



Introduction: The aim of this study was to compare the efficacy of safe penile prosthesis with or without antibiotic prophylaxis in patients with urinary tract infection and prostate enlargement. The study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital over a period of 12 months. The study included 40 patients who were divided into two groups: Group A (n=20) received safe penile prosthesis with antibiotic prophylaxis, and Group B (n=20) received safe penile prosthesis without antibiotic prophylaxis. The primary outcome was the incidence of urinary tract infection within 30 days of surgery. The secondary outcome was the incidence of urethral stricture. The results showed that the incidence of urinary tract infection was significantly lower in Group A compared to Group B. There was no significant difference in the incidence of urethral stricture between the two groups.

Alpaitersweefollcevdup. Patiterswhoo mplaioed lower urinary tract syndrome (LUTS) underwent Utlars on a gyl ( U S G ), i n t e s , c y t o s c o p y t o c o n f i r m u e t h a l s t r i c t u r e f o r m t a o . A l t h o u g h a i e t r s i n f o l l o w p w h o d i a g n o w e t d e t h a l s t r i c t u r e e t r e a e d w i t h i l b i r f m f o l l o w u e t h a d i l t a o a n d u r t h s e e r b a l i t a t i o n .

Statistical analysis: Data analysis was performed with the help of statistical software. The chi-square test was used to compare the incidence of urinary tract infection between the two groups. The p-value was 0.05, which is considered statistically significant.

**RESULTS**

To a h u m b e r o f p a i e t r s w e e 2 0 0 , n a u n d e d n e a c h o u p . T h e g r a n e d f o m 2 7 t h e y p e a n d h e s p e e t a t e o f f i n d i n g s o t g o u p s f a i e t r a i n g o m p l a i n t h l o w r u r i n a t r y c y n o m e U T S v e d e e c e t d h o u g h U t l a r s o n a g y l ( U S G ) , i n t e s , c y t o s c o p y e s h o w i n t h e T a b l e I F u r t h e r m o r e m m o s t o f u e t e a l s t r i c t u r e s h o w i n t h e T a b l e - I I .

DISCUSSION: The aim of this study was to compare the efficacy of safe penile prosthesis with or without antibiotic prophylaxis in patients with urinary tract infection and prostate enlargement. The study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital over a period of 12 months. The study included 40 patients who were divided into two groups: Group A (n=20) received safe penile prosthesis with antibiotic prophylaxis, and Group B (n=20) received safe penile prosthesis without antibiotic prophylaxis. The primary outcome was the incidence of urinary tract infection within 30 days of surgery. The secondary outcome was the incidence of urethral stricture. The results showed that the incidence of urinary tract infection was significantly lower in Group A compared to Group B. There was no significant difference in the incidence of urethral stricture between the two groups.

This study also showed that the incidence of urinary tract infection was significantly lower in Group A compared to Group B. There was no significant difference in the incidence of urethral stricture between the two groups. The results of this study are in line with other studies that have shown that the use of antibiotic prophylaxis reduces the incidence of urinary tract infection in patients undergoing urological surgery.

The present study has some limitations. The study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital, which may not be representative of other hospitals. The study was a retrospective study, which may be subject to bias. The study did not include a control group.

**CONCLUSION**

This study revealed that the use of safe penile prosthesis with antibiotic prophylaxis significantly reduces the incidence of urinary tract infection in patients with urinary tract infection and prostate enlargement. The use of safe penile prosthesis without antibiotic prophylaxis is associated with a higher incidence of urinary tract infection.

Findings	Group A (only TURP) n (percentage)	Group B (TURP + antibiotic prophylaxis) n (percentage)	P-value
Urinary tract infection	20(20%)	8(8%)	<0.05
UTI	11(11%)	9(9%)	>0.05
Mild BH	15(15%)	16(16%)	>0.05

n= number of patients with respective findings. Table I : Incidence of urinary tract infection and stricture

Part of urethral stricture	Number of patients	Percentage%
Penile urethra	8 out of 28	28.57 %
Meatus	20 out of 28	71.42 %

Table II common site of urethral stricture (n=28)

REFERENCE

1. Li regn ahEM...  
e dP hilade... 2007; 72: 29
2. Pansadom...  
U et h o b m i i a t e r n n U o l o g y 37 1998; 1 24.
3. Nielsen...  
p o s t a t e c o n y. u o l o g y 90; 35: 18
4. Muat M. liss...  
Management of Disease of the Prostate, 3rd  
ed. p e y n l a s i a : H a n s i n t o o k C o ; 2009. p 110
5. Marterim...  
differences: how to choose the right statistical  
test? Biochem Med 2010; 20(1): 15-32.
6. Letz HC...  
Strict... 1997; 117: 194.
7. Jogens...  
follow... 1986; 20: 253.
8. Emmel...  
u e t h o b n y i n 103... 196; 42: 51.
9. Baij...  
p e n t i o n f u e t h a l s t r i c t u f o l l o w i n g R P r i t U o l  
1977; 51: 28.
10. Lund...  
t h e e n o f T U R p o t s o p a t r i e c o m p l i c a t i o n s a S o u l  
n e p o l 1987; 2: 9
11. Bilal...  
m a n e g e m e n t o f o t s a d u t e m e d a t n t s i t e t 1986; 1: 42.
12. Wald...  
p o b l e m i t f U R o s t a t e : T h e v a l u e f o t s o p a t r i e s e l f  
d i a t i a o B r i t U o l , 1984; 56: 202.