A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EFFICACY OF SILODOSIN AND TAMSULOSIN INPATIENT OF URETERIC CALCULI

Surgery

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar	M.S. (Gen. Surg.), Assistant Professor, Department of surgery, Madhubani Medical College and Hospital, Madhubani, Bihar.
Dr. Vishwa Prakash Jha*	M.S. (Gen. Surg.), Senior Resident, Department of surgery, Madhubani Medical College and Hospital, Madhubani, Bihar.*Corresponding Author
Dr. N. K. Mishra	M.S. (Gen. Surg.), Professor and Head of Department, Department of surgery, Madhubani Medical College and Hospital, Madhubani, Bihar.
Dr. Debarshi Jana	Young Scientist (DST) Institute of Post-Graduate Medical Education and Research, A.J.C. Bose Road, Kolkata-700020, West Bengal, India.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare the efficacy of Silodosin and Tamsulosin as a medical expulsive therapy, in the management of ureteric stone in the term of stone clearance and stone expulsion time.

Patients and method: A prospective randomized study was conducted on 60 patient aged >15 year who had unilateral or bilateral ureteic stone < 6 mm or 6mm. patient were divided in two group. Group A received Tamsulosin (0.4mg) and group B received Silodosin (8 mg) daily for 28 days. the patient were followed up by ultrasonography, plain radiograph of kidney, ureter and bladder and IVU.

Results: There is significantly higher stone clearance rate of 73% in Group A VS in group B of 90% (p value < 0.05). Group B also showed a significant advantage for stone expulsion time. No severe complication were recorded during the treatment period. In Group A, out of 30 patient, 8 patient required ureteroscopic removal of stone or open ureterolithotomy but in group B, only 3 patient required the same.

Conclusion: Our data show that silodosin is more effective than tamsulosin in the management of ureteric stone < 6mm or 6mm for stone clearance rate and stone expulsion rate.

KEYWORDS

INTRODUCTION

The urinary stone disease is one of the most common affection of modern society and has been described since antiquity with the westernization of global culture, affecting 13% of men and 7% of women¹. The life time risk of urinary stone disease is estimated to be between 5% and 12%, in Europe and US, among all urinary stone, 20% present as uretric stone, of which 70% found in lower third of ureter². To date, minimally invasive therapy, such as extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy and ureterolithotripsy, represent efficacious treatment modalities in almost all case. Nevertheless, these procedure imply high cost and not risk free³. A watchful waiting approach has been reported to be associated with spontaneous stone expulsion in up to 50% of the case, but some complication may occur such as urinary tract infection⁴. There has been a paradigm shift in the management of ureteric calculi in the past decades, with the introduction of lesser invasive method and newer drugs. The alpha-1 blocker which were first developed as an anti hypertensive drug, now being effectively use in the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia, due to their relaxing property on urinary tract. Recent studies have reported excellent results with medical expulsion therapy for distal ureteric calculi, with alpha 1 blocker. Both American urological association (AUA) and European association of urology (EAU) also recommended alpha 1 blocker for the treatment of ureteric stone. Their use in the treatment of distal ureteric stone arose from the consent that they could induce a selective relaxation of ureteral smooth muscles, which could inhibit the urethral spasm and results in dialation of ureteral lumen.

In 1970, Malin et al demonstrated the presence of alpha and beta adrenergic receptor (AR) in the human ureter⁵. Alpha 1 are the most abundant subtype at the level of ureteric smooth muscles⁶. Itoh et al alpha 1a, alpha 1B, alpha 1D). Antagonist of these receptor have been prove to decrease ureteric basal tone, peristalsis activity and contraction thus decreasing intraureteric pressure and increasing urine transport. these meta-analysis have confirmed a positive effect of alpha blocker therapy on stone expulsion rate⁷. Alpha blocker has been proved to improve the likelihood of spontaneous stone passage and to decrease both the time to stone passage and analgesic requirement⁸.

According to European Association of urology Guideline, alpha blocker are recommended for Medical expulsion therapy⁹. Patient who elect for MET should have well controlled pain, no clinical evidence of sepsis and adequate renal function reserve¹⁰.

The alpha 1A/D selective alpha blocker TAMSULOSIN has been demonstrated to be safe and effective drug that enhance spontaneous passage of distal ureteric stone seized 10 mm or smaller¹¹. recent studies have demonstrated that the Alpha 1A subtype plays the major role in mediating phenylephrine induced contraction in the human isolated ureter. Kobayashi et al found that the selective alpha 1A adrenergic receptor antagonist, SILODOSIN was more effective than the selective alpha 1D adrenergic receptor antagonist, BMY-7378, for noradrenaline induced contraction in the human ureter¹². According to Tsuzaka et al, silodosin was clinically superior for stone expulsion when compare to tamsulosin¹³.

Hence, a study was planned to see the efficacy of SILODOSIN (8mg/day) – a new alpha 1a antagonist with TAMSULOSIN (0.4mg/day) -alpha 1A/ 1D antagonist.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In MMCH, All cases of flank pain or lower abdominal pain with urinary symptoms were admitted either in emergency or OPD. After proper investigation, 60 patients having ureteric calculi without hydronephrotic changes or any congenital anomaly or any evidence of infection were selected in study.

This prospective study was conducted during the period of August 2019 to July 2020 in Department of Surgery, Madhubani Medical College & hospital, Madhubani, Bihar.

Each patient was examined thoroughly after taking detailed history. The diagnosis and examination was made with history, clinical features and CBC, B/Urea, S/ Creatinine, Routine urine, digital X-RAY KUB, IVU, USG of whole abdomen to support the diagnosis.

- The patients evaluated with ureteic stones were managed conservatively. Every patient provided consent after receiving information about nature of study, time of study end, adverse effect, and the possibility of intervention if needed.

The patients confirmed with stone in ureter were divided in two groups by random selection. The patients were divided into two groups as follows:

- Group A:** Patients with ureteral calculi received single dose of Tamsulosin (0.4mg/day)

- Group B : patient with ureteric calculi received single dose of Silodosin (8 mg/day).

Both the group were strictly instructed to drink minimum of 2 litre of water daily and to use symptomatic treatment with tab diclofenac on demand. All the patients were advised to filter/strain their urine stream to detect stone passage or collect the urine in transparent container and to stop medication when the stone was expelled and report for confirmation.

The duration of trial was until expulsion of the stone, but no longer than 4 weeks.

The patients were then observed weekly and asked for any history of passage of calculi and digital X-RAY KUB & ultrasound scan was repeated after 15 days to look for any passage of calculi.

The findings were recorded and the patients were monitored and followed up for a period of one month. The passage of stones, was confirmed with ultrasonography & digital X-RAY KUB.

After 1 month if treatment failed, conservative management was discontinued and patient was advised for surgical intervention in higher centre where facilities for URS and ESWL is available.

INCLUSION CRITERIA

- Patients with age > 15 years
- Calculus in the ureter with stone size 6mm or less
- Stones at multiple sites were also included.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA:

- Stone larger than 6mm
- Patient who undergone same treatment before
- Clinical and laboratory signs of urinary tract infections (UTIs)
- Severe hydronephrosis on ultrasound examination (gross pelvicalyceal dilatation with parenchymal thinning).
- Co-morbid conditions such as diabetes, alteration in renal parameters (serum creatinine > 1.5mg/dl).
- Previous history of ureteral manipulation and/or surgery.
- Pregnancy.
- Urethral stricture
- Patient on alpha / beta blocker or CCB or steroid.
- Patient who are hypersensitive to tamsulosin or silodosin.

In each case studied, an elaborate history and physical examination and relevant investigations were carried out as depicted in proforma.

The treatment of the cases consisted of Alpha blocker drug tamsulosin (0.4 mg/daily) and silodosin 8mg/day given orally for 30 patients in each group along with NSAIDs, prednisolone in tapering dose and plenty of oral fluids. Patients who failed to expel the calculus with the above treatment were sent to Department of Urology for ureteroscopic removal of stone.

The patients were followed up for one month.

RESULT:

Data were collected and compared in terms of patients demographics, socio economic status, stone status, stone size and site of stone, stone expulsion rate and incidence of side effect.

The stone clearance rate was significantly different between the group, at 73% in group A and 90% in group B ($p = 0.05$). In group B, stone expulsion time was also significantly shorter than group A with mean of 19.1 days as compared to Group A with mean of 22.9 days.

Treatment outcome parameters in these Group

	Tamsulosin(A)	Silodosin(B)	P value
Expulsion rate	73% (23)	90% (27)	<0.05
Stone expulsion time (mean)	22.9	19.1	<0.05
Failure rate	27%	10%	<0.05

Demographic characteristics of these group.

Characteristic	Group A (tamsulosin)	Group B (silodosin)
Mean Age (in year)	32.6	29.6
Sex (male/female)	17/13	18/12
Laterality (right/ left)	19/11	13/17
Location (upper/ middle/ lower)	3/10/17	6/6/18
Mean Stone size (in mm)	5.7(1.2)	5.3(1.6)

In our study, in the group A, 3% of patients passed the ureteric calculus within 7 days, 6.7% of the patients passed the calculus within 14 days, 30% of the patients passed the calculus within 21 days and 33.3% of the patients passed the calculus within 28 days of follow up with mean expulsion time is 22.9 days. 26.6% patients did not pass the calculus. P value is less than 0.05, hence statistically significant.

In group B, 13% of patient passed stone within 1st week, 23% passed stone within 2nd week, 26.6% of patient passed stone within 3rd week and same 26.6% of patient passed stone within 4th week with mean expulsion time is 19.1 days. 10% patient did not pass the calculus. P value is less than 0.05, hence statistically significant.

Time of expulsion of stone in both the GROUP

Time of expulsion in week	Group A (Tamsulosin)	Group B (Silodosin)
1 st week	1	4
2 nd week	2	7
3 rd week	9	8
4 th week	10	8
Failure (in number)	8	3
Failure%	26.6	10
Mean expulsion time	22.9 days(5.6)	19.1 days(7.2)

In Group A, 6.7% (2 patient) of the patient had orthostatic hypotension which was the most common side effect of this group. Only one patient had dizziness, retrograde ejaculation, dizziness, nasal congestion and headache.

But in group B, 10% (3 patients) of the patient had retrograde ejaculation which was the most common side effect of this group. Two patients developed mild nasal congestion and only one patient had mild headache. None of the patients of group B developed orthostatic hypotension and dizziness.

Side effect	Group A	Group B
Orthostatic hypotension	2	0
Retrograde ejaculation	1	3
Dizziness	1	0
Nasal congestion	1	2
Headache	1	1

DISCUSSION:

Ureteroscopy and SWL remains the most effective treatment for ureteric stone, however, they are expensive and not risk free. Spontaneous stone expulsion can occur in up to 50% of cases. Nevertheless, these complications as ureteric colic, UTI, hydronephrosis may occur. Recently, the use of various adjuvant medication as MET for ureteric stone help to reduce pain, complication, and increase the rate of stone clearance^(12,13).

The alpha 1A and alpha 1D adrenoreceptor are the most abundant subtype in distal ureter, stimulation of these alpha 1 adrenoreceptor leads to increase in both the frequency of ureteric peristalsis and force of contraction. However, blockade of these receptors decrease basal ureteric tone, decrease peristalsis frequency and amplitude leading to decrease in intraluminal pressure while the rate of urine transport increase and thus increasing chance of stone passage¹⁴.

Highly selective alpha 1A adrenoreceptor blockers have been developed to minimize the cardiovascular adverse effect while maintaining the efficacy on urinary tract¹⁵. Tamsulosin is selective alpha 1 blocker with 10 fold greater affinity for alpha 1A and alpha 1D adrenoreceptor subtype than the alpha 1B subtype, while the affinity of Silodosin for alpha 1A subtype is about 162 and 50 fold greater than its affinity for the alpha 1B and alpha 1D adrenoreceptor subtype respectively, which explain weak cardiovascular adverse effect of Silodosin.

In our present study, the stone clearance rate was significantly higher in silodosin group (90%) compared with the tamsulosin group (73%) with $p < 0.05$. Mean stone expulsion time in silodosin group is significantly low (19.1 days) as compared to tamsulosin (22.9 days). Study done by Gupta et al¹⁶ who reported stone clearance rate of 82% and 64% for silodosin and tamsulosin respectively with stone expulsion time in the silodosin and tamsulosin at 12.5(3.5) vs 19.5 (7.5) days respectively. However, Imperatore et al¹⁷ reported a nonsignificant difference of stone clearance rate between silodosin (88%) and tamsulosin (84%).

For safety issue and adverse effect, both drug are safe and well tolerated and the most frequently encountered side effect in Silodosin group was retrograde ejaculation which is reported in 10% and 3% in tamsulosin group (A). Postural hypotension is most common in tamsulosin group (6.7)% which was managed conservatively. No patient discontinued treatment because of retrograde ejaculation and postural hypotension as both were reversible.

CONCLUSION:

Tamsulosin and silodosin are safe and effective treatment that enhance spontaneous passage of stone sizes 6mm or smaller. Silodosin are more effective than tamsulosin in term of stone expulsion rate 90% and 73% respectively (p value< 0.05) as well time taken for the stone expulsion 19.1 ± 5.6 days and 22.9 ± 7.2 days respectively (p value<0.05). Our study also demonstrate lower incidence of orthostatic hypotension (0%) in case of silodosin but slight higher incidence of abnormal ejaculation (10%) as compared to tamsulosin (3.3%).

REFERENCES

- Hollingsworth JM, Rogers MA, Kaufman SR et al, medical therapy to facilitate urinary stone : a meta analysis , Lancet 2006 , 368(9542); 1171-19.
- wolf JS , treatment selection and outcome : ureteral calculi , uroclinNorth Am 2007;34(3):421-30.
- Dellabella M, Milanese G, Muzzonigro G. Randomized trial of the efficacy of tamsulosin, nifedipine and phloroglucinol in medical expulsive therapy for distal ureteral calculi. J Urol. 2005; 174:167-72.
- Borghi L, Meschi T, Amat F, et al. Nifedipine and methylprednisolone in facilitating urethral stone passage : a randomised , double blind , placebo-controlled study . J Urol 1994;152(4):1095-8
- Malin JM Jr, Deane RF, Boyarsky S. Characterisation of adrenergic receptors in human ureter. Br J Urol. 1970; 42:171-4.
- Itoh Y, Kojima Y, Yasui T, et al. Examination of alpha 1 adrenoceptor subtypes in the human ureter. Int J Urol. 2007; 14:749-53.
- De Sio M, Autorino R, Di Lorenzo G, et al. Medical expulsive treatment of distal-ureteral stones using tamsulosin: a single-center experience. J Endourol. 2006; 20:12-6.
- Watts HF, Tekwani KL, Chan CW, et al. The effect of alpha blockade in emergency patient with ureterolithiasis. J emerg med 2010;38:368-73.
- Hollingsworth JM, Rogers MA, Kaufman SR, et al, Hollenbeck Medical therapy to facilitate urinary stone passage: a meta-analysis. Lancet. 2006; 368:1171-9.
- Türk C, Knoll T, Petrik A, et al. Guidelines on Urolithiasis European Association of Urology Updated March 2011.
- Kobayashi S, Tomiyama Y, Hoyano Y, et al. Gene expressions mechanical functions of 1-adrenoceptor subtypes in mouse ureter. World J Urol. 2009; 27:775-80.
- Tsuzaka Y, Matsushima H, Kaneko T, et al. Naftopidil vs silodosin in medical expulsive therapy for ureteral stones: a randomized controlled study in Japanese male patients. Int J Urol. 2011; 18:792-5.
- Dellabella M, Milanese G, Muzzonigro G. Randomized trial of the efficacy of tamsulosin, nifedipine and phloroglucinol in medical expulsive therapy for distal ureteral calculi. J Urol 2005; 174:167-72.
- Griwan MS, Singh SK, Paul H, Pawar DS, Verma M. The efficacy of tamsulosin in lower ureteral calculi. Urol Ann 2010; 2:63-06.
- Rossi M, Roumegue' re T. Silodosin in the treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Drug Des Dev Ther 2010; 27(4):291-7.
- Kumar S, Jayant K, Agrawal MM, Singh SK, Agrwal S, Parmar KM. Role of tamsulosin, tadalafil, and silodosin as the medical expulsive therapy in lower ureteric stone: a randomized trial (pilot study). Urology 2015; 85:59-63.
- Imperatore V, Fusco F, Creta M, Di Meo S, Buonopane R, Longo N, et al. Medical expulsive therapy for distal ureteric stones: tamsulosin versus silodosin. Arch Ital Urol Androl 2014; 86:103-07