diabetes and type of incontinence significantly affected the response time to BOTOX injection. A larger sample size and a prospective analysis of data are warranted to verify and validate these findings.
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Objective: To compare the results of emergency vs elective ureteroscopy (URS) for the treatment of a single ureteric stone.

Methods: We prospectively constructed a database for patients who underwent URS in the Al-Amiri Hospital from March 2015 through December 2017. Inclusion criteria were adult patients with a single ureteric stone diagnosed by computed tomography of the kidneys, ureters and bladder. Patients who had fever or ureteric stents were excluded. The emergency URS group (EM Group) included patients who presented to the emergency department with persistent renal colic and underwent emergency URS. The elective URS group (EL Group) included patients who underwent elective URS after admission through the outpatient appointment system. The technique for URS was the same in both groups. Safety was defined as absence of complications, whilst effectiveness was defined as stone-free rate after a single URS session. The chi-squared and t-test were used to compare the data of both groups.

Results: The study included 124 patients with a mean (SD) age of 41.4 (12.6) years. The EM Group included 67 patients and the EL Group included 57 patients. Laser disintegration was needed in 48 patients (84%) in the EL Group and 43 (64%) in the EM Group (P = 0.012). Post-URS stents were placed in 43 patients (75.4%) in the EL Group and 60 (89.6) in the EM Group (P = 0.037). Complications were comparable (3.5% for the EL and 4.5% for EM groups, P = 0.785). Ureteric perforation in one patient in the EM Group was treated with a JJ stent. Sepsis in one patient of the EM Group was treated with blood transfusion. Stone-free rates were comparable, 93% in the EL Group and 97% in the EM Group (P = 0.297).

Conclusion: Emergency URS in selected cases can be as safe and effective as elective URS for treatment of a single ureteric stone.
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Objective: To investigate the effect of urodynamic urethral catheter on uroflowmetry (UFM) parameters, as urodynamic studies (UDS) are an integral part in assessing voiding symptoms in both genders and its settings and components are points of debate for possible effects on results that sometimes vary from preliminary diagnoses, particularly the urethral or vesical catheters used in filling and voiding cystometry and their effect on UFM parameters.

Methods: We prospectively enrolled 150 patients undergoing UDS for established voiding symptoms from January 2016 to March 2018. Exclusion criteria were pre-UDS voided volume of <150 mL and/or inability to void during UDS with the catheter in place. Biometric data and clinical history were collected. Free UFM preceded the UDS. A double-lumen 8-F air-charged urethral catheter was inserted to measure intra-vesical pressure and for filling and voiding cystometry. Parameters of free UFM were compared with that of voiding cystometry using t-tests.

Results: The study included 105 eligible patients (mean age 55 years), 54% of which were females. Urge urinary incontinence was most frequent form of leak (28 patients) and 69% of strips showed detrusor overactivity. Statistically significantly better results were observed between pre-UDS UFM and pressure-flow UFM for the mean values of maximum urinary flow (Qmax: +4.33 mL/s, P < 0.001), average flow (+1.95 mL/s, P < 0.05), voiding time (-16.6 s, P < 0.001), and time to Qmax (+6.6 s, P < 0.001), but not post-void residual volume (PVR; 12.2 mL, P = 0.16) and percentage PVR of cystometric capacity (0.55%, P = 0.7). Time to Qmax becomes insignificant when compared amongst males only (P = 0.2), whilst all PVR assessments become significant amongst females alone (P < 0.05). Analysis was repeated including those who voided ≥120 mL (120 patients) on pre-UDS UFM and yielded results of similar significance.