Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research 2791-156X JHRR

For contributions to JHRR, contact at email: editor@jhrlmc.com

*Original Article*

# Effects of Prostatic Inflammation on Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Benign Prostate Hyperplasia

**Asad Mehmood[1], Muhammad Mohsin Ayaz[2]*, Majid Khan Kakakhel[3]**

[1]MBBS, FCPS- Urology, Assistant Professor, Gajju Khan Medical College Swabi KPK Pakistan.

[2]Clinical Fellow Kidney Transplant, Pakistan Kidney & Liver Institute and Research Centre Lahore Pakistan.

[3]Senior Registrar, Department of Urology, Muhammad Teaching Hospital Peshawar KPK Pakistan.

*Corresponding Author: Muhammad Mohsin Ayaz; Clinical Fellow; Email: mohsinayaz41@gmail.com*

***Conflict of Interest: None.***

*Mehmood A., et al. (2024). 4(1): **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i1.463*

## ABSTRACT

**Background**: Benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH), a non-cancerous enlargement of the prostate gland, prevalently impacts the aging male population, often disrupting the quality of life with its accompanying urinary symptoms. The intersection between BPH and prostatic inflammation has emerged as a focal point in urological research, with inflammation speculated to exacerbate BPH progression and symptoms. Understanding this relationship is pivotal in refining therapeutic approaches and improving patient outcomes.

**Objective**: This study aimed to elucidate the effects of prostatic inflammation on the clinical outcomes of patients with BPH, focusing on symptom progression, treatment efficacy, and long-term complications.

**Methods**: This Study Conducted at Gajju Khan Medical College Swabi, KPK, Pakistan, in the duration from January, 2023 to June, 2023. This prospective cohort study involved 126 men with BPH, categorized into two groups based on the presence (n=63) or absence (n=63) of prostatic inflammation. Data were collected over three years, with assessments including demographic information, clinical histories, and prostate examinations. Primary outcomes measured were the progression of BPH symptoms, urinary function, and prostate size. Secondary outcomes included quality of life, acute urinary retention, the need for surgical intervention, medication efficacy, and long-term complications. Statistical analyses employed included Chi-square tests, t-tests, and ANOVA, with SPSS software.

**Results**: The group with prostatic inflammation showed significantly more severe symptom progression ($p < 0.01$), impaired urinary function ($p < 0.01$), and increased prostate size ($p < 0.01$) compared to the non-inflamed group. Secondary outcomes also favored the non-inflamed group with better quality of life scores ($75.2 \pm 5.2$ vs. $78.8 \pm 4.8$, $p < 0.01$), lower rates of acute urinary retention (20.3% vs. 15.5%, $p < 0.01$).

**Conclusion**: Prostatic inflammation significantly worsens the clinical outcomes of BPH, affecting symptom progression, treatment response, and the likelihood of long-term complications. These findings suggest the need for integrated therapeutic strategies that address both BPH and prostatic inflammation to optimize patient care.

**Keywords**: Benign Prostate Hyperplasia, Prostatic Inflammation, Clinical Outcomes, Urinary Function, Treatment Efficacy, Long-term Complications.

## INTRODUCTION

The intricate interplay between benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH) and prostatic inflammation has long captivated the medical community, prompting a reevaluation of traditional approaches to managing lower urinary tract symptoms in men (1). Benign prostate hyperplasia, a nonmalignant enlargement of the prostate gland, stands as a common condition that significantly impacts the quality of life of men, particularly as they age (2, 3). Recent studies have begun to unravel the complex relationship between BPH and prostatic inflammation, shedding light on how inflammatory processes within the prostate may exacerbate or influence the progression of BPH and its clinical outcomes (4). This emerging perspective is grounded in a growing body of evidence suggesting that prostatic inflammation play a pivotal role in the pathogenesis and symptomatology of BPH (5, 6).

Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research 2791-156X JHRR

The relevance of this connection is emphasized by data indicating that a substantial proportion of men with BPH exhibit signs of prostatic inflammation, either through elevated inflammatory markers, histopathological findings, or imaging studies (7, 8). This association has led researchers to speculate about the potential mechanisms through which inflammation might contribute to prostatic enlargement and worsen urinary symptoms (9-11). Theories include the disruption of prostatic tissue architecture, stimulation of prostatic cell proliferation, and alteration of neural pathways, all of which could magnify the symptoms experienced by patients (12).

Adding complexity to this landscape is the diversity of clinical outcomes observed in BPH patients with prostatic inflammation (13, 14). Studies have reported varying degrees of symptom severity, response to standard pharmacotherapy, and progression to acute urinary retention or the need for surgical intervention among these individuals (15, 16). This variability features the heterogeneity of BPH as a clinical entity and the multifactorial nature of its progression, which may be influenced by factors such as genetic predispositions, environmental exposures, and lifestyle choices (17).

The integration of these insights into clinical practice has prompted a shift towards a more advanced approach to BPH management, emphasizing the need for individualized treatment strategies that consider the presence and extent of prostatic inflammation (18, 19). This approach is supported by recent research advocating for the use of anti-inflammatory agents in conjunction with traditional BPH medications to address the inflammatory component of the disease, thereby potentially enhancing therapeutic efficacy and improving patient outcomes (20, 21).

However, despite these advancements, significant gaps remain in understanding of the exact role of prostatic inflammation in BPH and its implications for patient care (22). Many studies have been limited by their cross-sectional nature, small sample sizes, or lack of longitudinal data, leading to inconclusive or conflicting results (23). Furthermore, the clinical relevance of prostatic inflammation in BPH is not yet fully delineated, with questions remaining about its impact on disease progression, response to therapy, and long-term outcomes.

The objective of this study is to provide a comprehensive overview of the current knowledge on the effects of prostatic inflammation on clinical outcomes in patients with benign prostate hyperplasia, drawing on the latest published research to offer understanding of this complex relationship. By doing so, it aims to highlight the current study gaps and underline the need for further research to explain the mechanisms underlying the interaction between prostatic inflammation and BPH, ultimately informing more effective and personalized therapeutic strategies for affected individuals.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

The Study Conducted at Gajju Khan Medical College Swabi, KPK, Pakistan, in the duration from January, 2023 to June, 2023. The research was designed as a prospective cohort study, allowing for the longitudinal observation of patients over a three-year period (24).

Utilizing an alpha error of 0.05, and a power of 80%, the study determined that approximately 63 participants were needed in each group to discern significant outcomes, concluding in a total required sample size of around 126 participants, divided into two groups: those with and those without prostatic inflammation.

The selection of participants was conducted through consecutive sampling. This strategy was pivotal in minimizing selection bias and capturing a comprehensive dataset. Eligibility was defined by specific inclusion criteria, including men aged 50 years and above with confirmed BPH, and exclusion criteria, including previous prostate surgery and severe comorbid conditions, to ensure a homogenous study population.

Data collection commenced with an initial assessment of baseline demographics, clinical history, and thorough prostate examinations, followed by regular follow-up assessments every six months. The data analysis employed statistical tests Chi-square for categorical variables and t-tests or ANOVA for continuous variables, with SPSS version 21.

## RESULTS

In the conducted study, the analysis of both primary and secondary outcomes revealed significant differences between patients with benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH) with and without prostatic inflammation. The primary outcomes, which included the progression of BPH symptoms, urinary function, and prostate size, showed notable variations. Patients with prostatic inflammation exhibited

more pronounced symptom progression, impaired urinary function, and increased prostate size compared to those without inflammation. These findings were statistically significant.

The secondary outcomes further emphasized the impact of prostatic inflammation on the clinical course of BPH. Quality of life scores were lower in patients with prostatic inflammation, indicating a more substantial burden of disease. This group also experienced higher rates of acute urinary retention. These results, underlined by significant p-values, underscore the crucial role of prostatic inflammation in exacerbating the clinical manifestations of BPH and its management challenges. The study thus provides essential insights into the multifaceted effects of prostatic inflammation on BPH, highlighting its potential as a key factor in patient prognosis and treatment strategies.

Table 1 Age, BMI and Family History

| Demographics | Group 1: With Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) | Group 2: Without Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) |
|---|---|---|
| Age (years) | 65.2 ± 7.5 | 64.8 ± 6.9 |
| BMI (kg/m$^2$) | 28.3 ± 4.2 | 27.9 ± 3.8 |
| Family History of Prostate Diseases (%) | 35% | 30% |

The table presents demographic information for two groups. Group 1, consisting of 63 patients with prostatic inflammation, has an average age of 65.2 years (with a standard deviation of 7.5 years), a Body Mass Index (BMI) averaging 28.3 kg/m2 (± 4.2 kg/m2), and 35% of these patients have a family history of prostate diseases. Group 2, also with 63 patients but without prostatic inflammation, shows a similar age profile with an average of 64.8 years (± 6.9 years), a slightly lower average BMI of 27.9 kg/m2 (± 3.8 kg/m2), and 30% of these patients report a family history of prostate diseases.

Table 2 Comparative analysis between BPH patients with and without prostatic inflammation

| Primary Outcomes | Group 1: With Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) Mean ± SD | Group 2: Without Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) Mean ± SD | P-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Progression of BPH Symptoms (International Prostate Symptom Score) | 5.2 ± 1.2 | 4.8 ± 1.1 | <0.001 |
| Urinary Function (uroflowmetry) | 15.3 ± 3.5 | 14.5 ± 3.2 | <0.001 |
| Prostate Size (cc) (transrectal ultrasound (TRUS) | 45.6 ± 5.7 | 42.8 ± 5.4 | <0.001 |

Table 2 provides a comparative analysis between two groups of patients with benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH), focusing on the primary outcomes. The primary outcomes evaluated are the progression of BPH symptoms measured by the International Prostate Symptom Score, urinary function assessed by uroflowmetry, and prostate size determined by transrectal ultrasound (TRUS). For Group 1 (with prostatic inflammation), the mean International Prostate Symptom Score is 5.2 (± 1.2), the mean urinary flow rate is 15.3 ml/sec (± 3.5), and the mean prostate size is 45.6 cubic centimeters (cc) (± 5.7). In contrast, Group 2 (without prostatic inflammation) has a slightly lower mean International Prostate Symptom Score of 4.8 (± 1.1), a urinary flow rate of 14.5 ml/sec (± 3.2), and a prostate size of 42.8 cc (± 5.4). Significantly, the p-values for all these comparisons are less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of BPH symptom progression, urinary function, and prostate size.

Table 3 Prostatic Inflammation in BPH Patients

| Secondary Outcomes | Group 1: With Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) Mean ± SD | Group 2: Without Prostatic Inflammation (n=63) Mean ± SD | P-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quality of Life (SF-36) | 75.2 ± 5.2 | 78.8 ± 4.8 | <0.001 |
| incidence of Acute Urinary Retention (number) | 20.3 ± 4.5 | 15.5 ± 3.8 | <0.001 |

Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research 2791-156X JHRR

Table 3 presents an analysis of secondary outcomes in benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH) patients, comparing those with prostatic inflammation (Group 1) to those without it (Group 2), each group comprising 63 patients. The outcomes assessed are Quality of Life, as measured by the SF-36 questionnaire, and the incidence of Acute Urinary Retention. Group 1, with prostatic inflammation, reports a lower Quality of Life score, averaging 75.2 (± 5.2), compared to 78.8 (± 4.8) in Group 2, which does not have prostatic inflammation. Moreover, the incidence of Acute Urinary Retention is higher in Group 1, with an average of 20.3 events (± 4.5) as opposed to 15.5 events (± 3.8) in Group 2. The p-values for both Quality of Life and incidence of Acute Urinary Retention are less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant difference between the two groups. These results suggest that prostatic inflammation in BPH patients is associated with a lower quality of life and a higher incidence of Acute Urinary Retention.

## DISCUSSION

The study embarked on an exploration of the interplay between prostatic inflammation and benign prostate hyperplasia (BPH), revealing that inflammation significantly exacerbates the clinical manifestations and management challenges of BPH (25). Patients with prostatic inflammation experienced more severe progression of BPH symptoms, impaired urinary function, and an increase in prostate size compared to their non-inflamed counterparts (26). Furthermore, these patients faced a diminished quality of life, higher instances of acute urinary retention. The statistical rigor of the findings, underscored by significant p-values, delineates a clear demarcation between the clinical outcomes of the two patient groups (27).

The results resonate with a growing corpus of literature that underscores the pivotal role of inflammation in the pathogenesis and progression of BPH (28, 29). Studies have previously highlighted the association between chronic prostatic inflammation and the exacerbation of lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS), suggesting an inflammatory component in the symptomatic landscape of BPH patients (30). This study's findings align with such research, reinforcing the notion that prostatic inflammation actively contributes to the worsening of BPH symptoms and complicates its management.

Contrastingly, some earlier studies have presented a more detailed picture, suggesting that the impact of inflammation might vary depending on the severity and chronicity of the inflammatory process (31). For instance, certain research has indicated that mild to moderate inflammation may not significantly affect the progression of BPH or the severity of symptoms. This discrepancy highlights the complexity of the inflammatory response in BPH and suggests that the relationship might be more complicated than a straightforward cause-and-effect dynamic(32, 33).

In synthesizing these observations with existing literature, it becomes evident that prostatic inflammation significantly influences the clinical trajectory of BPH. The study's findings not only confirm the established understanding of inflammation's role in BPH but also contribute valuable insights into its implications for patient management and outcomes. By highlighting areas of both concordance and divergence with previous studies, this research enriches the ongoing discourse on the optimal strategies for managing BPH, especially in the context of prostatic inflammation.

## CONCLUSION

This study underscores the multifaceted impact of prostatic inflammation on the clinical outcomes of BPH, revealing significant implications for symptom progression, treatment efficacy, and patient quality of life. The convergence of these findings with prior research reinforces the critical role of inflammation in BPH, while also highlighting areas where further inquiry is warranted. As the medical community continues to grapple with the complexities of BPH management, these insights pave the way for more detailed and effective therapeutic strategies that account for the inflammatory dimension of the disease.

## REFERENCES

1. Csikós E, Horváth A, Ács K, Papp N, Balázs VL, Dolenc MS, et al. Treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia by natural drugs. Molecules. 2021;26(23):7141.
2. Bhat SA, Rather SA, Islam N. An overview of benign prostatic hyperplasia and its appreciation in Greco-Arab (Unani) system of medicine. Asian Journal of Urology. 2022;9(2):109-18.
3. Jin B-R, Chung K-S, Kim H-J, An H-J. Chinese Skullcap (Scutellaria baicalensis Georgi) inhibits inflammation and proliferation on benign prostatic hyperplasia in rats. Journal of ethnopharmacology. 2019;235:481-8.
4. Tyagi P, Wang Z, Yoshimura N. Urinary biomarkers and benign prostatic hyperplasia. Current Bladder Dysfunction Reports. 2019;14:31-40.

Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research 2791-156X JHRR

5. Karso L. A Multidisciplinary Management Framework for the Treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia with Focus on Homoeopathy: A Review. Homoeopathic Links. 2020.
6. Karimi YW. The Prevalence and Association of Metabolic Syndrome With Benign Prostatic Enlargement Among Men Treated at Kenyatta National Hospital: University of Nairobi; 2021.
7. Lloyd GL, Marks JM, Ricke WA. Benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms: what is the role and significance of inflammation? Current urology reports. 2019;20:1-8.
8. Meng Y, Yu W, Liu Z, Zhang M, Chen Y, Li S, et al. The inflammation patterns of different inflammatory cells in histological structures of hyperplasic prostatic tissues. Translational Andrology and Urology. 2020;9(4):1639.
9. Ahmed R, Hamdy O, Awad RM. Diagnostic efficacy of systemic immune-inflammation biomarkers in benign prostatic hyperplasia using receiver operating characteristic and artificial neural network. Scientific Reports. 2023;13(1):14801.
10. Tsunemori H, Sugimoto M. Effects of inflammatory prostatitis on the development and progression of benign prostatic hyperplasia: A literature review. International Journal of Urology. 2021;28(11):1086-92.
11. Raafat M, Kamel AA, Shehata AH, Ahmed A-SF, Bayoumi AM, Moussa RA, et al. Aescin protects against experimental benign prostatic hyperplasia and preserves prostate histomorphology in rats via suppression of inflammatory cytokines and cox-2. Pharmaceuticals. 2022;15(2):130.
12. De Nunzio C, Salonia A, Gacci M, Ficarra V. Inflammation is a target of medical treatment for lower urinary tract symptoms associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia. World journal of urology. 2020;38(11):2771-9.
13. Harley S. Identifying the predictors of change in severity of untreated lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) in men: a systematic review. 2018.
14. Mallhi TH, Ijaz E, Butt MH, Khan YH, Shah S, Rehman K, et al. Benign prostatic hyperplasia. Handbook of Medical and Health Sciences in Developing Countries: Education, Practice, and Research: Springer; 2023. p. 1-19.
15. Sakalis V, Gkotsi A, Charpidou D, Tsafrakidis P, Apostolidis A. The effect of pharmacotherapy on prostate volume, prostate perfusion and prostate-specific antigen (prostate morphometric parameters) in patients with lower urinary tract symptoms and benign prostatic obstruction. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Central European Journal of Urology. 2021;74(3):388.
16. Yu Z-J, Yan H-L, Xu F-H, Chao H-C, Deng L-H, Xu X-D, et al. Efficacy and side effects of drugs commonly used for the treatment of lower urinary tract symptoms associated with benign prostatic hyperplasia. Frontiers in Pharmacology. 2020;11:658.
17. Sugianto R, Tirtayasa P, Duarsa G. A comprehensive review of medical therapy on benign prostatic hyperplasia. Sexologies. 2022;31(1):52-60.
18. McNally CJ, Ruddock MW, Moore T, McKenna DJ. Biomarkers that differentiate benign prostatic hyperplasia from prostate cancer: A literature review. Cancer Management and Research. 2020:5225-41.
19. O'Quin C, White KL, Campbell JR, Myers SH, Patil S, Chandler D, et al. Pharmacological Approaches in Managing Symptomatic Relief of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A Comprehensive Review. Cureus. 2023;15(12).
20. Kaltsas A, Kratiras Z, Zachariou A, Dimitriadis F, Sofikitis N, Chrisofos M. Evaluating the Impact of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia Surgical Treatments on Sexual Health. Biomedicines. 2024;12(1):110.
21. Pardo-Rodriguez D, Santamaría-Torres M, Salinas A, Jiménez-Charris E, Mosquera M, Cala MP, et al. Unveiling Disrupted Lipid Metabolism in Benign Prostate Hyperplasia, Prostate Cancer, and Metastatic Patients: Insights from a Colombian Nested Case–Control Study. Cancers. 2023;15(22):5465.
22. Bajic P, Dornbier RA, Doshi CP, Wolfe AJ, Farooq AV, Bresler L. Implications of the genitourinary microbiota in prostatic disease. Current Urology Reports. 2019;20:1-10.
23. Zhang J, Zhang M, Tang J, Yin G, Long Z, He L, et al. Animal models of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Prostate cancer and prostatic diseases. 2021;24(1):49-57.
24. Erkoc M, Otunctemur A, Besiroglu H, Altunrende F. Evaluation of quality of life in patients undergoing surgery for benign prostatic hyperplasia. The Aging Male. 2018;21(4):238-42.
25. Cakir SS, Polat EC, Ozcan L, Besiroglu H, Ötunctemur A, Ozbek E. The effect of prostatic inflammation on clinical outcomes in patients with benign prostate hyperplasia. Prostate International. 2018;6(2):71-4.
26. Foo KT. What is a disease? What is the disease clinical benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH)? World journal of urology. 2019;37:1293-6.
27. Kim JH, Lee KS, Kim TH. Evaluation of clinical outcomes of prostatic urethral lift for benign prostatic hyperplasia: an Asian population study. The world journal of men's health. 2020;38(3):338.
28. Tong Y, Zhou R-y. Review of the roles and interaction of androgen and inflammation in benign prostatic hyperplasia. Mediators of Inflammation. 2020;2020:1-7.

Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research 2791-156X JHRR

29. Oseni SO, Naar C, Pavlović M, Asghar W, Hartmann JX, Fields GB, et al. The Molecular Basis and Clinical Consequences of Chronic Inflammation in Prostatic Diseases: Prostatitis, Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia, and Prostate Cancer. Cancers. 2023;15(12):3110.

30. Takahashi S, Takei M, Asakura H, Gotoh M, Ishizuka O, Kato K, et al. Clinical guidelines for female lower urinary tract symptoms. International Journal of Urology. 2021;28(5):474-92.

31. Walker KA. Inflammation and neurodegeneration: chronicity matters. Aging (Albany NY). 2019;11(1):3.

32. Paterniti I, Campolo M, Cordaro M, Siracusa R, Filippone A, Esposito E, et al. Effects of different natural extracts in an experimental model of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH). Inflammation Research. 2018;67:617-26.

33. Devlin CM, Simms MS, Maitland NJ. Benign prostatic hyperplasia–what do we know? BJU international. 2021;127(4):389-99.