Study on the relation of the shape of the uroflowmetrogram and the urethral loss coefficient calculated from the uroflowmetrogram

Author(s)
Nishimoto, Ken-ichi; Tashiro, Koichiro; Yoshida, Naomasa; Harimoto, Koji; Nishikawa, Keiichiro; Tanaka, Tomoaki; Nakatani, Tatsuya; Yasuda, Kosaku

Citation
泌尿器科紀要 (2006), 52(1): 7-10

Issue Date
2006-01

URL
http://hdl.handle.net/2433/113775

Type
Departmental Bulletin Paper

Textversion
publisher
Kyoto University
STUDY ON THE RELATION OF THE SHAPE OF THE UROFLOWMETROGRAM AND THE URETHRAL LOSS COEFFICIENT CALCULATED FROM THE UROFLOWMETROGRAM
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The shape of the uroflowmetrogram reflects voiding conditions. Using a voiding simulation, we examined whether the urethral loss coefficient (LC) calculated from the approximated uroflowmetrogram correlates with parameters that regulate the shape of the uroflowmetrogram.

A total of 161 normal and abnormal uroflowmetograms were used. Normal female subjects and patients before and after transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) were also studied. The ratio of maximum flow rate (Qmax) to flow time (T), a parameter expressing the shape of the uroflowmetrogram, was calculated. The uroflowmetograms were approximated using a voiding model, and the urethral LC was calculated.

As a result, a strong negative correlation was observed between the Qmax-flow time ratio, Qmax/T, and LC. Qmax/T is the vertical to horizontal ratio of the uroflowmetrogram and indicates the average degree of acceleration of flow rate during voiding. On the other hand, urethral LC, which can be estimated from the shape of the uroflowmetrogram, is considered a kind of urethral resistance. We concluded that when urethral resistance is high, the degree of acceleration of flow rate is low on average. Our study also indicated that Qmax/T was less affected by voided volume (VV) compared to Qmax. As Qmax/T is not as dependent on VV, it is useful for comparing cases with different VV.
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INTRODUCTION

The shapes of uroflowmetograms are thought to reflect voiding conditions. This is because the temporal change in flow rate is dependent on the relation of detrusor pressure and urethral resistance during voiding. We have reported a method to distinguish normal and abnormal uroflowmetograms using three parameters regulating the shapes of uroflowmetograms¹⁾. Two of these parameters do not have dimensions while one (Qmax/T) does. This dimension is L³T⁻² and is the same as the temporal change in flow rate.

On the other hand, the urethral loss coefficient (LC) can be calculated from the relation of kinetic energy and pressure loss obtained by approximating the uroflowmetograms using a voiding model²⁾. This LC is a kind of urethral resistance and is presumed to have a negative correlation with the degree of acceleration of flow rate. By comparison with the actually measured Qmax/T ratio, we can determine whether urethral LC can be practically used, whether it can be conveniently substituted by Qmax/T and to what extent Qmax/T reflects urethral LC. For this purpose, we examined the relation between urethral LC and the shape of the uroflowmetrogram.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

A total of 161 normal and abnormal uroflowmetograms were used. In addition, 9 normal female subjects and 16 cases before and after transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) (8 patients) were studied. The Qmax/T ratio was calculated from maximum flow rate (Qmax) and flow time (T) obtained from these curves (Fig. 1). Uroflowmetograms were approximated using our

Fig. 1. Qmax/T shows the vertical to horizontal ratio of the uroflowmetrogram.
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Fig. 2. Pressure components \( (P_L, P_R, P_C) \) of the intraurethral pressure profile \( (P) \) corresponds to uroflow \( (Q) \).

previously reported voiding model\(^3\), and urethral \( LC \) and voided volume \( (VV) \) were calculated\(^5\). As the temporal change in pressure loss contributing to urethral inertial resistance, frictional resistance and elastic resistance can be separately calculated by approximating the uroflowmetograms using our voiding model\(^4\), \( LC \) was calculated as follows. When the integral value of pressure loss during voiding time contributing to inertial, frictional and elastic resistance was \( P_L \), \( P_R \) and \( P_C \), respectively (Fig. 2), and the total sum of energy used for elastic resistance during voiding was \( W_L \), \( LC = (P_R + P_C)/W_L \). \( VV \) was calculated by integrating the approximated flow rate. Age was not taken into consideration.

RESULTS

The relation of \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) and \( LC \) was expressed by the regression line \( Q_{\text{max}}/T = 1.09 \times LC^{-0.64} \) (Fig. 3). The relation of \( Q_{\text{max}} \) and \( LC \) was similarly expressed by \( Q_{\text{max}} = 18.3 \times LC^{-0.56} \). When the contribution of \( VV \) on \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) and \( Q_{\text{max}} \) was studied, the contribution rate of both \( LC \) and \( VV \) on \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) calculated by multivariate analysis was \( R^2 = 0.55 \). The contribution rate of both \( LC \) and \( VV \) on \( Q_{\text{max}} \) was \( R^2 = 0.67 \).

DISCUSSION

Urethral \( LC \) had a negative correlation with \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \), and the contribution rate of \( LC \) alone on \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) was 51% and the correlation coefficient was 0.71. The contribution rate of both \( VV \) and \( LC \) on \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) was 55%. As there was only a 4% increase in the contribution rate when \( VV \) was taken into consideration, the effects of \( VV \) were thought to be minimal. The contribution rate of \( LC \) alone on \( Q_{\text{max}} \) was 36% and the correlation coefficient was 0.6. The contribution rate of both \( LC \) and \( VV \) on \( Q_{\text{max}} \) was 67%. This indicated that the degree of contribution of \( LC \) alone was smaller on \( Q_{\text{max}} \) compared to \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \), while the degree of contribution of both \( LC \) and \( VV \) was similar on \( Q_{\text{max}} \). These results suggested that \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) better reflected urethral \( LC \) compared to \( Q_{\text{max}} \), and that the effects of \( VV \) were minimal on \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \). \( Q_{\text{max}}/T \) is therefore more suitable compared to \( Q_{\text{max}} \) when examining patients with different \( VV \).

\( Q_{\text{max}} \) is often actually used in comparing the degree of changes in lower urinary tract obstruction, but as the degree of contribution of \( LC \) and \( VV \) on \( Q_{\text{max}} \) is about the same, \( Q_{\text{max}} \) is affected not by \( VV \) alone but also by \( LC \) to the same extent. When this relation is illustrated using a \( VV-Q_{\text{max}} \) nomogram, the relation of \( VV-Q_{\text{max}} \) is thought to change with urethral \( LC \) as a parameter\(^5\) (Fig. 4). That is, when \( VV \) is the same, \( Q_{\text{max}} \) increases as \( LC \) decreases and \( Q_{\text{max}} \) decreases as \( LC \) increases. This agrees with actual clinical phenomena.
When Qmax is used to compare urethral resistance, it is necessary to adjust VV to about the same levels. In the result, urethral LC can be calculated non-invasively from the uroflowmetryogram, Qmax/T, and the contribution rate was 51%. As Qmax reflected LC and VV to the same extent, Qmax/T better reflected LC compared to Qmax without being affected as much by VV.

Many factors affect Qmax and Qmax/T. However, it is clinically extremely useful to be able to evaluate the conditions of the urinary tract non-invasively with accuracy. Our results suggested that urethral LC can be evaluated by Qmax/T to some extent.

Qmax/T, Qmax and LC were studied in 9 normal female subjects, 60 normal male subjects without urinary disturbance (included in the 161 cases studied) and 16 cases before and after TURP (8 patients) (Table 1). They were not studied according to VV. For example, there was no significant difference in Qmax between male and female groups (p = 0.064), but there was a significant difference in Qmax/T between male and female groups (p=0.032) (Fig. 5). The ability of Qmax/T to separate a difference among the groups is higher than that of Qmax. We previously reported that the normal value of Qmax/T was 0.78 or more\textsuperscript{1}, and LC equivalent to this value calculated from the regression line was 1.9 (Fig. 3). When the values of LC for both normal female and male subjects are considered, LC of 2 or less is normal, and from the LC value of 1.35±0.92 obtained from normal male subjects (n=60), LC of 4 or more can be regarded as abnormal. LC of 2 to 4 can be considered within the gray zone.

Urethral LC is smaller in normal female subjects compared to normal male subjects, reflecting the anatomical structure of the urinary tract. It is increased in BPH patients before TURP, but urethral resistance decreases and LC improves to about the same as those in normal male subjects after surgery. Qmax/T also improves to normal levels after TURP. Qmax is also higher in female normal subjects compared to normal male subjects and improves after TURP (Fig. 5).

Urethral LC can be calculated non-invasively from the uroflowmetry curve, and if it is used clinically, it can quantitatively express the conditions of the urinary tract. Moreover, our results indicated that as Qmax/T reflects urethral LC, LC can be conveniently estimated from Qmax/T to some extent.
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尿流曲線の形と尿流曲線から計算された尿道の損失係数との関係についての考察
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尿流曲線の形は排尿状態を反映している。排尿のシミュレーションを用い尿流曲線の近似から計算された尿道の損失係数が尿流曲線の形を規定するパラメーターと相関するのか検討した。

合計161例の正常異常尿流曲線を使用した。さらに正常女性、経尿道的前立腺切除術前後の症例についても検討した。尿流曲線の形を表現するパラメーターの1つである最大尿流量（Qmax）と排尿時間（flow time, T）の比を計算した。一方、尿流曲線を排尿モデルで近似し、尿道の損失係数（LC）を計算した。

結果として、Qmax と flow time の比 Qmax/T は LC と強い相関を認めた。

Qmax/T は尿流曲線の縦横比であるが、排尿中の平均的な流量の加速の度合いを示している。一方、尿道の損失係数 LC は尿道の抵抗の一種と考えてよい。抵抗が大きい尿道では、尿流量の加速の程度が平均値として小さい値を示すことが多く、尿流曲線の形が尿道の損失係数を推定できる。Qmax/T は Qmax に比較して排尿の影響が少なかった。Qmax/T は排尿量の依存する程度が小さく排尿量の異なる例を比較するのに適当である。

（泌尿紀要 52：7-10, 2006）