

# RESULTS

Table (1): Preoperative patient characteristics (No. =100).

Variables	Summary statistics
<b>Age (year)</b>	
Mean± S.D.	56±10
Median (IQ range)	59(35:72)
<b>Marital state</b>	
Married	97 (97%)
Not married	3 (3%)
<b>Diabetes mellitus</b>	
Non diabetic	50 (50%)
Diabetic	50 (50%)
<b>Hypertension</b>	
Not hypertensive	51(51%)
Hypertensive	49 (49%)
<b>Coronary artery disease</b>	
No	72 (72%)
Yes	28 (28%)
<b>Hb%A1c of <u>diabetic patients</u></b>	
Mean± S.D.	8.45±0.62
Median (IQ range)	8.45(7:10.1)
<b>PSA</b>	2.0996±1.12
Mean± s.d.	2.065(0.16:3.82)
Median (iq range)	
<b>Neutrophil lymphocyte ratio</b>	2.59± 1.7
Mean± S.D.	2(1:1.7)
Median (IQ range)	
<b>Penile Doppler finding</b>	
Arterial insufficiency	9 (9%)
Peyronie's disease	5(5%)
Venous leak	86(86%)
<b>penile length preoperative</b>	15.75±1.45
Mean± S.D.	16(14:19)
Median (IQ range)	

**In our preoperative data Table (1) we find that:**

As regarding Penile Doppler finding,

9 (9%) had arterial insufficiency,

5(5%) had Peyronie's disease,

And most of our patients 86(86%) had Venous leak.

**Table (2): Preoperative patient characteristics in both diabetic and non-diabetic group (No. =100).**

Variables	CONTROL Non-diabetic (N.= 50)	CASES Diabetic (N.=50)		P- value
		HbA1c $\geq$ 8 (N.=13)	HbA1c < 8 (N.=37)	
<b>Age (year)</b> Mean $\pm$ S.D.	54 $\pm$ 8 53.5(39:72)	49 $\pm$ 13	60 $\pm$ 8	*** 0.096
<b>Hb%A1c</b> Mean $\pm$ S.D Median (IQ range).	4.826 $\pm$ 0.66 4.9(3.5:6)	7.7 $\pm$ 0.3	8.7 $\pm$ 0.5	*** <0.001
<b>Hypertension</b> Not hypertensive (51) Hypertensive (49)	34(68%) 16 (32%)	8 5 (46%)	11 26(73%)	0.001*
<b>Coronary artery disease</b> No (72) Yes (28)	41 (82%) 9 (18%)	9 4(31%)	23 14(41%)	0.044*
<b>Penile dopplar finding</b> Arterial-insufficiency(9) Peyronie's disease(5) Venous leak (86)	4 (8%) 3(6%) 43(86%)	13	5 2 30	0.856

**In our preoperative patient characteristics data Table (2) we find that:**

- **In the HbA1c  $\leq$ 8 group (n=13):**
  - **Venous leak was the only finding, present in all cases (100%)**
- **In the HbA1c  $>$ 8 group (n=37):**
  - **Venous leak was still the predominant finding (81.1%, 30 cases)**
  - **Arterial insufficiency was found in 13.5% (combining both entries, 5 cases)**
  - **Peyronie's disease was present in 5.4% (2 cases)**

**The higher HbA1c group shows more diversity in doppler findings, while the lower HbA1c group exclusively showed venous leak patterns.**

**Table (3): intra and postoperative patients results (No. =100).**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Summary statistics</b>
<b>intraoperative complications</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>95 (95%)</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>5(5%)</b>
<b>postoperative complications</b>	
<b>No</b>	<b>87 (87%)</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>13(13%)</b>
<b>Patient satisfaction</b>	
<b>Not satisfied</b>	<b>13 (13%)</b>
<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>87(87%)</b>
<b>Partner satisfaction</b>	
<b>Not satisfied</b>	<b>6 (6%)</b>
<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>94(94%)</b>

<b>penile length early postoperative within 24 h (cm)</b> <b>Mean± S.D.</b>	<b>17.75±1.44</b>	<b>penile length early postoperative late post-operative after 6 M (cm)</b> <b>Mean± S.D.</b>	<b>17.45±1.44</b>
<b>penile length distribution</b>	<b>early</b>	<b>penile length distribution</b>	<b>Late</b>
min size	<b>16</b>	min size	<b>14</b>
max size	<b>21</b>	max size	<b>21</b>
<b>The mean difference in penile length (Early - Late)</b>	<b>0.26 ± 0.6</b>		

<b>penile length distribution number</b>	<b>Count</b>
<b>total patients</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>no change in size</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>decrease size</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>increase size</b>	<b>0</b>

**The mean difference in penile length (Early - Late) is  $0.26 \pm 0.6$**

**Most cases show no change in penile length over time rather than 13 patients show a decrease in the penile length which is reflecting on the patient satisfaction result to be 87 % satisfied and 13 % not satisfied .**

**Table (4): factors that affect postoperative complication.**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>No complication (N.= 87)</b>	<b>complication (N.=13)</b>	<b>P- value</b>
<b>Age (year)</b>			
<b>Mean± S.D.</b>	<b>55±10</b>	<b>59±9</b>	<b>0.19**</b>
<b>Diabetes mellitus</b>			
<b>Non diabetic (50)</b>	<b>44(88%)</b>	<b>6(12%)</b>	
<b>Diabetic(50)</b>	<b>43(86%)</b>	<b>7(14%)</b>	<b>1*</b>
<b>Hypertension</b>			
<b>Not hypertensive (51)</b>	<b>48(94%)</b>	<b>3(23.07%)</b>	<b>0.039*</b>
<b>Hypertensive (49)</b>	<b>39 (80%)</b>	<b>10(76.92%)</b>	
<b>Coronary artery disease</b>			
<b>No (72)</b>	<b>65 (90%)</b>	<b>7(10%)</b>	<b>0.182*</b>
<b>Yes (28)</b>	<b>22 (79%)</b>	<b>6(21%)</b>	
<b>Neutrophil lymphocyte ratio</b>			
<b>Mean± S.D.</b>	<b>2.56±1.94</b>	<b>6.97±2.017</b>	<b>&gt;0.0001</b>
<b>Median (IQ range)</b>	<b>1.85 (1:10.96)</b>	<b>7.23 (2.45:10.96)</b>	
<b>Intraoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (95)</b>	<b>85(89%)</b>	<b>10(11%)</b>	<b>0.015*</b>
<b>yes(5)</b>	<b>2 (40%)</b>	<b>3(60%)</b>	

\*P-value was calculated by Fisher's Exact Test

\*\* P-value was calculated by independent sample T-Test

\*\*\* P-value was calculated by Mann-Whitney Test

P-value less than 0.05 is statistically significant

**We find in the previous table (Table 4) there was no significant difference in the complication post-operative between the diabetic and the non-diabetic group - P value = (1)**

**Table (5): factors that affect patient satisfaction.**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>satisfied (N.= 87)</b>	<b>Not satisfied (N.=13)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Age (year)</b>			
<b>Mean± S.D.</b>	<b>56±10</b>	<b>52±10</b>	<b>0.16**</b>
<b>Diabetes mellitus</b>			
<b>Non diabetic (50)</b>	<b>43(86%)</b>	<b>7(14%)</b>	
<b>Diabetic(50)</b>	<b>44(88%)</b>	<b>6(12%)</b>	<b>1*</b>
<b>Hb%A1c of diabetic patients</b>			
<b>Mean± S.D</b>	<b>8.38±0.59</b>	<b>8.96±0.63</b>	<b>0.018**</b>
<b>Median (IQ range).</b>	<b>8.2(7:9.5)</b>	<b>9(8.2:10.1)</b>	
<b>Hypertension</b>			
<b>Not hypertensive(51)</b>	<b>45(88%)</b>	<b>6(12%)</b>	
<b>Hypertensive(49)</b>	<b>42 (86%)</b>	<b>7(14%)</b>	<b>0.772*</b>
<b>Coronary artery disease</b>			
<b>No (72)</b>	<b>64 (89%)</b>	<b>8(11%)</b>	
<b>Yes (28)</b>	<b>23 (82%)</b>	<b>5(19%)</b>	<b>0.508*</b>
<b>postoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (87)</b>	<b>77(89%)</b>	<b>10(11%)</b>	
<b>yes(13)</b>	<b>10 (77%)</b>	<b>3(23%)</b>	<b>0.369*</b>

\*P-value was calculated by Fisher's Exact Test

\*\* P-value was calculated by independent sample T-Test

\*\*\* P-value was calculated by Mann-Whitney Test

P-value less than 0.05 is statistically significant

**In this table (Table 5) we find that there is no relationship between patients satisfaction and the patient's parameters and no relation between patient's satisfaction and post-operative complications**

**Table (6\_a): postoperative complications.**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>CONTROL Non-diabetic (N.= 50)</b>	<b>CASES Diabetic (N.=50)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>Total postoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (87)</b>	<b>44(88%)</b>	<b>43(86%)</b>	<b>0.015*</b>
<b>yes(13)</b>	<b>6 (12%)</b>	<b>7(14%)</b>	
<b>Total postoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (87)</b>	<b>44(88%)</b>	<b>43(86%)</b>	<b>0.015*</b>
<b>Superficial wound infection(5)</b>	<b>2(4%)</b>	<b>3(6%)</b>	
<b>UTI(7)</b>	<b>4 (8%)</b>	<b>3 (6%)</b>	
<b>Hypermobile Glans (1)</b>	<b>0(0%)</b>	<b>1(2%)</b>	

In the table (6\_a) we can find

The analysis revealed a statistically insignificant difference in postoperative complication rates between diabetic and non-diabetic patients undergoing malleable penile prosthesis surgery (p = 0.015).

**Table (6\_b): postoperative complications.**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Fairly control diabetic (n=13)</b>	<b>Poor control Diabetic (n=37)</b>	<b>P-value</b>
<b>HbA1c</b>	<b>≥ 8</b>	<b>&lt; 8</b>	
<b>Total postoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (43)</b>	<b>13(100%)</b>	<b>30(81%)</b>	<b>0.1679*</b>
<b>yes(7)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>7(19%)</b>	
<b>Total postoperative complications</b>			
<b>No (43)</b>	<b>13(100%)</b>	<b>30(81%)</b>	
<b>Superficial wound infection(5)</b>	<b>0(0%)</b>	<b>3(8%)</b>	
<b>UTI(7)</b>	<b>0 (0%)</b>	<b>3 (8%)</b>	
<b>Hypermobile Glans (1)</b>	<b>0(0%)</b>	<b>1(3%)</b>	

\*P-value was calculated by Fisher's Exact Test

\*\* P-value was calculated by independent sample T-Test

\*\*\* P-value was calculated by Mann-Whitney Test

P-value less than 0.05 is statistically significant

### **In the table (6\_b) we can find that**

- There are 3 types of complications observed:
  - Superficial wound infection/dehiscence (3 cases)
  - UTI (3 cases)
  - Hypermobility Glans (1 case)
- The majority of cases (43) had no complications

### **HbA1c Relationship:**

- Highest mean HbA1c (9.33) was observed in cases with superficial wound infection
- UTI cases had mean HbA1c of 8.8
- Cases without complications had mean HbA1c of 8.37
- The single case of Hypermobility Glans had HbA1c of 8.3

This suggests a trend where higher HbA1c levels might be associated with increased risk of complications, particularly wound-related complications.