# Comparison of standard JJ stents to magnetic JJ stents with regard to stent placement and removal discomfort and cost analysis

Submission date 15/01/2021	<b>Recruitment status</b> Stopped	<ul><li>Prospectively registered</li><li>Protocol</li></ul>		
Registration date	Overall study status Stopped	Statistical analysis plan		
22/01/2021		Results		
Last Edited	<b>Condition category</b> Other	☐ Individual participant data		
16/10/2024		Record updated in last year		

### Plain English summary of protocol

Background and study aims

For over 40 years ureteric stents have been used in urology and the placement of a ureteral stent is the most frequent urological intervention performed. Modern ureteric stents are thin, flexible plastic tubes which are curled at both ends to avoid damaging the kidney and urinary bladder and to prevent it from dislocating.

There are certain reasons for stent placement, for example after kidney stone removal. Unfortunately up to 80% of patients complain about irritative voiding (urinating) symptoms after stent implantation. Usually, the stent is removed after 714 days. The standard procedure to remove a stent is by cystoscopy.

The cystoscopic removal of stents can be unpleasant and needs specific preparation for up to 30 minutes. The idea to remove a stent by using two magnets has been tried to be implemented for over 10 years and only recently have magnetic stents been available. Despite the wide adoption of magnetic stents worldwide, there is a relative lack of data to support their use compared to non-magnetic stents.

The aim of this study is to assess the effectiveness of a magnetic stent that allows for removal without cystoscopy. The impact on patient's quality of life in terms of stent and stent removal related symptoms, as well as the stent removal, will especially be addressed.

#### Who can participate?

All patients who had a short term (<6 weeks) stent placed, either magnetic or conventional

# What does the study involve?

When it is time to place a stent at the end of a ureteroscopy procedure, participants are randomly allocated to have either a magnetic stent or a conventional ureteric stent placed. When the patients return to have their stent removed, they will undergo a quality of life assessment with a symptom questionnaire. After the stent is removed, the discomfort caused by the removal is recorded. Patients will be followed up for a minimum of 6 months.

What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

There is no direct benefit to participants. However, there is a benefit to society, as participating

in this study will increase knowledge about which type of stent is more comfortable for patients and which removal method is least painful. Participants may require a stent regardless of being in the study. Both types of stents are commonly used already and participating in this study has no risk.

Where is the study run from? Mercy University Hospital (Ireland)

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for? July 2020 to February 2024

Who is funding the study? Investigator initiated and funded

Who is the main contact? Derek Hennessey dhennessey@muh.ie

# Contact information

## Type(s)

**Public** 

#### Contact name

Mr Derek Hennessey

#### Contact details

14 Rosefield Model Farm Road Cork Ireland T12 VKP1 +353 (0)830333325 dhennessey@muh.ie

# Additional identifiers

Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)

Nil known

ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)

Nil known

Protocol serial number

ECM 4 (c) 07/07/2020

# Study information

Scientific Title

A prospective single-centre randomised control trial of magnetic DJ stents versus conventional DJ stents

#### **Study objectives**

That magnetic DJ stents are superior to conventional DJ stents with regard to removal discomfort and cost.

#### Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

#### Ethics approval(s)

Approved 22/09/2020, Clinical Research Ethics Committee Of the Cork Teaching Hospitals (Lancaster Hall, 6 Little Hanover Street, Cork, Ireland; +353 (0)21 4901901; crec@ucc.ie), ref: ECM 4 (c) 07/07/2020, ECM 3 (z) 20/10/2020

#### Study design

Prospective randomized control trial

#### Primary study design

Interventional

#### Study type(s)

Treatment

#### Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Post ureteroscopy renal drainage with a DJ stent

#### **Interventions**

When it is time to place a ureteric stent at the end of a ureteroscopy procedure, a random number generator will be used to generate a number. When an even number is generated, a magnetic ureteric stent will be placed, and an odd number meaning a conventional ureteric stent will be placed. When the patients return to have their stent removed, they will undergo a quality of life assessment with a ureteral symptom questionnaire (USSQ). After the stent is removed, a visual analogue scale (VAS) will be used to document the discomfort caused by the D Jremoval. Patients will be followed up for a minimum of 6 months.

#### Intervention Type

Procedure/Surgery

#### Primary outcome(s)

- 1. Quality of life assessed using ureteral symptom questionnaire (USSQ) immediately prior to JJ stent removal
- 2. Stent removal pain assessed using a visual analogue scale (VAS) after JJ stent removal

# Key secondary outcome(s))

Cost of each type of stent, including removal, measured using Total Resource Use Index after data collection is complete

## Completion date

02/02/2024

#### Reason abandoned (if study stopped)

Participant recruitment issue

# **Eligibility**

#### Key inclusion criteria

All patients who had a short term (<6 weeks) JJ stent placed, either magnetic or conventional

#### Participant type(s)

**Patient** 

#### Healthy volunteers allowed

No

#### Age group

Adult

#### Sex

All

#### Key exclusion criteria

- 1. Patients aged under 18 years
- 2. Pregnant women
- 3. Sheltered patients
- 4. Patients taking alpha-blockers or anticholinergics

#### Date of first enrolment

01/10/2020

#### Date of final enrolment

02/02/2024

# Locations

#### Countries of recruitment

Ireland

# Study participating centre Mercy University Hospital

Grenville Place Cork Ireland T12 WE28

# Sponsor information

### Organisation

Mercy University Hospital

#### ROR

https://ror.org/017q2rt66

# Funder(s)

## Funder type

Other

#### **Funder Name**

Investigator initiated and funded

# **Results and Publications**

#### Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are not expected to be made available.

## IPD sharing plan summary

Not expected to be made available

## **Study outputs**

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
Participant information sheet			04/02/2021	No	Yes
Participant information sheet	Participant information sheet	11/11/2025	11/11/2025	No	Yes
Protocol file			04/02/2021	No	No