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18-year prostate cancer-specific mortality after prostatectomy, brachytherapy, external beam radiation therapy, hormonal therapy, or monitoring for localized prostate cancer
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Long-term mortality in patients with positive lymph nodes at radical prostatectomy
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Oncologic outcomes after radical prostatectomy for high risk prostate cancer: Impact of various definitions on cancer-specific and overall mortality
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Which patients with clinically node positive prostate cancer should be considered as candidates for radical prostatectomy as part of a multimodal treatment? The impact of nodal burden
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Impact of bilateral neurovascular bundle preservation on oncological outcomes in non-organ confined prostate cancer patients


1University Hospital Frankfurt, Dept. of Urology, Frankfurt, Germany, 2Ospedale San Raffaele, Dept. of Urology, Milan, Italy, 3University of Montreal, Dept. of Urology, Montreal, Canada, 4University Hospital Hamburg-Eppendorf, Dept. of Urology, Hamburg, Germany, 5University Hospital Hamburg-Eppendorf, Martini-Klinik, Hamburg, Germany

Oncologic outcomes of patients with incidental prostate cancer who underwent robot-assisted radical cystectomy: A comparison between nerve sparing and non-nerve sparing approach
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Dehydrated human amnion/chorion membrane accelerates the return to continence and potency recovery after a nerve-sparing robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy

By: Govorov A., Kolontarev K., Dyakov V., Rasner P., Pushkar D.
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The impact of surgical experience on the risk of surgical margins and biochemical recurrence after robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: A learning-curve study
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Gleason pattern 4 or 5 at a positive surgical margin predicts early biochemical recurrence (<12 months) after robotic radical prostatectomy

By: Planas Morin J., Celma A., Regis L., Cuadras M., Placer J., Salvador C., Lorente D., Trilla E., Morote J.

Hospital Vall d'Hebrón, Dept. of Urology, Barcelona, Spain
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