Objective
To develop an evidence-based recommendation concerning the use of α-blockers for uncomplicated ureteric stones based on an up-to-date Cochrane review, as the role of medical expulsive therapy for uncomplicated ureteric stones remains controversial in the light of new contradictory trial evidence.

Methods
We applied the Rapid Recommendations approach to guideline development, which represents an innovative approach by an international collaborative network of clinicians, researchers, methodologists and patient representatives seeking to rapidly respond to new, potentially practice-changing evidence with recommendations developed according to standards for trustworthy guidelines.

Results
The panel suggests the use of α-blockers in addition to standard care over standard care alone in patients with uncomplicated ureteric stones (weak recommendation based on low-quality evidence). The panel judged that the net benefit of α-blockers was small and that there was considerable uncertainty about patients’ values and preferences. This means that the panel expects that most patients would choose treatment with α-blockers but that a substantial proportion would not. This recommendation applies to both patients in whom the presence of ureteric stones is confirmed by imaging, as well as patients in whom the diagnosis is made based on clinical grounds only.

Conclusion
The Rapid Recommendations panel suggests the use of α-blockers for patients with ureteric stones. Shared decision-making is emphasised in making the final choice between the treatment options.
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Introduction

This primary care Rapid Recommendation article is one of a series that provides GPs with trustworthy recommendations for potentially practice-changing evidence. A summary is offered here and the full version including decision aids is on the MAGICapp (https://app.magicapp.org/app#/guideline/1822), for all devices in multilayered formats. Those reading and using these recommendations should consider individual patient circumstances, and their values and preferences, and may want to use consultation decision aids in MAGICapp to facilitate shared decision-making with patients. We encourage adaptation and contextualisation of our recommendations to local or other contexts. Those considering use or adaptation of content may go to MAGICapp to link or extract its content for permission to reuse content in this article.

Definition of ureteric colic

Ureteric colic refers to acute pain episodes related to obstructing renal stones that have travelled into the ureter causing partial or complete obstruction. Spontaneous passage rates of small stones (≤4 mm) are reported to vary between 76% and 81% [1,2]. Larger stones may obstruct the ureter, cause episodic severe pain, and in rare cases have life-threatening complications such as sepsis.

Epidemiology

Urinary stones occur frequently worldwide. Prevalence rates of 7–13% are reported in North America, 5–9% in Europe, and 1–5% in Asia [3]. Rates vary greatly based on several factors such as: geography, climate, diet, fluid intake, genetics, gender, occupation, and age [3]. Incidence rates appear to have doubled over the last two decades, but are likely largely the result of increased utilisation of CT [4]. Estimated recurrence rates of urinary stones are between 35% and 50% within 5 years [5]. The 1-year incidence and prevalence of renal colic in general practice are estimated between two and 19 per 1000 patients in The Netherlands and Belgium [6,7].

Causes and risk factors

Most patients with ureteric stones form stones containing calcium, particularly calcium oxalate. Ureteric stones appear to be related to urine composition, which can be affected by patient lifestyle but also by certain conditions and diseases including: hypertension, gout, diabetes mellitus, obesity, and weight gain. Dietary risk factors for calcium oxalate stones that may play a role in the aetiology of stone disease include: a low dietary calcium intake, high oxalate intake (e.g. spinach, potato chips), high animal protein consumption, a low potassium intake, a high sodium intake, and a low fluid intake [8].

Symptoms

Flank pain that may radiate into the groin area, haematuria, as well as nausea and vomiting are classic symptoms of ureteric stones [6]. Less common symptoms include acute or vague abdominal pain, urinary urgency or frequency, difficulty urinating, and penile or testicular pain [8]. Some ureteric stones may be asymptomatic.

Diagnosis

The diagnosis of a suspected ureteric stone is based on clinical signs and symptoms, consisting of acute severe flank pain, the urge to move around, and haematuria [6]. The S.T.O.N.E. [stone size (S), tract length (T), obstruction (O), number of involved calyces (N), and essence or stone density (E)] risk assessment tool uses a combination of five criteria (sex, timing of onset of pain, origin, nausea, and haematuria) to stratify patients into a low, moderate or high probability of having a ureteric stone [9]. A urinary stone was confirmed in 73–99% of patients in the S.T.O.N.E. high-probability group (10–13 points) in a review of four subsequent validation studies in emergency settings [10]. Imaging practice varies in different part of the world. In some countries, management is based on clinical presentation only, whereas in others patients are imaged with CT, ultrasonography of the kidneys, ureter, and bladder or plain radiographs to confirm the diagnosis.

Treatment mechanism of α-blockers

α-Blockers reduce smooth muscle tone and are widely used to treat hypertension. Selective α1-blockers (also called α-adrenergic blocking agents) constitute a subset of this drug class that preferentially block α1-adrenergic receptors in the lower urinary tract. They are widely used to treat LUTS related to BPH [11]. α1-Blockers as medical expulsive therapy (MET) for ureteric stones is an off-label indication of this drug.

Methodology

An international team, including patients with past experience of ureteric stones, GPs, emergency clinicians, urologists familiar with treating renal colic, epidemiologists, and methodologists constituted the guideline panel. No panel member had financial conflicts of interest; intellectual and professional conflicts of interests were minimised and described (Appendix S1). The panel met three times via web conference.

Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach

The panel followed the BMJ Rapid Recommendations procedure for creating a trustworthy recommendation and used the GRADE approach to critically appraise the evidence.
and create recommendations (Appendix S2) [12]. The GRADE approach provides guidance for rating quality of evidence and grading strength of recommendations in healthcare. It has important implications for those summarising evidence for systematic reviews, health technology assessment, and clinical practice guidelines. GRADE provides a systematic and transparent framework based on PICO (population, intervention, comparator and outcome)-structured questions with patient-relevant outcomes, a systematic summary of the evidence, and criteria for moving from evidence to recommendation or decision [13].

Importance of outcomes
The scope of the recommendations and the importance of potential relevant outcomes were individually rated by each panel member on a scale from 1 to 9 (7–9 critical, 4–6 important, 1–3 of limited importance). For each outcome, the mean scores were calculated and outcomes that scored ≥7 were selected for the recommendation, as recommended by GRADE [14]. Pain, hospitalisation, surgery, stone clearance, and major adverse events (MAEs) scored on average ≥7 and were thus rated as critical outcomes.

Summary of the evidence
The summary of the evidence was based on a linked Cochrane systematic review on the effects of -blockers as MET for uncomplicated ureteric stones [15]. The latest literature search date of this review was November 2017, including unpublished data of a randomised clinical trial (RCT) of treatment with tamsulosin to promote passage of urinary stones by Meltzer et al. [16], and data from the single largest trial with >3000 patients from China [17].

From evidence to recommendations
The panel discussed the evidence and formulated specific recommendations. Formal methods were used to reach consensus (Appendix S2). For each outcome, the panel considered the balance of benefits, harms and burden of the interventions, the quality of evidence (Table 1), patient values and preferences, feasibility, and acceptability. The panel assessed the overall quality of evidence, the combined rating of the quality of evidence across all outcomes considered critical [18]. Recommendations can be strong or weak and for or against a certain course of action. The panel took the individual patient perspective when making these recommendations.

Results
Characteristics of studies
Table 2 provides an overview of the trial and patient characteristics of the systematic review. All studies were performed in emergency care settings. Exclusion criteria referred mainly to complicated stones or other abnormalities. There were 67 RCTs included, gathering data from 10 509 patients with confirmed ureteric stones. The intervention consisted of -blockers (mostly tamsulosin), which were compared to either pain medication (52 studies) or to placebo (15 studies). Outcomes of the systematic review were stone clearance, stone expulsion time, number of pain episodes, dose of diclofenac, hospitalisations, and surgical interventions, as well as the occurrence of MAEs. The follow-up period in the studies included was mostly up to 4 weeks. Several predefined subgroup analyses were conducted based on stone size, stone location, and type of -blocker [15]. A sensitivity analysis of solely high-quality trials focused on a subset of trials that had a low risk of bias. This sensitivity analysis formed the basis of the panel’s recommendations for those outcomes where the quality of evidence was rated higher than it would be in the overall analysis. This was the case for one outcome (stone clearance; see paragraph 6.1 in the Cochrane review).

Benefits of -blockers in patients with confirmed stones
-Blockers in patients with confirmed ureteric stones increase stone clearance, probably decrease hospitalisations, and may slightly reduce the number of pain episodes. Stone clearance within the first 4 weeks was 764 per 1000 inpatients that received usual care compared to 833 per 1000 in those receiving -blockers (high-quality evidence). The systematic review suggests that -blockers are more effective for stones of ≥5 mm compared to smaller stones [15].

Approximately 141 per 1000 patients with usual care were hospitalised within 4 weeks, compared to 72 per 1000 in patients with -blockers (moderate-quality evidence). Patients that received usual care experienced 2.2 pain episodes in 4 weeks compared to 1.5 in patients receiving -blockers (low-quality evidence). There was little or no difference between usual care and -blockers on surgical interventions. During the study period, 109 per 1000 patients that received usual care had surgery compared to 81 per 1000 in patients receiving -blockers (low-quality evidence).

Harms of -blockers in patients with confirmed stones
The systematic review evaluated the MAEs, defined as patients that experienced orthostatic hypotension, collapse, syncope, palpitations, or tachycardia [15]. There is little or no difference between usual care and -blockers on MAEs in patients with confirmed stones. In all, 20 per 1000 patients in the usual care group had MAEs compared to...
25 per 1000 in groups that received α-blockers (low-quality evidence).

**Benefits of α-blockers in patients with suspected stones**

Whereas the body of evidence summarised in the Cochrane review that formed the basis of the recommendation was restricted to patients with a stones diagnosis confirmed by imaging, it is common practice in many parts of the world to treat patients based on clinical presentation alone. This adds uncertainty as to the magnitude of the benefit that these patients would experience. Even in a setting where the likelihood of an obstructing ureteric stone is high (for example, >80% based on the S.T.O.N.E. score), a subset of patients would not benefit as they do not have a ureteric stone. The panel judged that the benefits for patients with confirmed stones also apply to patients with suspected stones but that the actual effect size in this population is likely to be smaller as some patients with suspected stones will not have a stone. In addition, they expected substantial variation between how clinicians all over the world would treat patients with suspected stones, depending on the setting (primary or secondary care), the healthcare system, and on the experience of the clinician. For this reason, the panel downgraded the quality of evidence further. Therefore, in patients with suspected ureteric stones, the systematic review showed that α-blockers probably increase stone clearance (moderate quality), may decrease hospitalisation (low quality), and may slightly decrease the number of pain episodes (low quality). There is little or no difference between usual care and α-blockers on surgical interventions (low quality).

**Harms of α-blockers in patients with suspected stones**

Similarly, the panel judged that this evidence also applies to patients with suspected stones. Therefore, the panel judged that there may be little or no difference between usual care and α-blockers on the risk of MAEs (low-quality evidence).

**Patient values and preferences**

The panel judged that patients might perceive small decreases in number of pain episodes as important because the pain intensity is very high. Small reductions in hospitalisations and avoiding surgery might also be relevant to patients. Patients may value the reduction in hospitalisations due to its major impact on one’s life, inability to work, and the associated costs in some countries. Although stone clearance is considered of lesser importance, patients may feel reassured if a stone has passed. The panel judged that patient preferences may vary for these effects. The same considerations should apply to patients with confirmed and suspected ureteric stones.

**Recommendation**

The panel suggests the use of α-blockers in addition to standard care over standard care alone in patients with uncomplicated ureteric stones (weak recommendation based on low overall quality of evidence). The panel judged that the net benefit of α-blockers was small and that there was considerable uncertainty about patients’ values and preferences. This means that the panel expects that most patients would choose treatment with α-blockers but that a substantial proportion would not. In both patients with confirmed and suspected ureteric stones, patients should be treated for 4 weeks or until the stone has passed. This...
recommendation is intended for patients treated by GPs, urologists and emergency physicians.

The infographic (Fig. 1) provides an overview of the recommendations and the absolute benefits and harms of α-blockers for patients with confirmed and suspected ureteric stones. Detailed information can also be viewed through MAGICapp, including decision aids designed to support shared decision-making with patients (https://www.magicapp.org/app#/guideline/1822) (Appendix S3).

Discussion
Why does the panel issue weak recommendations?

Three reasons underlay the panel’s judgement. First, the panel considered the net benefit of α-blockers across outcomes as small. The reduction in number of pain episodes was small, as was the absolute increase in stone clearance due to the high baseline risk of spontaneous stone clearance. Second, there was uncertainty about and variability of patients’ values and preferences. The panel included two patients that helped to inform the likely patients’ values and preferences in this setting but no further published empirical evidence was found on this topic. Third, there was uncertainty on the risk of MAEs due to the risk of bias and serious imprecision in these data. The panel weighted that as important as it was the only outcome on harms in the systematic review. For a substantial proportion of patients, the benefits might therefore not outweigh the uncertainty of the harms, although the possible MAEs are limited. The weak recommendation means shared decision-making to elicit individual patients’ values and preferences is important in clinical practice.

Comparison with current guidelines

Most current guidelines advise the use of α-blockers (tamsulosin, doxazosin, terazosin, alfuzosin, naftopidil and silodosin) or the calcium-channel blocker nifedipine for MET (tamsulosin, doxazosin, terazosin, alfuzosin, naftopidil and silodosin) or the calcium-channel blocker nifedipine for MET (tamsulosin, doxazosin, terazosin, alfuzosin, naftopidil and silodosin). The systematic review showed no difference between groups in MAEs. However, α-blockers may cause dizziness (often: ≥1/100 to <1/10 patients) and orthostatic hypotension (sometimes: ≥1/1000 to <1/100 patients), especially when combined with antihypertensive medication. Other possible AEs are ejaculation disorders (often), fatigue (sometimes), headache (sometimes), itch or a cutaneous rash (sometimes), and rarely floppy iris syndrome during operative cataract treatment [20].

One should be more cautious in the use of α-blockers in patients taking multiple medications because the use of α-blockers may increase the risk of drug–drug and drug–disease interactions in these patients.

α-Blockers are inexpensive. However, the overall impact on costs to the individual patient and the healthcare payer is uncertain when the consequences of each option are considered.
**Recommendation 1**

We suggest the use of α-blockers for the treatment of ureteric stones.

### Comparison of benefits and harms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favours standard therapy or placebo</th>
<th>No important difference</th>
<th>Favours α-blockers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1–8 weeks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pain episodes</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7 fewer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence quality</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median score (meter)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalisations</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69 fewer</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical intervention</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>No important difference</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone clearance</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>69 more</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAEs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No important difference</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practical issues

α-blockers as MET is an off-label use of this drug class. The duration of α-blockers treatments in the RCTs was typically 4 weeks or until stone clearance. Tamsulosin was the most commonly prescribed α-blocker, given as a single dose of 0.4 mg per day.

### Values and preferences

The panel believes that for most patients the possible benefit (small decrease in number of pain episodes and small reduction of hospitalisations) outweighs the risk of AEs. There might be a substantial proportion of patients that chooses not to use α-blockers because of the uncertainty of the benefits and harms. Therefore we issue a weak recommendation.

### Adverse events

There is possibly no difference between groups in MAEs, but α-blockers may cause orthostatic hypotension and dizziness, especially when combined with antihypertensive medication. Other possible AEs are fatigue, headache, ejaculation disorders, itch or a cutaneous rash.
Topics for further research

The treatment preferences and values of patients with ureteric stones is an area that needs future research. No studies were found that examined this topic.

Other topics for further research include the effect and safety profile of α-blockers in different populations, such as patients presenting at the emergency room vs GP practice, in older patients, or in patients with comorbidities.
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