## 4-1 Original study:

The sonographic scanning of the patient in this study from part of routine medical management, there is no patient identification or individual patient detail published

The data were represented and analyzed by using Ms Office excel computer.

After analyzing the collecting data, the following results were obtained.

## 4-2 Results and data analysis:

Table(1)

|  | age | Prostate <br> volume | Voiding urine | Residual <br> Urine |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean | 67.22 | 42.82 | 401.8 | 59.2 |
| standard deviation | 11.05882 | 12.45185 | 120.8759 | 32.62902 |

Table (4-2-1) the incidence of the residual urine in BPH patients:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 | 3 | 6.0 |
| 20 | 4 | 8.0 |
| 30 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 40 | 3 | 6.0 |
| 50 | 13 | 26.0 |
| 60 | 7 | 14.0 |
| 70 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 90 | 6 | 12.0 |
| 100 | 6 | 12.0 |
| 150 | 2 | 4.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-1)

Table (4-2-2) the incidence of volumes of BPH:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 31 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 32 | 4 | 8.0 |
| 34 | 2 | 4.0 |
| 35 | 9 | 18.0 |
| 36 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 37 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 38 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 39 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 40 | 2 | 4.0 |
| 41 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 42 | 2 | 4.0 |
| 44 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 55 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 60 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 61 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 64 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 65 | 3 | 6.0 |
| 81 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-2)

Table (4-2-3) the incidence of age:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $45-49$ year | 1 | 2.0 |
| $50-54$ year | 7 | 14.0 |
| $55-59$ year | 4 | 8.0 |
| $60-64$ year | 12 | 24.0 |
| $65-69$ year | 3 | 6.0 |
| $70-74$ year | 4 | 8.0 |
| $75-79$ year | 9 | 18.0 |
| $80-84$ year | 9 | 18.0 |
| $85-90$ year | 1 | 2.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-3)

Table (4-2-4) the incidence of voiding urine:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 200 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 250 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 300 | 13 | 26.0 |
| 340 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 350 | 3 | 6.0 |
| 400 | 9 | 18.0 |
| 500 | 11 | 22.0 |
| 550 | 1 | 2.0 |
| 600 | 5 | 10.0 |
| 700 | 1 | 2.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-4)

Table (4-2-5) the incidence of cystitis:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 30 | 60.0 |
| 2 | 20 | 40.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-5)

Table (4-2-6) the incidence of the retention urine:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 22 | 44.0 |
| 2 | 28 | 56.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-6)

Table (4-2-7) the incidence of the calcification:

|  | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 18 | 36.0 |
| 2 | 32 | 64.0 |
| Total | 50 | 100.0 |



Fig (4-2-7)

Table (4-2-8) the relation between prostate volume, Cystitis and Calcification

|  |  | Prostate volume | Cystitis | Calcification |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prostatic volume | Pearson Correlation | 1 | $-.296 *$ | $-.494 * *$ |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | . 037 | . 000 |
|  | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Cystitis | Pearson Correlation | -.296* | 1 | . 102 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 037 |  | . 481 |
|  | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Calcification | Pearson Correlation | $-.494^{* *}$ | . 102 | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | . 000 | . 481 |  |
|  | N | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |  |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |  |  |  |  |

Table (4-2-9) the Relation between the prostate volume and cystitis

| prostate <br> volume | Cystitis | Yes | cystitis <br> NO | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $30-39$ | 13 | 15 | 28 |  |
| $40-49$ | 8 | 2 | 10 |  |
| $50-59$ | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |
| $60-69$ | 8 | 2 | 10 |  |
| $70-79$ | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| $80-89$ | 30 | 20 | 50 |  |
| Total |  |  | 1 |  |
| *- |  |  |  |  |


| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 15.671 a | 17 | .547 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 19.331 | 17 | .310 |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 4.296 | 1 | .038 |
| N of Valid Cases | 50 |  |  |
| a. 35 cells (97.2\%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum <br> expected count is .40. |  |  |  |

Fig (4-2-9)(a) the relation between prostate volume and cystitis:


Fig (4-2-9)(b) The relation between the prostate volume and cystitis:


Table(4-2-10) The relation between the prostate volume and Calcification:

| prostate <br> volume | Calcification <br> Yes | Calcification <br> NO | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $30-39$ | 3 | 25 | 28 |
| $40-49$ | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| $50-59$ | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $60-69$ | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| $70-79$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $80-89$ | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 18 | 32 | 50 |


| Chi-Square Tests |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pearson Chi-Square | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |
| Likelihood Ratio | 37.513 | 17 | .036 |
| Linear-by-Linear <br> Association | 11.973 | 1 | .003 |
| N of Valid Cases | 50 | .001 |  |
| a. 35 cells (97.2\%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum |  |  |  |
| expected count is .36. |  |  |  |

Fig (4-2-10)(a) The relation between the prostate volume and calcification:


Fig (4-2-10)(b) The relation between the prostate volume and calcification:


Fig (4-2-11) The relation between the cystitis and calcification:


Fig(4-2-12) the relation between prostate gland volume and voiding urine volume


Fig(4-2-12)

Fig (4-2-13) the relation between prostate gland volume and age


Fig (4-2-13

Fig(4-2-14) the relation between the prostate gland volume and the volume of the residual urine


Fig(4-2-14)

## 5-1 Discussion:

This study screening and prospective one carried in Sudan. Several previous studies in various setting has been supported ultrasonographic scanning as safe, cost effective, reliable, and accurate tool for the volume of the residual urine in the benign prostatic hyperplasia.

According to the results that were shown in the chapter four, depending on ultrasonographic scan done to 50 patients in the study, the researcher found that the (1)has less percentage of volume of the residual urine occurrence $(2 \%)$ the volume ( 70 ml ), and most percentage of the residual urine volume occurrence $(26 \%)$ the volume $(50 \mathrm{ml})$, and the intermediate volume of the residual urine has averaged percentage in compare to other two volume.

Table (4-2-1) showed that the incidence of residual urine volumes represents from the 50 patients.

Table (4-2-2) showed that the incidence of the prostate gland volume represents from the patients.
Table (4-2-3) showed that the incidence of the age represents from the patients.

Table (4-2-4) showed the incidence of voiding urine represents from the patients.

Table (4-2-5) showed that the incidence of the cystitis represents from the patients.

Table (4-2-6) showed that the incidence of the retention urine represents from the patients.

Table (4-2-7) showed that the incidence of the calcification represents from the patients.

Table(4-2-8) showed the relation the prostate volume and both cystitis and calcification ,with cystitis (0.037) , and calcification (0.000).

Table(4-2-9) showed the relation prostate volume and cystitis, when prostate gland volume is increase with the cystitis increased. Table (4-2-10) showed the relation between the prostate volume and calcification ,thus prostate volume is increase the calcification increasing. The fig (4-2-11) showed the relation between cystitis and calcification ,thus cystitis is increase with increasing the calcification. Finally the last three fig(4-2-12),(4-2-13),(4-2-14) showing the relation between prostate gland volume and voiding urine volume ,the relation between prostate gland volume and age, the last one is important showed the relation between the prostate gland volume and the volume of the residual urine, the volume of prostate gland increase with increasing the volume of the residual urine.
The study as establish to demonstrate the use fullness of the ultrasonography in measurement of residual urine volume in BPH it is likely that ultrasonography is suitable for this purpose, and would not confused with other clinical conditions.

