

Ureteral small stones Conservative management: 192 patients' backdated study

DR SAFAA IBRAHIM KADHIM

Chief of Urology Department, Ministry of health, Missan Alsader theaching Hospital.

Email: Sfadtwr15@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Ureteral calculi (UC) management has progressed over the previous decades along with new medical and surgical treatments advent. Guidelines currently are supporting management being conservative as a conceivable method for (UTS) of ≤ 10 mm size. Aims: we tenor to monitor the usual UTS antiquity conservatively accomplished in the current backdated investigation. Materials and methodology: 192 patients' males and females with a ureteral ≤ 10 mm single stone size were covered in current investigation. Clinical out analyses for different stone sizes was done. Results: size of stone was detected as associated to the hydronephrosis degree and the need likelihood for management surgically. Conservative management (CM) was detected to be clinically effective, where patients of 88% did not need surgery regarding stones. Patients of 96.1% with 0 – 4 mm stone managed for expelling their UTS. CMs are clinically effective particularly for stone size less than 4 mm.

Key Words: Ureteral calculi (UC), hydronephrosis, Ureteral small stones

INTRODUCTION

Ureteral calculi (UC) management has progressed over the previous decades along with new shockwave extracorporeal lithotripsy advent, the technology of ureteroscopic development and the medical expulsive therapy (MET) introduction. Patients of diameter of UC ≤ 10 mm have great expulsion of spontaneous stone likelihood and the guidelines as existing joint European association of urology (EAU)/American urological association (AUA) present the conservative approach option as an preliminary along with MET utilize and nearby following-up [1].

In decision-making process if a patient is qualified or not for CM, radiological parameters (size of stone, dilatation degree, position of stone) besides parameters being subjective i.e., level of pain are able to contribute to the ultimate resolution for surveillance or treatment being active. There is no solid proof on how the stone size might be linked to the level of pain, whereas there is proof that associates with the pain level and type along the position of stone [2]. Stones being larger reasonably appear to be related to a greater degree of hydronephrosis [3].

Hitherto studies on MET have chiefly concentrated on the utilization of $\alpha 1$ blockers, Ca channels corticosteroids and antagonists. The present proof favors the blockers of $\alpha 1$ along tamsulosin as the mostly examined one. [4-7] MET appears as chiefly operative on 5 – 10 mm stones [5, 8], as stones < 5 mm have chances of over 65% being expelled with no extra treatment [1]. The MET past recommendation just for distal UTS has been extended recently, with proof level, on the proximal UTS management [9]. Thus, a current blind controlled trial randomized debates of placebo the nifedipine or tamsulosin usefulness in stone passage promotion [10].

In respect to the correct patients following-up radiologically, there is a consensuses lack in scan type and timing terms which must be done [11 – 14]. Whereas the EAU recommendations guidelines which recently favor non-contrast computed tomography utilize for the diagnostic acute pain as flank approach, there are not

whatever recent recommendations on the way of following-up UTS patients conservatively, managed.

Particular proof is there, if stones being small CM can irreversibly compromise the renal function (RF). Relevant proofs mostly were according to models of animal and a complete obstruction as ureteral being reversal. Therefore, the outcoming proof is biased and controversial [15 – 19].

Objectives: We tenor for following the natural UTS history conservatively managed in the current backdated investigation, from presentation to stone-free time.

MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

This is backdated 192 males and female's analyses from Jan., 2010 until Mar., 2014. All chosen patients of single UTS, maximum diameter sized of ≤ 10 mm, with no or with renal stones as a concomitant, and had chosen for CM of their UTS. The chosen patients were begun on MET with 0.4 mg tamsulosin one time per day and painkillers regularly include NSAID as requisite, directly following they were UTS diagnosed. All patients were diagnosed, following they had developed renal colic episode, and all initially were evaluated in department of hospital emergency.

Regarding protocol of trusts renal colic, the diagnostic of all colic patients assessment was performed with ultrasound, radiological findings (KUB) and unenhanced CTS (ureters, kidneys, and bladder). The MET cons and pros vs surgical early extracorporeal lithotripsy shockwave or removal were clarified to whole nominated patients with UTS as small. Patients who were selected for CM initially were covered in the sample. The measures of exclusion are shortened in Table 1.

Following-up: All nominated patients, for their UTS, were followed-up, with UTS or different scans [x – ray ureters, bladder, kidneys, and intravenous occasionally and urogram, in which essential, CTS. The following-up type choice of the waiting intervals and the scan till such done were according to the stone characters (size, position, hydronephrosis, radio-opaqueor not). Patients of small hydronephrosis degree, small pain level and good RF had typically extra delayed following –up scans, whereas in few

cases in which the stone was well obvious in the x-rayKUB, such as our only following-up scan.

Our goal was to not delay the following-up scan for an extra six weeks, despite few patients had to be rescanned late than such. Patients of following-up after 6 months were excluded for any reason. Few patients need surgeries (stenting or elective lithotripsy) throughout their following-up, either due to the persistence of stone on the following-up scans, or their RF deterioration, or frequent colic.

Analyzed parameters: The patients were categorized by age, stone size, gender, extra renal stones number. We distributed the UTS according to their size (0 – 4, 4 – 6 and 6 – 10 mm). The dilatation UTS presence degree because was assembled based on the radiological CTS criteria in none, mild, moderate and severe.

RESULTS

The closing sample contained 192 patients with 42.72 years median age (19–79 years). Outcomes of epidemiology confirmed in which patients of 75.5% (n = 143), were males, while females were of 25.5% (n = 49). Patients of 82.3% were having single UTS; whereas 12% of 1 extra renal stone and 5.7% had extra than1 renal stone. The mean UTS size was 4.65 mm (1.6 – 9 mm). The UTS majority were (42.7%) of 4 – 6 mm size (Table 2).

Comparison between females and males groups on the tested parameters (size and position of stone, dilatation degree, and stones number) the only differences of significance detected were such associated with the stones number and to the dilatation degree. Male patients are of double probabilities (20.3 vs 10.3%) to display extra renal stones, apart from their ureteral one, while patients as females were extra possible to have hydronephrosis as moderate (26.5 vs 21.7%) or severe (4.1 vs 0%).

The size of stone was independently related to the hydronephrosis degree. For patients elected, 169 (88%) were effective with MET, whereas 23 (12%) were of surgical treatment due to UTS persistence. Patients of UTS being larger had a larger needing for surgical process chance. Figure 1 demos net ultimate results.

DISCUSSION

The predominant sample of male patients is in harmony with urolithiasis as epidemiologically [20] also of double extra renal stones chances. Amusingly, patients as females were of hydronephrosis marginally worse. Patients of 6–10 mm UTS had a 22.5% superior chance of needing surgical management, in comparison to the patient's group with 0–4 mm stones. The total stone of ≤ 10 mm expulsion rate was 88%, whereas, expulsion rate was 96.2% in the < 4 mm group.

In the current case, 90.1% of our patients were effectively followed – up along scan of a single following-up. In extra than 55% of our circumstances, such as a single USS KUB, as just 18.2% of the patients have no dilatation degree on presentation. In a smaller amount than 15% of our group, an extra CTS was needed. The following-up scans number done was detected to be associated with the re-attendancenumber. Truly, patients mostly that returned to because of pain were rescanned. In contrast, the following-up scans # was not directly related

to the size of the stone. Therefore, patients with larger stones do not need extra scans for their following-up, nor have extra renal colic episodes.

In respect to clinical MET outcome, the 0–4 mm UTS group had an impressive > 96% expulsion rate, making doubts on the following-up scans need within the protocol for such group. Regarding patient's group of 6–10 mm stones, the rate of expulsion was as great as 73.7%, while in the 4–6 mm group, such as 92.7% (Figure 1).

CONCLUSION

Our chief results respecting the natural UTS history sized ≤ 10 mm are that larger stones are causing greater hydronephrosis degree, and are fewer expected to be CM-expelled; in contrast, they are not associated with higher pain amount. Such is an outcome that hasn't been formerly noticed. Regarding our patient's following-up, the ultrasound KUB scan as single was detected to be enough as a following-up scan in extra than 55% of cases. In respect to the effectiveness clinically, patients of 4 mm up stone were effective with CM in more than 96% of cases.

REFERENCES

1. Preminger GM, Tiselius HG, Assimos DG, Alken P, Buck AC, Gallucci M, Knoll T, Lingeman JE, Nakada SY, Pearle MS, Sarica K, Türk C, Wolf JS Jr: 2007 Guideline for the management of UC: Eur. Urol. 2007; 52: 1610 – 1631.
2. Einser BH, Reese A, Sheth S, Stoller ML: UTS location at emergency room presentation with colic. J. Urol. 2009; 182: 165 – 168.
3. Goertz JK, Lotterman S: Can the degree of hydronephrosis on ultrasound predict kidney stone size? Amer. Emerg. Med. 2010; 28: 813 – 816.
4. Al – Ansari A, Al – Maimi A, Alobaidy A, Assadiq K, Azmi MD, Shokeir AA: Efficacy of tamsulosin in the management of lower UTS: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled study of 100 patients. Urology. 2010; 75: 4 – 7.
5. Liatsikos EN, Katsakiori PF, Assimakopoulos K, Voudoukis T, Kallidonis P, Constantinides C, Athanasopoulos A, Stolzenburg JU, Permenis J: Doxzaosin for the management of distal – UTS. J. Endourol. 2007; b21: 538 – 541.
6. Porpiglia F, Vaccino D, Billia M, Renard J, Gracco C, Ghignone G, Scoffone C, Terrone C, Scarpa RM: Corticosteroids and tamsulosin in the medical exclusive therapy for symptomatic distal ureter stones: single drug or association? Eur. Urol. 2006; 50: 339 – 344.
7. Yilmaz E, Batislam E, Basar MM, tuglu D, Ferhat M, Basar H: The comparison and efficacy of 3 different alpha 1 – adrenergic blockers for distal UTS. J. Urol. 2005; 173: 2010 – 2012.
8. Hermanns T, Sauermann p, Rufibach K, Frauenfelder T, Sulser T, Strebel RT: Is there a role for tamsulosin in the treatment of distal UTS of 7 mm or less? Results of a randomized, double – blind, placebo – controlled trial. Eur. Urol. 2009; 56: 407 – 412.
9. yencilek F, Erturhan S, Canguven O, Koyuncu H, erol B, Sarica K: Does tamsulosin change the management of proximally located UTS? Urol res 2010; 38: 195 – 199.
10. Pickard R, Starr K, MecLennan G, McDonald A, Anson K, N'Dow J, Burgess N, Clark T, Kilonzo M, Gillies K, shearer K, Boachie C, Cameron S, Norrie J, McClinton S: Medical expulsive therapy in adults with ureteric colic: a multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2015; 386: 341 – 349.
11. Johnston R, Lin A, Du J, Mark S: Comparison of kidney – ureter – bladder abdominal radiography and computed

- tomography scout films for identifying renal calculi. *BJU Int* 2009; 104: 670 – 673.
12. Macejko A, Okotie OT, Zhao LC, Liu J, Perry K, Nadler RB: Computed tomography – determined stone – free for ureteroscopy of upper – tract stone. *J. Endourol.* 2009; 23: 379 – 382.
 13. Kalra MK, Maher MM, D'Souza RV, Rizzo S, Halpern EF, Blake MA, Saini S: Detection of urinary tract stones at low – radiation – dose CT with z – axis automatic tube current modulation: phantom and clinical studies. *Radiology*, 2005; 235: 523 – 529.
 14. Oner S, Oto A, Tekgul S, Koroglu M, Hascicek M, Sahin A, Akhan O: comparison of spiral CT and US in the evaluation of pediatric urolithiasis. *LBR – BTR* 2004; 87: 219 – 223.
 15. Yang M, Gao F, Liu H, Pang H, Zuo YP, Yong T: Prospectively estimating the recoverability of RF after relief of unilateral urinary obstruction by measurement of renal parenchymal volume. *Acad. Radiol.* 2013; 20: 401 – 406.
 16. Chaabane W, Praddaude F, Buleon M, Jaafar A, Vallet M, Rischmann p, Galarreta CI, Chevalier RL, Tack I: RFal decline and glomerulotubular injury are arrested but not restored by release of unilateral ureteral obstruction (UUO). *Amer. J. Physiol. Renal. Physiol.* 2013; 304: F432 – 439.
 17. Ravanan R, Tomson CR: Natural history of post obstructive nephropathy: a single–center backdated study. *Nephron Clin. Prac.* 2007; 105: c165 – 170.
 18. Huland H, Gonnermann D, Leichtweiss HP, Dietrich – hennings R: Reversibility of pre – glomerular active vasoconstriction in the first weeks after complete unilateral ureteral obstruction by inhibition of prostaglandin synthesis. *J. Urol.* 1983; 130: 820 – 824.
 19. Ito K, Chen J, El Chear M, Stern jm, Seshan SV, Khodadadian JJ, Richardson I, Hyman MJ, Vaughan ED Jr, Poppas DP, Felsen D: Renal damage progresses despite improvement of RF after relief of unilateral ureteral obstruction in adult rats. *er. J. Physiol. Renal Physiol.* 2004; 287: F1283 – 1293.
 20. Trinchieri A: epidemiology of urolithiasis: an update. *Clin Cases Miner Metab.* 2008; 5: 101 – 106