RESULTS

Table (1) : Age distribution among the studied groups.

Groups	Group I		Group II		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%		
20-30	1	10.0	1	10.0	0	--
30-40	4	40.0	6	60.0	0.632	> 0.05
40-50	4	40.0	3	30.0	0.290	> 0.05
>50	1	10.0	0	0	0.333	> 0.05

With stastically insignificant difference as regard age in both groups. The mean age in the slected 20 patients was 40 years.

Table (2) : Distribution of the studied groups according to marital status.

Groups	Group I		Group II		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	8	80.0	7	70.0	15	75.0
Not married	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	25.0
Total	10	100.0	10	100.0	20	100.0

df. = 1 , $X^2 = 0.2667$, P > 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard marital status between the two groups (df = 1, $X^2 = 0.2667$, P > 0.05).

Urinary tract symptoms before and after injection :

Table (3) : Distribution of the studied groups according to burning micturation before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	7	70.0	2	20.0	5	7143	1.5076	> 0.05
Group II	9	90.0	4	40.0	5	55.55	1.8898	>0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard burning micturation before and after injection in both groups. ($Z = 1.5076$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 1.8898$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (4) : Distribution of the studied groups according to difficulty of micturation before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	6	60.0	2	20.0	4	66.67	1.1547	> 0.05
Group II	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	40.0	0.577	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard difficulty of micturation before and after injection in both groups.

($Z = 1.1547$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 0.577$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (5) : Distribution of the studied groups according to frequency of micturation before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	6	60.0	2	20.0	4	66.67	1.1547	> 0.05
Group II	3	30.0	2	20.0	1	33.33	0.258	> 0.05

With statistically insifnigiant difference as regard frequency of micturation before and after injection in both groups (Z = 1.1547, P >0.05 and Z = 0.258, P > 0.05 in group I and group II respectively).

Table (6) : Distribution of the studied groups according to nocturia before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	6	60.0	1	10.0	5	83.33	1.3868	> 0.05
Group II	4	40.0	1	10.0	3	75.0	0.7746	> 0.05

With statistically insignficiant difference as regard nocturia before and after injection in both groups (Z = 1.3868, P > 0.05 and Z = 7746, P > 0.05 in group I and group II respectively).

Table (7): Distribution of the studied groups according to abnormal stream before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	2	20.0	1	10.0	1	50.0	0.2425	> 0.05
Group II	4	40.0	2	20.0	2	50.0	0.5345	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard abnormal stream before and after injection in both groups (Z = 0.2425, P > 0.05 and Z = 0.5345, P > 0.05 in group I and group II respectively).

Table (8) : Distribution of the studied groups according to urethral discharge before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	3	30.0	1	10.0	2	66.67	0.5	> 0.05
Group II	2	20.0	0	0	2	100.0	0.7071	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard urethral discharge before and after injection in both groups (Z = 0.5 , P > 0.05 and Z = 7071 , P > 0.05 in group I and group II respectively).

Sexual symptoms before and after injection.

Table (9) : Distribution of the studied groups according to premature ejaculation before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	9	90.0	6	60.0	3	33.33	1.3416	> 0.05
Group II	7	70.0	5	50.0	2	28.57	0.7071	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard premature ejaculation before and after injection in both groups ($Z = 1.3416$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 1.3416$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (10) : Distribution of the studied groups according to weak erection before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	5	50.0	1	10.0	4	80.0	1.069	> 0.05
Group II	6	60.0	3	30.0	3	50.0	0.9045	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard weak erection before and after injection in both groups ($Z = 1.069$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 0.9045$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (11) : Distribution of the studied groups according to (pain during or after ejaculation) before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	5	50.0	2	20.0	3	60.0	0.8321	> 0.05
Group II	4	40.0	2	20.0	2	50.0	0.5345	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard pain during or after ejaculation before and after injection in both groups. ($Z = 0.8321$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 0.5345$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively)

Painfull conditions.

Table (12) : Distribution of the studied groups according to perineal pain before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	4	40.0	1	10.0	3	75.0	0.7746	> 0.05
Group II	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	40.0	0.5774	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard perineal pain before and after injection in both groups. ($Z = 0.7746$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 5774$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (13) : Distribution of the studied groups according to low back pain before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	3	30.0	1	10.0	2	66.67	0.5	> 0.05
Group II	2	20.0	1	10.0	1	50.0	0.2425	> 0.05

With statistically insignificant difference as regard low back pain before and after injection in both groups. ($Z = 0.05$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 0.2425$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and group II respectively).

Table (14) : Distribution of the studied groups according to suprapubic pain before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Subj. improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	1	10.0	0	0	1	100.0	0.333	> 0.05
Group II	2	20.0	1	10.0	1	50.0	0.2425	> 0.05

With statistically insignifiant difference as regard suprapubic pain before and after injection in both groups ($Z = 0.333$, $P > 0.05$ and $Z = 0.2425$, $P > 0.05$ in group I and gorup II respectively).

Table (15) : Pus cells count in group I before and after injection.

Group I	Before inj.		After inj.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%		
< 10	0	0	6	60.0	3.00	< 0.05
10 -	3	30.0	4	40.0	0.774	> 0.05
20 -	5	50.0	0	0	2.2361	< 0.05
> 30 +	2	20.0	0	0	0.7071	> 0.05
> 10	10	100.0	4	40.0	2.449	< 0.05

With statistically significant difference as regard pus cells count before and after injection ($Z = 2.449$, $P < 0.05$).

Table (16) : Pus cells in group II before and after injection.

Group II	Before inj.		After inj.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%		
< 10	0	0	5	50.0	2.2361	< 0.05
10 -	4	40.0	5	50.0	0.3015	> 0.05
20 -	5	50.0	0	0	2.2361	< 0.05
30 +	1	10.0	0	0	0.333	> 0.05
> 10	100	100.0	5	50.0	2.236	< 0.05

With statistically significant difference as regard pus cells count before and after injection ($Z = 2.235$, $P < 0.05$).

Table (17) : Mean and standard deviation of pus cells among the studied groups before and after injection.

Groups	Group I		Group II	
	Before injection	After injection	Before injection	After injection
$\bar{X}$	23.4	9.2	20.4	9.8
± S D	± 7.027	± 2.898	± 7.877	± 4.264
Paired - t	5.139		4.662	
P	< 0.001		< 0.001	

With statistically highly significant difference as regard mean pus cells count before and after injection in both groups (paired T = 5.139, P < 0.001 and paired T = 4.662, P < 0.001 in group I and group II respectively).

Table (18) : Distribution of the studied groups according to culture before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Obj. Improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	10	100.0	4	40.0	6	60.0	2.449	< 0.05
Group II	10	100.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	1.633	> 0.05

With statistically significant difference as regard bacterial growth on culture before and after injection in group on culture before and after injection in group I (Z = 2.449 , P < 0.05) and statistically insignificant difference before and after injections in group II (Z= 1.633, P > 0.05).

Table (19) : Distribution of the studied groups according to (colony count > 100,000) before and after injection.

Groups	Before inj.		After inj.		Obj. Improvem.		Z	P
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Group I	10	100.0	4	40.0	6	60.0	2.449	< 0.05
Group II	10	100.0	6	60.0	4	40.0	1.633	> 0.05

With statistically significant difference as regard colony count before and after injection in group I ($Z = 2.449$, $P < 0.05$) and statistically insignificant difference before and after injection in group II ($Z = 1.633$, $P > 0.05$).

Table (20) : Distribution of the studied groups according to improvement after injection.

Group	Group I		Group II		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Good	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	50.0
Fair	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	25.0
Poor	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	25.0
Total	10	100.0	10	100.0	20	100.0

With statistically insignificant difference as regard improvement between group I and group II (df. = 2 , $X^2 = 0.8$, $P > 0.05$).