.61, p=0.02) [11].

Micro-PCNL demonstrates more variable efficacy depending on stone size. A review of micro-PCNL literature reported success rates of 82-100% for appropriately selected cases, primarily stones 15 mm [4]. However, a network meta-analysis found that micro-PCNL showed non-significant differences compared to RIRS for lower pole stones (OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.39-2.3) [13].

Stone size significantly influences outcomes across all miniaturized techniques. Mini-PCNL shows significantly lower SFR compared to standard PCNL for multiple stones or stone burden >2 cm, but comparable rates for single stones or burden ≤2 cm [7]. A systematic review confirmed that stone-free rates were comparable between miniaturized and standard PCNL, with the largest mean stone size treated using miniaturized instruments being 980 mm² [5].

Safety Profile and Complications

Hemorrhagic complications represent the most significant safety concern with PCNL. Meta-analysis demonstrates that mini-PCNL significantly reduces hemoglobin drop compared to standard PCNL (p0.00001), with correspondingly lower transfusion requirements (p0.00001) [6]. A multicenter RCT found hemoglobin drop of 5.2 g/L less in mini-PCNL versus standard PCNL (p0.001) [12].

Ultra-mini PCNL further reduces bleeding risk. A prospective comparison showed progressively decreasing hemoglobin drop from standard PCNL to mini-PCNL (p=0.008) to ultra-mini PCNL (p0.001), with ultra-mini PCNL demonstrating the least blood loss [8]. Mean hemoglobin loss with ultra-mini PCNL ranges from 0.33-0.81 g/dL in reported series [9,14].

Micro-PCNL demonstrates minimal bleeding, with reported hemoglobin drops of 0.1-1.4 g/dL and no transfusion requirements in published series [4].

Overall complication rates favor miniaturized techniques. Mini-PCNL demonstrates significantly fewer complications than standard PCNL, including reduced rates of bleeding (p=0.01), perforation (p=0.03), and urinary leakage (p=0.01) [6]. A recent multi-institutional RCT found similar Clavien-Dindo complication rates between mini-PCNL (15%) and standard PCNL (14%) when both were performed tubeless (p=0.593) [15].

Infectious complications, including fever and sepsis, show no significant differences across miniaturized and standard techniques [6,12]. A systematic review confirmed that complications other than bleeding were not notably different between miniaturized and standard PCNL [5].

Operative Parameters

Operative time represents a consistent trade-off with miniaturization. Meta-analysis shows mini-PCNL requires longer operative time than standard PCNL (p=0.0005) [6]. Ultra-mini PCNL demonstrates even longer operative times compared to both standard PCNL (p0.001) and mini-PCNL (p=0.011) [8]. Mean operative times for ultra-mini PCNL range from 45-78 minutes depending on stone complexity and positioning [9-10,14].

Hospital stay is significantly shorter with miniaturized techniques. Mini-PCNL reduces hospitalization by approximately 0.6-1.8 days compared to standard PCNL (p0.0001) [6,12,16]. Ultra-mini PCNL further decreases length of stay compared to both standard and mini-PCNL (p0.001) [8]. Mean hospital stay for ultra-mini PCNL ranges from 25-38 hours in contemporary series [9-10].

Postoperative pain scores favor miniaturized approaches. Standard PCNL demonstrates higher visual analog scale (VAS) scores compared to mini-PCNL (difference 0.8, p0.001) [12]. A recent RCT found low pain scores in both mini-PCNL (1.88) and standard PCNL (2.53) when performed tubeless, with no significant difference (p=0.440) [15].

Tubeless procedures are more frequently achievable with miniaturized techniques. Mini-PCNL demonstrates significantly higher rates of tubeless completion compared to standard PCNL (75.1% vs 4.6%, p0.001 in one series; OR favoring mini-PCNL p=0.0002 in meta-analysis) [6-7]. Ultra-mini PCNL and micro-PCNL are routinely performed totally tubeless without nephrostomy tubes or ureteral stents [9,14].

Clinical Indications and Stone Selection

Current evidence supports technique selection based on stone characteristics. Mini-PCNL is appropriate for stones 15-40 mm, particularly when high stone-free rates are prioritized [3,12,17]. A multicenter RCT specifically validated mini-PCNL for 20-40 mm stones [12]. For lower pole stones 10-20 mm, mini-PCNL provides superior SFR compared to RIRS (OR 2.65, p=0.003) [17].

Ultra-mini PCNL is best suited for moderate-sized stones 10-25 mm [3,9,11]. A consecutive cohort study of 94 patients demonstrated optimal outcomes for stones with mean size 15.9±4.5 mm [9]. Network meta-analysis confirmed that ultra-mini PCNL achieves higher SFR than RIRS for stones >2 cm [13].

Micro-PCNL is indicated for stones 15 mm, particularly in special situations such as calyceal diverticular stones or pediatric cases [3-4]. The technique competes with extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy and flexible ureteroscopy in this size range [3].

Patient factors also influence technique selection. Miniaturized approaches are particularly valuable in patients with coagulopathy, solitary kidney, or significant comorbidities where minimizing bleeding risk is paramount [18]. Renal insufficiency patients benefit from mini-PCNL's reduced transfusion rates (7.9% vs 16.7%, p=0.017) while maintaining comparable stone-free rates and renal function outcomes [16].

Regarding the ongoing debate between miniaturized PCNL and retrograde intrarenal surgery (RIRS), evidence suggests that while both are viable for medium-sized stones, mini-PCNL and ultra-mini PCNL offer superior stone-free rates for lower pole calculi. The decision-making process should weigh the higher efficacy of miniaturized percutaneous access against the lower morbidity of the ureteroscopic approach.

Comparative Analysis

When directly comparing miniaturized techniques, several patterns emerge. A prospective study comparing all three approaches found that ultra-mini PCNL demonstrated the least hemoglobin drop, followed by mini-PCNL, then standard PCNL. However, operative time increased progressively with smaller tract sizes [8].

Stone-free rates remain comparable across miniaturized variants when appropriately matched to stone size [5,8]. A survey of 420 procedures across multiple techniques found that mini-PCNL represented a favorable compromise, being the most effective and safe among PCNL variants. Micro-PCNL showed significantly lower SFR compared to standard PCNL overall, though this difference disappeared when analyzing only 1-2 cm stones [19].

Complication profiles favor progressive miniaturization. All miniaturized techniques demonstrated lower complication rates than standard PCNL, with mini-PCNL showing the most protective effect in comparative analysis [19]. The minimal bleeding associated with ultra-mini and micro-PCNL enables routine totally tubeless procedures [4,9,14].

The following table summarizes the technical specifications and clinical indications for the different percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL) modalities, highlighting the progressive shift in tract size and stone selection.

Table 1: Technical and Clinical Comparison of PCNL Techniques

Technique	Access Sheath Size (Fr)	Target Stone Size (mm)	Key Clinical Advantages
Standard PCNL	24–30 Fr	> 20 mm	Gold standard for large calculi; multiple lithotripsy options.
Mini-PCNL	14–24 Fr	15–40 mm	Reduced blood loss and stay vs standard; high stone-free rates.
Ultra-Mini PCNL	11–13 Fr	10–25 mm	Minimal hemoglobin drop; shorter hospital stay; enables tubeless procedures.
Micro-PCNL	4.85–8 Fr	< 15 mm	Least invasive; minimal bleeding; ideal for pediatric or calyceal diverticular stones.

Limitations and Future Directions

Current evidence has important limitations. Most comparative studies are retrospective or non-randomized, with only a few high-quality RCTs available. Heterogeneity in tract sizes, stone characteristics, and outcome definitions complicates direct comparisons [5]. Selection bias is inherent, as surgeons typically choose techniques based on stone and patient factors [19].

Furthermore, the learning curve associated with these techniques, particularly ultra-mini and micro-PCNL, remains a critical factor; the reduced visual field and altered irrigation dynamics in ultra-mini and micro-PCNL require specific surgical expertise [5,8]. Although these smaller tracts significantly reduce hospitalization time, the potential increase in costs due to specialized disposable equipment and extended operative times must be balanced against these clinical gains.

Future research should focus on well-designed RCTs with standardized outcome measures, long-term stone recurrence data, and quality-of-life assessments. Technological advances in imaging, lithotripsy, and instrumentation continue to evolve, potentially further improving outcomes across all miniaturized platforms.

Conclusion

Miniaturization of PCNL represents a significant advancement in minimally invasive stone management. Mini-PCNL, ultra-mini PCNL, and micro-PCNL each offer distinct advantages over standard PCNL, primarily through reduced bleeding, shorter hospitalization, and lower complication rates while maintaining comparable stone-free rates. The choice among techniques should be individualized based on stone size, location, complexity, and patient factors. Mini-PCNL serves as an excellent option for 15-40 mm stones, ultra-mini PCNL for 10-25 mm stones, and micro-PCNL for stones 15 mm. As technology and surgical expertise continue to advance, miniaturized PCNL techniques will likely play an increasingly prominent role in the urologist's armamentarium for renal stone management.

Declaration

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Sources of Funding: There are no funding sources to be declared.

Guarantor of Submission: The corresponding author is the guarantor of submission.

Acknowledgements: None.

Availability of Data and Materials: Supporting material is available if further analysis is needed.

Provenance and Peer Review: Not commissioned, externally peer-reviewed.

References

1. Soderberg L, Ergun O, Ding M, *et al.,* Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Versus Retrograde Intrarenal Surgery for Treatment of Renal Stones in Adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2023 ;11 :CD013445. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013445.pub2.
2. Desai J, Shah HN. Mini Percutaneous Kidney Stone Removal: Applicable Technologies. Urol Clin North Am. 2022 ;49(1):161-173. doi: 10.1016/j.ucl.2021.08.003.
3. Ganpule AP, Bhattu AS, Desai M. PCNL in the Twenty-First Century: Role of Microperc, Miniperc, and Ultraminiperc. World J Urol. 2015 ;33(2):235-40. doi :10.1007/s00345-014-1415-1.
4. Ganpule AP, Chabra J, Desai MR. "Microperc" Micropercutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Review of the Literature. Urolithiasis. 2018 ;46(1):107-114. doi :10.1007/s00240-017-1021-y.
5. Ruhayel Y, Tepeler A, Dabestani S, *et al.,* Tract Sizes in Miniaturized Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Systematic Review from the European Association of Urology Urolithiasis Guidelines Panel. Eur Urol. 2017 ;72(2):220-235. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2017.01.046.
6. Wan C, Wang D, Xiang J, *et al.,* Comparison of Postoperative Outcomes of Mini Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy and Standard Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Meta-Analysis. Urolithiasis. 2022 ;50(5):523-533. doi :10.1007/s00240-022-01349-8.
7. ElSheemy MS, Elmarakbi AA, Hytham M, *et al.,* Mini vs Standard Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy for Renal Stones : A Comparative Study. Urolithiasis. 2019 ;47(2):207-214. doi :10.1007/s00240-018-1055-9.
8. Adamou C, Goulimi E, Pagonis K, *et al.,* Comparison Between Standard, Mini and Ultra-Mini Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy for Single Renal Stones : A Prospective Study. World J Urol. 2022 ;40(10):2543-2548. doi :10.1007/s00345-022-04107-y.
9. Datta SN, Solanki R, Desai J. Prospective Outcomes of Ultra Mini Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Consecutive Cohort Study. J Urol. 2016 ;195(3):741-6. doi: 10.1016/j.juro.2015.07.123.
10. Seleem MM, Desoky E, Abdelwahab K, *et al.,* Flank-Free Modified Supine Prone Ultra-Mini-Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy in Treatment of Medium-Sized Renal Pelvic Stone: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Endourol. 2022 ;36(9):1149-1154. doi :10.1089/end.2022.0016.
11. Jung HD, Chung DY, Kim DK, *et al.,* Comparison of Ultra-Mini Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy and Retrograde Intrarenal Surgery for Renal Stones: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis from the KSER Update Series. J Clin Med. 2022 ;11(6):1529. doi :10.3390/jcm11061529.
12. Zeng G, Cai C, Duan X, *et al.,* Mini Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Is a Noninferior Modality to Standard Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy for the Management of 20-40mm Renal Calculi : A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial. Eur Urol. 2021 ;79(1):114-121. doi: 10.1016/j.eururo.2020.09.026.
13. Hinojosa-Gonzalez DE, Saffati G, Kronstedt S, *et al.,* Endourological Management of Renal Stones : A Systematic Review, Bayesian Network Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression. Urology. 2025 ;198 :193-206. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2024.12.030.
14. Yilmazel FK, Cinislioglu AE, Karabulut I, *et al.,* Ultra-Mini Flexible Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy in the Treatment of Moderate-Size Kidney Stones: A New Instrument, a Preliminary Prospective Study.

Urolithiasis. 2021 ;49(4):345-350. doi :10.1007/s00240-020-01225-3.

15. Sheetz T, Finegan JL, Sivalingam S, *et al.,* Clinical Outcomes Comparing Mini Versus Standard PCNL Without Postoperative Nephrostomy Tube: A Multi-Institutional Randomized Controlled Trial from the EDGE Consortium. Urology. 2026 ;209 :32-38. doi: 10.1016/j.urology.2025.11.229.
16. Wei W, Zhou C, Yang H, *et al.,* Comparison of Mini-Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy and Standard Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy in the Treatment of Renal Calculi with Renal Insufficiency. Sci Rep. 2025 ;15(1):14727. doi :10.1038/s41598-025-99087-5.
17. Gao XS, Liao BH, Chen YT, *et al.,* Different Tract Sizes of Miniaturized Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Versus Retrograde Intrarenal Surgery : A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Endourol. 2017 ;31(11):1101-1110. doi :10.1089/end.2017.0547.
18. Awedew AF, Seman YS, Yalew DZ, *et al.,* Efficacy and Safety of Surgical Treatment for 1-2 cm Sized Lower Pole of Renal Stone: Network Meta-Analysis of Randomized Control Trials. Urolithiasis. 2023 ;51(1):82. doi :10.1007/s00240-023-01454-2.
19. Zanetti SP, Talso M, Palmisano F, *et al.,* Comparison Among the Available Stone Treatment Techniques from the First European Association of Urology Section of Urolithiasis (EULIS) Survey: Do We Have a Queen? PloS One. 2018 ;13(11): e0205159. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0205159.