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ABSTRACT

Introduction
Effective medical expulsion for ureteric stones with α-blockers offers numerous advantages over surgical alternatives. However, its effectiveness remains uncertain and with the publication of new trial data, the available evidence requires reappraisal.

Objective
To assess the efficacy of α-blockers the management of ureteric lithiasis.

Methods
A systematic review of the literature, with pre-defined search criteria, was conducted using Pubmed and Embase. All randomised trials comparing α-blocker monotherapy to placebo or standard therapy were included. Stone expulsion rate was the primary outcome measure. Secondary outcome measures were time to stone expulsion, analgesic usage and pain scores. Subgroup analyses assessed individual adrenergic antagonists and variations in standard therapy. Sensitivity analysis was based on stone location, stone size, Cochrane Risk of Bias score and study protocol. Summary effects were calculated using a random-effects model and presented as Relative risks (RR) and mean differences (MD) for dichotomous and continuous outcome measures respectively.

Results
67 studies randomising 6654 patients were included in the meta-analysis. Stone expulsion rates improved with α-blockers (RR, 1.49; 95% CI 1.38-1.61). Contrast enhanced funnel showed evidence of publication bias. Stone expulsion time was 3.99 days (CI -4.75- -3.23) shorter with α-blockers. Similarly, patients required 106.53mg [CI -148.20- -64.86] less diclofenac compared to control/placebo, and had 0.80 [CI -1.07 – -0.54] fewer pain episodes. Visual Analogue Scores were also reduced, -2.43 [CI -3.87 – -0.99]. All formulations of α-antagonists all demonstrated beneficial effects over conservative treatment/placebo. Sensitivity analysis demonstrated significant effects of stone location, stone size and study design.

Conclusions and Relevance
Despite the opposing results of recently published trial, current evidence continues to demonstrate a potential benefit of α-blocker treatment particularly for distal stones over 5mm.

How did you gather, select and analyze the info you considered in your review?’
Online databases (Medline, Embase) where searched for all studies including abstracts. Clinical trials databases were searched for emerging and unpublished studies. All trials that compared stone expulsion rates in α-blockers and standard therapy or placebo were included in the analysis.

Take-home message for the clinician?
Despite the recent publication of major trials with conflicting results, the results of this meta-analysis continue to support the beneficial role of α-blockers in the management ureteric calculi.
INTRODUCTION

Urolithiasis remains a common complaint in an often otherwise healthy population. With a prevalence of 2-3% and recurrence rates of up to 50%, the morbidity of urolithiasis is clearly reflected in the volume of literature evaluating its management and treatment.

Whilst some stones may remain asymptomatic, an obstructing ureteric calculus with infection represents a surgical emergency requiring immediate intervention. Pain is the main cause for hospital admissions and the likelihood of stone passage is key to determining further management. Smaller stones are liable to pass spontaneously with stones less than 5mm having a 68% chance of passing without treatment.[1] As stone sizes increases, spontaneous passage rates diminish and consequently the need for active treatment increases. Surgical options such as lithotripsy and ureteroscopy offer high stone free rates but at price both in terms of increased costs to the health system and increased risk to the patient. Effective medial expulsive treatment aims to bridge this gap with the potential for treatment of ureteric stone disease without the risks or costs of surgical interventions.

By inhibiting the contraction of ureteric smooth muscle, α-blockers are believed to promote antegrade stone passage and reduce colic. A large number of randomised studies have been performed assessing their efficacy. Up till now the results from the majority of meta analyses have shown a benefit of alpha blocker treatment in increasing stone expulsion rates and times.[1-6] Medical expulsive therapy is now widely prescribed yet the evidence remains hotly debated[7]. In response the
SUSPEND trial, a large multicentre randomised trial, was conducted assessing the effectiveness of tamsulosin, nifedipine and placebo in treating ureteric calculi.

We have performed the first meta-analysis incorporating these new findings into the existing body of literature to assess the value of α-blockers in treating ureteric calculi.
METHODS

This study was performed using the guidelines set out by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) statement. PROSPERO registration number: CRD42015029499.

Search Strategy

Searches of electronic databases (Pubmed, Embase) were performed to identify relevant full texts and abstracts. Clinical trial registries (ClinicalTrials.gov; International Clinical Trials Register) were searched for unpublished and emerging trials and authors were contacted for results. Searches were completed on 20th February 2016. No time restrictions were placed on search results. The following MeSH terms and keywords were used in various combinations; “urolithiasis”, “alpha blocker”, “tamsulosin”, “alfuzosin”, “medical expulsive therapy”, “silodosin”, “terazosin”, “doxazosin”, “calculus”, “stone”, “ureteric” “renal colic”, “ureter* colic”, “expulsive therapy”, “facilitated passage”. See supplementary table 1 for the search strategy. Reference lists were searched by hand for further eligible studies.

Inclusion Criteria

All English language studies published up to 20th February 2016 were included if they met the following criteria:

1. Patients presenting with acute ureteric colic
2. Adult patients >18 years
3. Single ureteric calculus
4. A-blocker monotherapy compared to placebo/standard therapy
5. Prospective, randomised studies
Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded if any of the following criteria were met.

1. Studies without original data
2. Studies in which α-blockers were used as adjuvants to lithotripsy or surgery
3. Studies that did not report stone free rates
4. Animal studies

Quality Assessment

All studies were evaluated using The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias[8]. Trials were categorised into low, intermediate and high risk groups.

Data Review and Analysis

A standardised data extraction form was agreed prior to the literature searches being performed. Two reviewers independently extracted data using the standardised form. Extracted information included baseline study characteristics (single/multi centre; randomisation method; blinding; power calculation and sample size), number of enrolled patients and drop outs; analysis technique (per protocol/ intention to treat), inclusion/ exclusion criteria, baseline patient characteristics (age, sex), size of stone, position of stone, diagnosis technique, follow up protocol and duration, treatment regime, expulsion rate and time, symptoms, analgesic requirements, adverse effects and withdrawals. Authors of studies for which additional information was required were contacted by email.
Primary analysis compared the rate of stone expulsion in patients receiving standard
dose α-blockers to standard therapy or placebo. Standard therapy was defined as
symptomatic management regimes including fluids, analgesia, anti-cholinergic
agents, anti-spasmodic agents and steroids given to both intervention and control
arms.

Secondary analysis compared time to stone expulsion, analgesic usage and pain
score variations.

Subgroup analyses, identified a priori, assessed placebo-controlled trials, individual
adrenergic antagonists and variations in standard therapy regimes. Unless otherwise
stated, all analyses compared α-blockers against conservative treatment/placebo.
Sensitivity analysis was performed based on the Cochrane risk of bias score for
each study, trial analysis protocol, stone position and stone size.

**STATISTICAL METHODS**

For dichotomous variables Mantel-Haenszel test pooled risk ratios (RR) were used
to evaluate the relative benefit of α-blocker treatment. For continuous variables
inverse variance weighted mean differences were calculated. Given the
heterogeneity a random effects model was used for both continuous and
dichotomous variables. Forest plots were created to display the RR estimates for
each study. Potential heterogeneity was assessed using the $I^2$ statistic and “remove-
one” analysis. Publication bias was assessed for by visual inspection of the contrast
enhanced funnel plot[9]. Evidence of small study effects was further evaluated using
Peter’s test[10]. To further identify possible sources of significant heterogeneity
sensitivity analysis was performed. Analyses were performed using Revman v. 5.3 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration) and Stata software v. 14 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX).

RESULTS

The initial search for randomised studies assessing the efficacy of α-blockers resulted in 1184 articles via Medline and Embase. After review of the abstracts, 127 articles were selected for more detailed review. 15 further studies were identified through hand searches of bibliographies. On the criteria detailed above, we excluded 14 studies. Figure 1 provides details of the excluded studies. Finally, 67 studies randomising 6654 patients were selected for inclusion into the meta-analysis (Table 1).

Primary Outcome Analysis

Primary analysis compared α-blocker therapy to standard conservative treatment/placebo. Random effects analysis assessing the chance of passing a ureteric calculus indicated a RR of 1.49 (95% CI 1.38-1.61) in favour of α-blockers (Figure 2). The I² statistic showed significant heterogeneity (I² = 75%). Remove-one analysis did not demonstrate a major influence of one particular study. Neither the pooled RR nor I² changed significantly with removal of any one study (results not shown). Contour enhanced funnel plot demonstrates significant asymmetry. An absence of studies in the area of low significance suggests a degree of publication bias which was confirmed by Peter's test(P<0.05) (Figure 3). Adjustment of the funnel plot using trim and fill suggested 21 missing studies however these led to only a modest change in outcomes (Supplementary Figure 1). Analysis of estimated effect of this publication
bias showed that whilst pooled RR was reduced to 1.31 (95% CI 1.22 to 1.41), the effects remained significant.

Quality Assessment

Results of quality assessment using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool can be found in Figure 7. Overall a high degree of bias was seen with only nine studies judged to be at low risk[11-19] whilst 41 were judged to be intermediate risk[20-60] and 17 high risk[61-77]. The most common cause for bias was blinding of both participants and personnel and outcomes assessment.

Secondary Outcome Analysis

The key secondary outcome measure is stone expulsion time. Analysis of 31 studies, 2433 subjects, showed reduced expulsion time with α-blocker therapy by 3.99 days [CI -4.75 - -3.23] compared to standard therapy or control (I²=88%, p=<0.00001) (Figure 4).

Functional outcomes such as analgesic usage and pain scores were poorly reported by the majority of studies preventing comprehensive analysis. Diclofenac requirements were reported by 13 studies with 909 participants[12,24,25,30,32,37,40,48,52,57,58,66,67]. Alpha-blockers treatment resulted in patients using 106.53mg less diclofenac [CI -148.20 - -64.86] compared to standard therapy/placebo (I²=99%, p<0.00001). 14 studies reported the number of pain episodes experienced within α-blockers and control/placebo
cohort [12,17,19,24,51,52,57-60,66-68,76]. A-blockers resulted in 0.80 [CI 1.07 – -0.54] fewer pain episodes as compared to control ($I^2=81\%$, $p<0.00001$). Just six studies, 1130 participants, reported Visual Analogue Scores to pain measurement [16,24,46,51,56,66]. A mean score difference of -2.43 was seen with α-blockers [CI -3.87 – -0.99] ($I^2=97\%$, $p<0.00001$). 12 studies, 1524 patients, reported side-effects experienced [12,16,21,25,29,48,51,59,65,67,68,76]. A-blockers treatment resulted in a RR of 1.59 [CI 1.01– 2.51] ($I^2=0\%$, $p=0.80$).

Subgroup analysis all demonstrated similarly beneficial effects to α-blockers treatment. 16 studies of 2633 patients compared α-blockers to placebo [11-16,18-21,32,44,47,64,69,73], RR = 1.28 [CI 1.13-1.44], $I^2=81\%$, $p=<0.00001$). Confining analysis to just tamsulosin, 48 studies compared it to standard therapy or placebo. Outcomes were very similar to the primary analysis with RR 1.48 [CI 1.35-1.62] in favour of α-blockers ($I^2=77\%$, $p=<0.00001$). Further studies analysed the individual effects of terazosin, doxazosin, alfuzosin and silodosin. In all cases, treatment with an α-blocker resulted in increased stone expulsion rates (Supplementary Figure 2).

Various regimes constituted standard therapy across the 68 studies. Three studies prescribed patients only fluids. 35 studies gave fluids and analgesia and 221 studies gave only analgesia. Seven studies gave all patients anticholinergic medications routinely whilst one study did not stipulate a standard therapy regime [16]. Aside from the three studies that advised fluids alone which demonstrated an equivocal collective outcome, α-blockers were associated with increased stone expansion across all management regimes (Supplementary Figure 3).

Sensitivity analysis was performed to assess for possible sources of heterogeneity.
The effect of bias was explored through comparison of low, intermediate and high risk studies (Figure 7). The nine low risk trials demonstrated a modest but significant benefit of α-blocker therapy (RR 1.15 (CI 1.02- 1.30; $I^2 = 77\%$ p=<0.0001). Studies with an intermediate (n=41) or high risk of bias (n=17) showed greater beneficial effects of alpha blockers (intermediate risk RR= 1.52 [CI 1.42-1.62] $I^2= 34\%$ p=0.02; high risk RR= 1.60 [CI 1.35-1.91], $I^2= 65\%$, p= 0.0001) (Supplementary Figure 4). The differences between low risk and intermediate risk and low risk and high risk were significant (ratio of relative risk (RRR)= 0.76 [CI 0.66-0.87] and RRR= 0.72 [CI 0.58-0.88] respectively)[78].

Stone location was used to further evaluate the robustness of the data set. The authors’ definition of distal, mid and proximal ureteric calculi was followed. The majority of studies included only distal ureteric stones however 10 included proximal stones and four studies included mid ureteric stones. Six studies did not report stone position[35,40,47,72,74,79]. Whilst beneficial in distal and proximal stones, α-blockers were more significantly more effective in treating distal ureteric stones (RR= 1.50 [CI 1.38- 1.62], $I^2= 51\%$ p= <0.00001). Effects did not reach significance in mid ureteric stones likely due to the small number of studies included (Supplementary Figure 5).

60 studies reported mean stone size. Stratified by stone size (less or equal to 5mm vs greater than 5mm) both groups showed a higher stone free rate with alpha-blockers vs standard therapy/control (stone ≤ 5mm: RR 1.19 [CI 1.08-1.31], $I^2=55\%$ p=0.004; stone > 5mm: RR 1.60 [CI 1.44-1.77] $I^2=72\%$, p<0.00001). As expected, the benefit of α-blocker treatment increased with greater stone diameter (Figure 5).
Sensitivity analysis was also performed on non-adherence to study protocol. Seven studies applied intention to treat analysis[18,33,43,48,58,62,65]. Data for remaining studies, which used either per protocol analysis or did not state an analysis method, were then reassessed using an intention to treat protocol. Primary outcome analysis was largely unaffected (RR= 1.51 [CI= 1.39 -1.65] I²= 76% p< 0.00001).

**DISCUSSION**

The pooled results of 67 randomised trials involving 6654 participants suggests that overall α-blockers significantly increase the rate of ureteric stone passage. Use of an α-blocker is associated with a 40% increase in the chance of passing a ureteric stone compared to either standard therapy or placebo. Tamsulosin was used in the majority of studies however all formulations (tamsulosin, doxazosin, terazosin, alfuzosin, silodosin, naftopidil) demonstrated beneficial effects of α-antagonism in stone expulsion. In addition to an increased rate of stone expulsion, α-blockers were associated with a shorter time to stone expulsion.

Variations in outcome measures and study methodologies impeded assessment of secondary outcomes such as pain, analgesic use and side effects. Only nine studies reported diclofenac usage and 11 studies reported pain scores, both of which showed reduce pain with α blocker usage. Conversely, whilst it is acknowledged that side affects are generally poorly reported, a small increased event rate of side effects was seen with α-blockers. Yet treatment appears to be well tolerated. Across
all studies only 21 patients were reported to have withdrawn because of adverse effects.

Significant heterogeneity was demonstrated on analysis. Both the contrast enhanced funnel plot and Peter’s test provided evidence for publication bias.

Yet the effects of bias were shown to be more limited and when adjusted for bias, the results remained significant. As seen in previous analysis, whilst publication bias remains fairly prevalent, its impact on outcomes appears to be far more limited\[80\]. Sensitivity analysis for potential factors of clinical factors proved to be similarly insignificant. In contrast to protocol deviations which did not significantly affect outcomes, an association was seen with overall study quality. Nonetheless even when limited to high quality studies, the beneficial effects of α-blockers remained significant. Stone position and size were also significant factors. A-blockers were significantly more effective in treating stones larger than 5mm with a 38% greater chance of stone passage, likely due to the high spontaneous passage rate of small stones\[1\]. Stone location influenced treatment efficacy as well. Whereas distal stones were 51% more likely to pass with α-blockers, treatment was ineffective for mid and proximal ureteric stones. A-antagonists target the action of α-adrenoreceptors in ureteral smooth muscle. Most abundant subtypes are 1-a and 1-d particularly in the distal ureter where α-blockers will be most effective. In vitro studies have shown both that α-adrenoceptor stimulation promotes peristaltic activity while antagonism reduces ureteric tone\[81-83\]. Smooth muscle relaxation leads to reduced intraureteral pressure increasing urine flow above the stone whilst reducing pressure distally. The net increase in the intraureteral pressure gradient results in a
greater expulsive force[84,85]. Inhibition of peristalsis reduces the painful colic associated with stone passage.

In line with previous reviews, this meta-analysis continues to demonstrate a beneficial effect of α-blockers in treating ureterolithiasis[2-6]. These results contrast with the multicentre SUSPEND trial by Pickard et al that did not show a benefit of α-blocker treatment[16]. Variations in clinical factors and study design were found to have significant effects on trial outcomes but these did not affect the review’s primary outcome.

Whilst the SUSPEND trial’s methodology is in many respects very robust, certain aspects do require further consideration. Although the study included stones less than 10mm, the majority of patients had stones less than 5mm, which have a high chance of passing spontaneously[1]. Subgroup analysis of 282 patients (24.8%) with larger stones (>5mm) was performed showing a trend towards the benefit of tamsulosin over placebo (71.3% vs 60.6%). This did not reach significance but small patient numbers may mean this subgroup analysis was underpowered. Similarly, for stone position a greater but not significant benefit was seen with distal ureteric stones. In contrast our findings for stones over 5mm, based on 3850 patients, demonstrated a significant benefit with α-blockers. Secondly whilst the pragmatic end point of a need for intervention is arguably more useful to the clinician in the field, it is a more imprecise assessment of stone passage rates compared to radiological assessment as used in the majority of studies. Together with a lack of data on compliance rates, there is the potential for under recording stone passages rates especially in the smaller >5mm patient group.
Conclusion

Despite the results of the SUSPEND trial, α-blocker treatment for ureteric stones cannot be conclusively refuted. Particularly in patients with distal stones over 5mm, there is sufficient evidence to support the continued use of medical expulsive therapy with α-blockers.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Number Randomised</th>
<th>Number Analysed</th>
<th>Mean Age (years)</th>
<th>Mean Stone Size (mm)</th>
<th>Stone Expulsion Rate (%)</th>
<th>Stone Expulsion Time (mean days)</th>
<th>Risk of Bias Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdel-Meguid[11]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Placebo</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 81.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Treatment Comparison</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>No. of Patients</td>
<td>P-value</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrawal[20]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Alifuozin 10mg vs. Placebo</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 34</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad[21]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Placebo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 50</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed[59]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Alifuozin 10mg vs. Control</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 29</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Ansari[12]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Placebo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 50</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert[60]</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Silodosin 8mg vs. Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 40</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldemir[22]</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Rowatinex 10mg vs. Control</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 31</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alizadeh[61]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrabal-Martin[23]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autorino[62]</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 32</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avdoshin</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayubov[24]*</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Doxazosin 4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Doxazosin: 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baçi[25]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Nifedipine 10mg vs. Control</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 25</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhat[64]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Alifuozin 10mg vs. Placebo</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Alifuozin: 46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Červenákov[26]</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 51</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cha[27]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs. Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Alifuozin 10mg vs. Control</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg: 41</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chau[28]</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Alifuozin 10mg vs. Control</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Alifuozin: 33</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Siò[29]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Control</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 50</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doluoglo[30]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs. Sexual Intercourse vs. Control</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 21</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dong[31]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs Control</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tamsulosin: 19</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Said[65]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Alifuozin 10mg vs Control</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Alifuozin: 28</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
<td>Treatment 2</td>
<td>Outcome 1</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>Drug Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Gamal[32]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erturhan[33]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Tolterodine 2mg</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eryldirim[66]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferre[34]</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furyk[13]</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgescu[35]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griend[67]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmann[14]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim[36]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam[37]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itoh[38]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itoh[39]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaneko[40]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim[41]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar[68]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küpeli[42]</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laddha[69]*</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee[43]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liatsikos[70]</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Doxazosin 4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lojanapwit[71]</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.2mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitra[44]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohseni[45]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Terazosin 10mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhtarov[46]*</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Doxazosin 4mg vs.</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Treatment Comparison</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TRF</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochoa-Gomez [47]</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro [15]</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Alfuzosin 7mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickard [16]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Nifedipine 30mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porpiglia [48]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg + Deflazacort vs Tamsulosin 0.4mg + Deflazacort vs Placebo</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesh [72]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Tamsulosin + Deflazacort vs Placebo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathi [49]*</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Silodosin 8mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddy [50]</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Nifedipine 10mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resim [51]</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sameer [17]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Nifedipine 30mg vs Alfuzosin 10mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayed [52]</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su [73]</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Silodosin 8mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sümmer [74]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Alfuzosin 10mg vs Prednisolone 16mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun [79]</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Naftopidil 50mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur [18]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Silodosin 8mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taghavi [53]*</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Nifedipine 20mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thapa [54]</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukhali [55]*</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Doxazosin 2mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincendeau [19]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang [76]</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Terazosin 2mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yencilek [56]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yilmaz [57]</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tamsulosin 0.4mg vs Terazosin 5mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yüksel [58]</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Silodosin 4mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zehr [77]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Doxazosin 2mg vs Placebo</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>