

List of Contents

Introduction	1
Aim of the work	3
Review of literature	4
Historical development of ESWL.....	4
Physics of ESWL	6
Mechanism of stone fragmentation.....	15
Indications of ESWL.....	17
Contraindications of ESWL.....	18
Pathogenesis of pain during ESWL.....	20
Petroleum jelly and ESWL related pain	20
EMLA cream in ESWL	23
Residual stone fragments	24
Patients and methods	30
Results	37
Discussion.....	51
Summary and conclusion	56
References	58
Arabic summary	

List of Tables

No.	Title	Page
1	Historical background of extra corporeal shock wave lithotripsy (ESWL)	5
2	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding age	37
3	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding sex	37
4	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding side of stone	38
5	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding stone size	38
6	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding solitary renal stone site	39
7	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding hydrohephrosis	40
8	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding number of shots	41
9	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding pain score	42
10	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding need of anaesthesia	43
11	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding final results three months after the last ESWL session	45

List of Figures

No.	Title	Page
1	Schematic view of an electrohydraulic shockwave generator	7
2	Schematic view of an electromagnetic shockwave generator that uses an acoustic lens to focus the shockwave.	8
3	Schematic view of an electromagnetic shockwave generator that uses a parabolic reflector to focus the shockwave	9
4	Schematic view of a piezoelectric shockwave generator	10
5	Summary of how the various mechanical forces generated by a lithotripsy shockwave might cause a kidney stone to fracture	17
6	Dependence of lower caliceal collecting system (minimal dependence)	27
7	Dependence of lower caliceal collecting system (very dependant lower calyx)	27
8	Infundibulopelvic angle according to Elbahnasy et al., (1998)	27
9	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding solitary renal stone site.	39
10	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding hydrohephrosis	40
11	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding pain score	42
12	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding need of anaesthesia	43
13	The comparison between the three studied groups regarding final results	45
14	(a) KUB of a patient with left renal pelvic stone	46
	(b) IVU of the same patient without hydronephrosis	47
	(c) KUB of the same patient 3 months after the last ESWL session showing complete stone clearance	47
15	(a) KUB of a patient with right renal pelvic stone	48
	(b) IVU of the same patient with minimal hydronephrosis	48
	c) KUB of the same patient 3 months after the last ESWL session showing complete stone clearance	49
16	(a) KUB of a female patient with left renal pelvic stone	49
	(b) IVU of the same patient without hydronephrosis.	50
	(c) KUB of the same patient 3 months after the last ESWL session showing complete stone clearance	50