

Robotic assisted lobectomy favors early lung recovery vs. limited thoracotomy: results of a prospective study.

V. Lacroix (1), D. Kahn (2), P. Matte (1), A. Goussens (1), T. Pieters (3), P. Noirhomme (1), A. Poncelet (1), A. Steyaert (2)(4)

(1) Cardio-vascular and thoracic surgery, Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Woluwe-Saint-Lambert, Belgium; (2) Anesthesiology. Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Woluwe-Saint-Lambert, Belgium; (3) Pulmonary medicine, Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc, Woluwe-Saint-Lambert, Belgium; (4) Institute of Neuroscience, Université Catholique de Louvain

Corresponding author

Valérie Lacroix

Department of Cardiovascular and thoracic surgery

Cliniques Universitaires Saint-Luc

Avenue Hippocrate 10

1200 Woluwé-St-Lambert, Belgium

valerie.lacroix@uclouvain.be

Abstract

Background: Postoperative pulmonary recovery after lobectomy has well been studied and showed early benefits for the VATS and sparing open techniques over non-sparing open techniques. Robotic assisted procedures offer benefits in term of clinical outcomes, but their advantages in term of pulmonary recovery and quality of life have not yet been distinctly prospectively studied.

Methods: 86 patients undergoing lobectomy alone over a period of 29 months for oncological reasons were prospectively studied for their pulmonary function recovery (Forced Expiratory Volume in 1 sec-FEV1, Vital Capacity-VC, Forced Vital Capacity-FVC, Maximal Inspiratory and Expiratory Pressure-MIP, MEP) and pain score level during the in-hospital stay and at 1, 2 and 6 months postoperatively. Quality of life was also evaluated at 2 and 6 months. 45 patients were operated by postero-lateral limited thoracotomy and 41 patients by robotic approach. The postoperative analgesia protocol differed for the two groups: an epidural pump was used for all thoracotomy patients, and an intravenous patient-controlled analgesia device combined with a muscular block or a wound infiltration for the robotic patients.

Results: The pulmonary tests were not significantly different during the in-hospital stay. At 1 month, the FEV1, FVC, VC and MEP were significantly better for the robotic group (respectively $p=0.05$; 0.02 ; 0.05 and 0.02). At 2 and 6-month follow-up, there was no significant difference left. Pain intensity was equivalent during the in-hospital stay, but was significantly lower for the robotic group at 1 month ($p=0.02$). At two and six months, pain and quality of life was comparable in the two groups.

Conclusions: Robotic technique can offer similar pulmonary and pain recovery during the in-hospital stay with a lighter postoperative analgesia protocol. It clearly favors the early term recovery compared to the open limited technique. The objective and subjective functional recovery becomes equivalent at 2 and 6 months for both techniques.

1 Introduction

Postoperative pulmonary recovery after lobectomy for NSCLC has well been described, depending on the surgical approach, being VATS or thoracotomy. VATS techniques implying limited muscular division, or limited thoracotomies that consider muscle sparing, are both considered rather equivalent, but superior to open non-sparing thoracotomy [1-8].

Robotic lobectomy shows favorable results over postoperative pulmonary complications [9-10] and over postoperative pain compared to a muscle-sparing thoracotomy approach and VATS [11-12], that could suggest a better early pulmonary recovery, but this has not yet been proven in the literature.

The goal of this study is to compare the early and mid-term postoperative pulmonary testing and quality of life after lobectomy for lung cancer, performed by robotic and limited thoracotomy.

2 Patients and methods

2.1 Study cohort

After ethical committee approval (Ethics Committee University Hospital record B403201525121), we collected data from 86 consecutive patients who underwent single lobectomy in our institution over a period of 29 months (October 2015–March 2018). Patients were operated by postero-lateral limited thoracotomy (45 patients, group T) or robotic approach (41 patients, group R). Selection of the technique was based on the location, size of the tumor and risk factors of the patient. Central or large (more than 4 cm) lesions were considered for open procedure. Patients presenting risk factors for bronchopleural fistula [13,14] were also directed to open procedure with use of an intercostal flap (8 patients in T group).

2.2 Surgical and anesthetic technique

All patients underwent single lobectomy, associated with a mediastinal lymph node dissection. The thoracotomy technique implied a limited postero-lateral incision with serratus anterior muscle sparing. Analgesia was provided in all patient of the T group by means of a patient-controlled pump, connected to an epidural catheter inserted before induction of general anesthesia.

The robotic technique, which has been described in an earlier paper [15], was complete four arms, with a single intercostal space port access and a 0-degree camera. All patients in the R

group received an intravenous patient-controlled analgesia device, combined with either a serratus plane block before surgery (21 patients), an endoscopic intercostal nerve block by the surgeon at the start of the procedure (3 patients), or a wound infiltration at the end of the surgery (17 patients).

2.3 Postoperative management

Postoperative management was in the intensive care unit for the first 24 hours and then in the thoracic surgery unit. Drainage tubes were removed when there was no air leak for 24h and when output fell below 250 ml.

2.4 Pulmonary function tests

The pulmonary function testing determined the forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1), vital capacity (VC), forced vital capacity (FVC), maximum inspiratory pressure (MIP) and maximum expiratory pressure (MEP). These tests were performed preoperatively and repeated at 2 and 6 months, using a Morgan TLC spirometer (Morgan Medical, Rainham, UK; MDas v.4.01 software).

Same acquisition protocol was performed preoperatively, every day of the postoperative in-hospital stay and at 1 month, using a Micromedical microloop spirometer Mk8 with spirometry software (MicroMedical Limited, Rochester, UK) for the volumes testing and a MEC Pocket-Spiro® MPM100 (MEC Medical Electronic Construction, Brussels, Belgium) for the pressure testing. All measurements are expressed in percentages with respect to a reference value. As both protocols were used preoperatively, we can assume a strong correlation between them.

2.5 Evaluation of postoperative pain and quality of life

Postoperative pain intensity was assessed daily during the in-hospital stay as well as one month after surgery, using a 0 to 10 numerical rating scale. Pain scores were recorded by an independent person, before the measurement of pulmonary function.

Two and six months after surgery, patients were contacted by mail. Persistent pain was assessed with the French version of the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) questionnaire. This validated instrument has been used before in studies evaluating pain after thoracic surgery [15,16]. Besides pain intensity and location, it also collects information on pain medication and the de-

gree to which pain interferes with different daily activities. The probability for neuropathic pain was assessed with the first seven items of the DN4 questionnaire [17].

Two and six months after surgery, we also evaluated health-related quality of life with the Medical Outcomes Study 36-item Short Form (SF-36). This instrument has been recommended for evaluation of HRQOL after thoracic surgery [18] and we already used it in previous studies [15,19]. The SF-36 assesses eight different health concepts: physical functioning, role limitation caused by physical problems, bodily pain, general health perception, energy and vitality, social functioning, role limitation caused by emotional problems, and mental health. Each dimension is scored on a Likert scale and subsequently grouped into two summary scores: a physical component scale (PCS) and an emotional component scale (MCS, mental component scale). Both score ranges from 0 to 100, with a higher score indicating better QoL [20].

3 Statistical analysis

Data are presented as mean (SD), median (interquartile range) or proportions. Normality of the data was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk test. We compared baseline data, pulmonary function and pain scores of patients who underwent robotic surgery with those of patients who underwent open surgery using Khi-square test, unpaired Student t-test or Wilcoxon test. We considered a p -value of 0.05 to be statistically significant. We performed all statistical analysis with JMP Pro 14.0 (SAS Institute Inc.).

4 Results

4.1 Demographics and surgical characteristics

Forty-five patients were operated by postero-lateral muscle-sparing thoracotomy (group T) and 41 patients with a robotic approach (Group R). Table 1 describes the general demographics, which were equivalent in the two groups except for type (primary NSLC or secondary) and size of the tumor. Mean lesion size was a selection criterion for the operative technique and was significantly greater in the group T (30 mm vs. 18 mm, $p = 0.01$). The distribution of the operated lobes was equivalent (Table 2). Mean operating room occupation time was equivalent for both procedures.

4.2 Pre- and postoperative pulmonary function (Figures 1 to 4)

Pre-operative pulmonary function testing was available in all patients and did not differ between groups T and R. Similarly, acute postoperative pulmonary function was not significantly different between the two groups. One month after surgery, however, patients in the robotic group had significantly higher forced vital capacity (70% predicted $\pm$ 15 vs. 81% predicted $\pm$ 19, $p = 0.04$) and maximum expiratory pressure (73 cmH₂O $\pm$ 22 vs. 97 cmH₂O $\pm$ 40, $P = 0.02$). Forced expiratory volume (69% predicted $\pm$ 13 vs. 76% predicted $\pm$ 15) and vital capacity (73% predicted $\pm$ 16 vs. 81% predicted $\pm$ 15) were also higher in the robotic group, but the difference fell just short of statistical significance ($p = 0.05$). At two and six-month follow-up, there was no significant difference in the pulmonary testing.

4.3 Postoperative pain and quality of life (Table 3)

Acute pain intensity during the first postoperative week was similar in both groups. At one month, significantly less patients in group R reported the presence of pain (82% vs. 42%, $p = 0.005$) and their pain intensity was lower (1 [IQR 1–2] vs. 0 [IQR 0–1], $p = 0.04$). There was a significant correlation between pain intensity at one month and vital capacity ($p = 0.04$), forced vital capacity ($p = 0.02$) and maximal expiratory pressure ($p = 0.002$).

Two months after surgery, 46 (53%) patients returned completed questionnaires. Of those, 13 (28%) reported no pain, 26 (57%) mild, 5 (11%) moderate and 2 (4%) severe pain in the area of surgery. Significantly less patients in group R reported moderate or severe pain ($p = 0.03$). Pain didn't interfere significantly with daily activities, with a median interference score of 1 [IQR 0.5–3]. According to the DN4 questionnaire, 5 patients (15%) reported neuropathic pain characteristics. A quarter of painful patients didn't take any pain medication. Acetaminophen was the most commonly taken analgesic (70%), followed by weak opioids (27%), pregabalin (6%) and NSAIDs (3%). Mean SF-36 PCS score was 59.8 ± 17.6 while mean MCS score was 65.9 ± 22.5 , without difference between group T and R.

Six months after surgery, 33 (38%) patients returned completed questionnaires. Of those, 11 (33%) reported no pain, 17 (52%) mild and 5 (15%) moderate pain in the area of surgery, without difference between patients in groups T and R ($p = 0.45$). Pain interfered only mildly with daily activities, with a median interference score of 1 [IQR 0–2]. According to the DN4 questionnaire, 4 patients (18%) reported neuropathic pain characteristics. Almost half (45%) of patients with pain didn't take any pain medication. Acetaminophen was the most commonly taken analgesic (27%), followed by weak opioids (13%), NSAIDs (13%) and pregabalin

(5%). Mean SF-36 PCS score was 63.7 ± 22.2 while mean MCS score was 62.6 ± 24.4 , without difference between group T and R.

5 Discussion

Our two groups showed equivalent pulmonary function tests before surgery. The surgical approach was based between-other on the size of the tumor (lesion less than 40 mm for the group R), which explains a statistically greater mean tumor size for the T group. One must here keep in mind that we study a same procedure, a single lobectomy. Considering the tumor size range for the two groups (ea. 20-48 mm for the group T and 13-38 mm for the group R), no difference in technical management should be evoked.

Pulmonary function recovery after lobectomy in lung cancer has well been described for thoracotomy approach [21] and for VATS [22]. Data clearly shows the advantages of the VATS technique on pulmonary recovery in the short-term compared to open non-sparing techniques [1,4,5,8,23]. Mid-term functional recovery after lobectomy has been compared between VATS and sparing open approach [4,24], and showed no advantages of the VATS technique. There is actually in the literature no comparative data on pulmonary function after robotic and sparing open lobectomy. In the present study, we show a significance difference at 1 month for the forced vital capacity and maximum expiratory pressure, with higher FEV1 and vital capacity in favor for the robotic group. There was no difference left at mid and long term, in accordance to some few studies that showed no difference left, considering open or VATS approaches [1,4]. Acute pain following thoracic surgery is often intense, requiring multimodal and often invasive analgesic techniques [25]. In addition to NSAIDs and acetaminophen, all thoracotomy patients benefited from continuous epidural analgesia, whereas patients in the robotic group received an intraoperative single-shot nerve block and an intravenous patient-controlled analgesia pump. Despite this different—and less invasive—analgesic regimen, pain scores were similar in both groups during the first postoperative days. These results seem to support previous reports that suggested that the analgesic requirements are reduced after robotic surgery when compared to open approaches [26]. Moreover, significantly more patients in the robotic group were pain-free one month after surgery. These findings are consistent with an earlier study by Cerfolio et al., who reported lower pain intensity three weeks after robotic surgery, compared with a rib- and nerve-sparing thoracotomy procedure [11]. In our sample, pain intensity was correlated with pulmonary function; this could be one of the factors explaining the quicker functional recovery we observed in the robotic group.

Persistent postoperative pain is a frequent complication of thoracic surgery, affecting around 50% of patients [27]. In our study, 71% and 67% reported persistent pain at two and six months, respectively. Pain intensity was mostly mild, with only 15% reporting moderate pain or higher at both time-points. Moreover, the pain only modestly interfered with their daily activities, and most patients only took simple analgesics. This is in line with the results of a recent study describing pain after video-assisted thoracic surgery—another minimally invasive approach—where 11% of patients reported moderate or higher pain scores three months after their procedure [28]. In our sample, the incidence of persistent pain was not different between the robotic and thoracotomy group, in line with a recent prospective observational study that found a similar incidence of chronic pain after thoracotomy or video-assisted thoracic surgery [29]. Contrary to a meta-analysis which concluded that 66% of persistent pain after thoracic surgery was neuropathic [30], only 15% (at two months) and 18% (at six months) of our patients with pain reported a DN4 score indicating likely neuropathic pain.

The evidence on QoL after open or minimally invasive thoracic surgery is mixed, with studies reporting better, equivalent or worse QoL after VATS [31-33]. Cerfolio et al. were the first to study QoL in thoracic robotic surgery patients [34]. They reported improved QoL three weeks after robotic surgery compared with open surgery, but this difference was no longer significant by the fourth postoperative month. Similarly, in this study, both MCS and PCS scores were similar between the thoracotomy and robotic group at two and six months. In terms of QoL, our results are similar to those of an earlier study by our team [15] and compare favorably with previous studies that also used the SF-36 to evaluate QoL after thoracic procedures [19,31]. A possible explanation for the lack of difference between the groups could be the use of the SF-36, a generic QoL instrument. Procedure-specific questionnaires could be more sensitive to change and thus unmask subtle differences. The PIDATS (pain-related impairment of daily activities after thoracic surgery) questionnaire has been specifically developed for the evaluation of QoL after thoracic surgery [33](Ringsted et al. 2012), but as it has not yet been translated and cross-culturally validated in French and we were therefore unable to use it for this study.

6 References

1. Handy JR, Asaph JW, Douville EC, Ott GY, Grunkemeier GL, Wu Y. Does video-assisted thoracoscopic lobectomy for lung cancer provide improved functional outcomes compared with open lobectomy. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2010;37:451-5.
2. Nomori H, Horio H, Fuyuno G, Kobayashi R, Yashima H. Respiratory muscle strength after lung resection with special reference to age and procedures of thoracotomy. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 1996;10(5):352-8.
3. Nomori H, Horio H, Naruke T, Suemasu K. What is the advantage of a thoracoscopic lobectomy over a limited thoracotomy procedure for lung cancer surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001;72:879-84.
4. Nomori H, Ohtsuka T, Horio H, Naruke T, Siemasu K. Difference in the impairment of vital capacity and 6-minute walking after a lobectomy performed by thoracoscopic surgery, an anterior limited thoracotomy, an anteroaxillary thoracotomy, and a posterolateral thoracotomy. *Surg Today* 2003;33:7-12.
5. Kaseda S, Aoki T, Hangai N, Shimizu K; Better pulmonary function and prognosis with video-assisted thoracic surgery than with thoracotomy. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2000;70:1644-6.
6. Andreetti C, Menna C, Ibrahim M, Ciccone AM, D'Andrilli A, Venuta F, Rendina EA. Postoperative pain control: videothoracoscopic versus conservative mini-thoracotomic approach. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2014;46(5):907-12.
7. Stephens N, Rice D, Correa A, Hoffstetter W, Mehran R, Roth J, Walsh G, Vaporciyan A, Swisher S; Thoracoscopic lobectomy is associated with improved short term and equivalent oncological outcomes compared with open lobectomy for clinical stage I non-small cell cancer: a propensity-matched analysis of 963 cases. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2014;46:607-13.
8. Nakata M, Saeki H, Yokoyama N, Kurita A, Takiyama W, Takashima S. Pulmonary function after lobectomy: video-assisted thoracic surgery versus thoracotomy. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2000;70:938-41.
9. Kneuert PJ, D'Souza DM, Moffatt-Bruce SD, Merritt RE. Robotic lobectomy has the greatest benefit in patients with marginal pulmonary function. *J Cardiothorac Surg* 2018;13(1):56.
10. Louie BE, Wilson JL, Kim S, Cerfolio RJ, Park BJ, Farivar AS, Vallières E, Aye RW, Burfeind WR, Block MI. Comparison of video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery and robotic approaches for clinical stage I and stage II non-small cell lung cancer using the society of thoracic surgeons database. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2016;102:917-24.

11. Cerfolio RJ. Total port approach for robotic lobectomy. *Thorac Surg Clin* 2014;24:151-6.
12. Kwon S, Zhao L, Reddy R, Chang A, Orringer M, Brummett C, Lin J. Evaluation of acute and chronic pain outcomes after robotic, video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery, or open anatomic pulmonary resection. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2017;154:652-9.
13. Hu XF, Duan L, Jiang GN, Wang H, Liu HC, Chen C. A clinical risk model for the evaluation of bronchopleural fistula in non-small cell lung cancer after pneumonectomy. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2013 Aug;96(2):419-24.
14. Zanotti G, Mitchell JD. *Thorac Surg Clin*. 2015 Nov;25(4):421-7. Bronchopleural Fistula and Empyema After Anatomic Lung Resection.
15. Lacroix, V., Nezhad, Z., Kahn, D., Steyaert, A., Poncelet, A., Pieters, T., Noirhomme, P. (2016). Pain, Quality of Life, and Clinical Outcomes after Robotic Lobectomy *The Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgeon* 65(05), 344-350.
16. Cleeland, C., Ryan, K. (1994). Pain assessment: global use of the Brief Pain Inventory. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore* 23(2), 129 138.
17. Bouhassira, D., Lantéri-Minet, M., Attal, N., Laurent, B., Touboul, C. (2008). Prevalence of chronic pain with neuropathic characteristics in the general population *Pain* 136 (3), 380 387.
18. Pompili C, Novoa N, Balduyck B; ESTS Quality of life and PatientSafety Working Group. Clinical evaluation of quality of life: a survey among members of European Society of Thoracic Surgeons(ESTS). *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2015;21(4):415–419
19. Heuker D, Lengele B, Delecluse V, et al. Subjective and objective assessment of quality of life after chest wall resection. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2011;39(1):102–108.
20. Leplège A, Ecosse E, Verdier A, Perneger TV. The French SF-36 Health Survey: translation, cultural adaptation and preliminary psychometric evaluation. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1998;51(11):1013–1023
21. Kim HK, Lee YJ, Han KN, Choi YH. Pulmonary function changes over 1 year after lobectomy in lung cancer. *Respir Care* 2016;61(3):376-82.
22. Seok Y, Jheon S, Cho S. Serial changes in pulmonary function after video-assisted thoracic surgery lobectomy in lung cancer patients. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2014;62(2):133-9.

23. Nagahiro I, Andou A, Aoe M, Sano Y, Date H, Shimizu N. Pulmonary function, postoperative pain, and serum cytokine level after lobectomy: a comparison of VATS and conventional procedure. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001;72:362-5.
24. Salati M, Brunelli A, Xiumè F, Monteverde M, Sabbatini A, Tiberi M, Pompili C, Palloni R, Refai M. Video-assisted thoracic surgery lobectomy does not offer any functional recovery advantage in comparison to the open approach 3 months after the operation : a case matched analysis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2017;51(6):1177-82.
25. Maxwell, C., Nicoara, A. New developments in the treatment of acute pain after thoracic surgery *Current Opinion. Anaesthesiology* 2014; 27(1), 6-11.
26. Pauli, H., Eladawy, M., Park, J. Anesthesia for robotic thoracic surgery *Annals of Cardiothoracic Surgery* 2019; 8(2), 263-268.
27. Bayman, E., Brennan, T. Incidence and Severity of Chronic Pain at 3 And 6 Months After Thoracotomy: Meta-Analyses. *The journal of pain : official journal of the American Pain Society* 2014; 15(9), 887-89.
28. Wildgaard, K., Ringsted, T., Hansen, H., Petersen, R., Kehlet, H. Persistent postsurgical pain after video-assisted thoracic surgery - an observational study *Acta anaesthesiologica Scandinavica* 2016; 60(5), 650 658.
29. Bayman, E., Parekh, K., Keech, J., Selte, A., Brennan, T. A Prospective Study of Chronic Pain after Thoracic Surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2017; 126(5), 938 951.
30. Haroutiunian, S., Nikolajsen, L., Finnerup, N., Jensen, T. The neuropathic component in persistent postsurgical pain: a systematic literature review *Pain* 2013; 154(1), 95 102.
31. Rizk, N., Ghanie, A., Hsu, M., Bains, M., Downey, R., Sarkaria, I., Finley, D., Adusumilli, P., Huang, J., Sima, C., Burkhalter, J., Park, B., Rusch, V. A Prospective Trial Comparing Pain and Quality of Life Measures After Anatomic Lung Resection Using Thoracoscopy or Thoracotomy *The Annals of Thoracic Surgery* 2014; 98(4), 1160-1166.
32. Bendixen, M., Jørgensen, O., Kronborg, C., Andersen, C., Licht, P. Postoperative pain and quality of life after lobectomy via video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery or anterolateral thoracotomy for early stage lung cancer: a randomised controlled trial *The Lancet Oncology* 2016;17(6), 836-844.
33. Rauma, V., Andersson, S., Robinson, E., Räsänen, J., Sintonen, H., Salo, J., Ilonen, I. (2019). Thoracotomy and VATS-surgery in local non-small cell lung cancer: differences in long-term health-related quality of life *Clinical Lung Cancer* . 2019

34. Cerfolio, R., Bryant, A., Skylizard, L., Minnich, D. Initial consecutive experience of completely portal robotic pulmonary resection with 4 arms The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery 2011;142(4), 740-746.

33. Ringsted, T., Wildgaard, K., Kreiner, S., Kehlet, H. Pain-related Impairment of Daily Activities After Thoracic Surgery The Clinical Journal of Pain 2013; 29(9), 791-799.

7 Tables

Table 1 — Demographic and surgical characteristics of the patients, according to operative technique.

	Thoracotomy group (n = 45)	Robotic group (n = 41)	P-value
Sex (male/female)	22/23 (49/51)	27/14 (65/35)	0.11
Age (years)	63 (11)	64 (8)	0.73
BMI	25 (4)	27 (4)	0.10
Tobacco habit (pack-year)	21 [0–32]	30 [20–45]	0.06
Primary/secondary lesion	38/7 (84/16)	40/1 (97/3)	0.02
Lesion size (mm)	30 [19–42]	18 [12–36]	0.01
%FEV1 (% predicted)	93 (20)	87 (17)	0.22
%VC (% predicted)	100 (16)	95 (18)	0.23
%FVC (% predicted)	98 (18)	95 (19)	0.43
%DL_{CO} (% predicted)	83 (19)	83 (13)	0.89
PEmax (cmH₂O)	81 (28)	88 (36)	0.30
Operating room occupation time (min)	274 [249–297]	289 [260–323]	0.12

Data are presented as numbers (%), mean (SD) or median [IQR]. BMI: body mass index, FEV: forced expiratory volume in one second, VC: vital capacity, FVC: forced vital capacity, DL_{CO}: carbon monoxide diffusing capacity.

Table 2 — Distribution of the operated lobe, according to operating technique.

	Thoracotomy group (n = 45)	Robotic group (n = 41)	<i>P</i>-value
Right upper lobe	13 (29)	12 (29)	0.74
Right middle lobe	2 (4)	2 (5)	
Right lower lobe	9 (20)	6 (15)	
Left upper lobe	13 (29)	9 (22)	
Left lower lobe	8 (18)	12 (29)	

Data are presented as numbers (%).

Table 3 — Numerical pain scores during the study period, according to operative technique.

	Number	Thoracotomy group	Robotic group	<i>P</i> value
Preoperative	86	0 [0–0]	0 [0–0]	0.63
Day one	75	5 [3–6]	4 [3–6]	0.61
Day two	73	4 [3–5]	4 [2–5]	0.66
Day three	76	3 [2–5]	3 [1–4]	0.09
Day four	74	3 [2–4]	3 [1–4]	0.25
Day five	59	3 [2–4]	2 [1–4]	0.27
One month	50	1 [1–2]	0 [0–1]	0.04*
Two months	46	1 [0–2]	0.25 [0–1]	0.19
Six months	33	1 [0–3]	0.5 [0–2.25]	0.33

Data are presented as median [IQR].

8 Figures

Figure 1 — Pre- and postoperative forced expiratory volume, according to operating technique.




Figure 2 — Pre- and postoperative vital capacity, according to operating technique.




Figure 3 — Pre- and postoperative forced vital capacity, according to operating technique.




Figure 4 — Pre- and postoperative maximal expiratory pressure, according to operating technique.

