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Abstract

Background and Aim
Mitomycin-C is a potent agent that plays an important role in tissue healing and scar formation. This study aims to investigate the efficacy of Mitomycin-C in treating anterior urethral stricture after internal urethrotomy.

Methods
Studies evaluating efficacy of mitomycin-c for anterior urethral stricture post urethrotomy were searched using Pubmed, Scopus, Sciencedirect, MEDLINE, and Cochrane Reviews as directory databases. The search was done in March 15th 2020. Terms being used in the searching process were “mitomycin-c” or “mitomycin”, “urethral stricture”, “urethral stenosis”, “internal urethrotomy”, “optical urethrotomy” and its synonyms. Every study with the design of retrospective or prospective clinical study being done in human subject was included. Study appraisal conducted in accordance to Oxford University Center for Evidence-Based Medicine. The conclusion of each study was summarized and the calculation of random effects from every study was conducted in meta-analysis. Random effects model is chosen because small number of studies and quite different.

Results
Three studies involving 311 patients were included in this review, all of them reported less recurrence of in patients treated with mitomycin-c post urethrotomy (p<0.001). Risk ratio of all studies was 0.41 with 95% confidence interval (0.25-0.68).

Conclusion
Mitomycin-C has the potential of efficacy in treating anterior urethral stricture post internal urethrotomy. Relatively few numbers of studies may impact in the strength of this review and further studies need to be done.
Background
Urethral stricture often impairs quality of life and may result in a large economic burden1. There are several procedures available for treating this condition, ranging from minimally invasive procedures like internal optical urethrotomy (IOU) to invasive procedure such as urethroplasty, with or without grafting, and tissue engineering2. However, despite the methods available, urethral stricture often recurs. Several manipulations have been tried to prevent urethral stricture, such as indwelling catheter insertion, urethral calibration procedure, and home self-catheterization. Unfortunately, repeated instrumentation can cause scar formation. Moreover, it can also complicate subsequent reconstruction, which can lead to several complications3,4. On the other hand, there have been several studies evaluating the effects of antifibrotic drugs such as glucocorticoid and mitomycin-C on urethral strictures. Mitomycin-C is an agent that has the potential to inhibit mitosis, fibroblast proliferation, formation of blood vessels, and synthesis of protein and collagen. This agent plays role in tissue healing process and scar formation by reducing the release of matrix proteins by inhibiting proliferative fibroblasts5.

To our knowledge, there have not been any systematic reviews or meta-analyses regarding the efficacy of mitomycin-C in treating anterior urethral stricture post internal urethrotomy. Thus, the present study aims to investigate the efficacy of mitomycin-C in treating anterior urethral stricture post internal urethrotomy. We hope that by conducting this review and analysis, a definite conclusion regarding the efficacy of such treatment could be achieved.

Methods
This systematic review was conducted based on guidelines from the Oxford University Center for Evidence-Based Medicine6. Our present study aims to determine whether mitomycin-C provide better efficacy compared to controls (without mitomycin-C) in adult patients with anterior urethral stricture after internal urethrotomy.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria
Inclusion criteria were (1) Study type: RCT (Randomized Control Trial) until March 15th 2020; (2) Intervention and comparator: internal urethrotomy with addition Mitomycin-C vs internal urethrotomy without Mitomycin-C; (3) Patients: humans with anterior urethral stricture; (4) Primary outcome: efficacy of Mitomycin-C administration, determined by risk ratio; and (5) Secondary outcome: side effects from Mitomycin-C administration. Exclusion criteria were (1) Animal study; (2) case reports; (3) case series; (4) book chapters; and (5) editorials.

Search strategy
To find suitable studies to be included in this review, we used PubMed, Scopus, ScienceDirect, MEDLINE, and Cochrane Reviews as directory databases. We used combination of keywords “((((mitomycin c[MeSH Terms]) OR mitomycin[MeSH Terms]) OR mitomycin c)) AND (((((((urethral stricture[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral strictures[MeSH Terms]) OR stenosis, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR stenoses, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral stenosis[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral stenoses[MeSH Terms]) OR stenosis, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR stenoses, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral stenosis[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral stenoses[MeSH Terms]) OR stenosis, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR stenoses, urethral[MeSH Terms]) OR urethral stricture) OR urethral strictures) OR stricture, urethral) OR urethral) OR urethral stenosis) OR urethral stenoses) OR stenosis, urethral) OR stenoses, urethral) OR "urethra/ surgery”[MeSH Terms] AND Humans[Mesh]”. We also used term “human” as limiting term to exclude every study that was not conducted on human subjects.

Study selection and data extraction
A single reviewer screened the articles based on the titles, abstracts, and full text. Then, the data on author, publication year, details of studies subjects, details of studies intervention, and results are extracted.

Risk of bias assessment
Another single reviewer assessed the risk of bias using the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool, which include random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective reporting. Every domain was judged with 3 levels (low risk, unclear risk, and high risk).

Analysis and concluding the review
We evaluated the study using appraisal worksheet for randomized clinical trial from Oxford University Center for Evidence-Based Medicine to stratify the risk of bias7. Using Revman 5.3 software, recurrence number from all selected studies were analyzed. Data were analyzed using forest plots with calculation of random effects. It was also done using Revman 5.3 to show relative risk/risk ratio for recurrence rate variable dan p-value. We summarized the conclusion of each study at the table along with its appraisal. We decided to use random effects model since the small amount of study and the difference between them.

Results

Literature search
Searching process (searching strategy showed in Figure 1) by using five databases found 49 study articles. There were 13
articles eliminated after screening for duplication. The remained 36 articles were reduced to seven articles after title and abstract screening, leaving seven full text articles to be reviewed. Based on study design, we eliminated three articles, leaving four articles to be summarized in systematic review and meta-analysis.

Study characteristics and quality assessment
Four selected studies were conducted in 2007, 2015, 2016, and 2019\(^2\),\(^4\),\(^7\),\(^8\). All studies evaluated the effectivity of mitomycin-C given after internal urethrotomy for anterior urethral stricture. From these selected articles, three evaluated the usage of submucosal injection of mitomycin-C for anterior urethral stricture after urethrotomy. How mitomycin-C was injected differed in every study. Mazdak et al.\(^4\) study used 0.1 mg of Mitomycin-C in 2 ml of distilled water injected in four quadrants, Ali et al.\(^2\) study used 0.1% Mitomycin-C injected in three quadrants, and Islam et al.\(^7\) study used 0.1 mg in 2 ml of distilled water in two quadrants. Moradi et al.\(^8\) study evaluated intraluminal injection of Mitomycin-C in hydrogel base, consisting of 0.8 mg Mitomycin-C with 1cc water and propylene glycol to PF-127 poloxamer. The hydrogel base was injected through a small feeding tube to reach the site of stricture. All studies applied mitomycin-C after internal urethrotomy procedure and were conducted in populations with different age means. Each of studies’ quality was assessed using guide from Oxford University Center for Evidence-Based Medicine; this is explained in Table 1 and Table 2.

Outcome measures
We included the studies in which recurrence was defined by a patient having obstructive symptoms, obvious stricture at retrograde urethrography, or uroflowmetry with maximum flow rate less than 12 mL/s, and stricture was measured using
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Average age (year)</th>
<th>Pre-intervention stricture site</th>
<th>Procedure of internal urethrotomy</th>
<th>Clinical feature</th>
<th>Cause of injury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MMC group</td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>MMC Group</td>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moradi et al., 2016[^1]</td>
<td>54.55 ± 21.25</td>
<td>53.75 ± 24.75</td>
<td>Anterior urethral stricture</td>
<td>Trans-urethral incision at 12 o'clock via cold knife urethrotomy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali et al., 2015[^2]</td>
<td>37.31 ± 10.1</td>
<td>40.1 ± 11.4</td>
<td>Bulbar urethra: 84.6% Penile urethra: 15.4%</td>
<td>Internal Optic urethrotomy</td>
<td>Mitomycin-C group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazdak et al., 2007[^3]</td>
<td>29.8 (15–70)</td>
<td>29.2 (11–66)</td>
<td>Anterior urethral stricture</td>
<td>Trans-urethral incision at 12 o'clock via cold knife urethrotomy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam et al., 2019[^4]</td>
<td>49.43 ± 8.10</td>
<td>48.98 ± 7.20</td>
<td>Anterior urethral stricture</td>
<td>Internal Optic Urethrotomy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1] MMC, mitomycin C.
### Table 2. Summary and appraisal of the selected articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>LoE</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Methods of mitomycin-C application</th>
<th>Timing of mitomycin-C application</th>
<th>Follow up end-point</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moradi et al., 2016</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Intraluminal injection of 0.8 mg mitomycin-C + propylene glycol through indwelling catheter</td>
<td>After Internal Urethrotomy</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali et al., 2015</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Submucosal injection of 0.1% mitomycin-C at three quadrants (1, 11, &amp; 12 o'clock position) using TLA needle</td>
<td>After Internal Urethrotomy</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazdak et al., 2007</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Submucosal injection of 0.1 mg mitomycin-C in four quadrants (1, 5, 7, &amp; 11 o'clock position) using 22-Gauge cystoscopic needle</td>
<td>Before Internal Urethrotomy</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam et al., 2019</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Submucosal injection of 0.1 mg Mitomycin-C in two quadrants (11 &amp; 1 o'clock) using 21-gauge cystoscopic needle</td>
<td>After Internal Urethrotomy</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LoE, level of evidence; RR relative risk; ARR, absolute risk reduction; RRR, relative risk reduction; NNT, number needed to treat.*
Retrograde urethrogram or ultrasonography of the urethra. The outcome that measured was recurrence rate (percentage).

Risk of Bias
The summary of the risk bias assessment can be found in Figure 2. All of the studies stated that they have undergone randomization. But only Ali et al. and Islam et al. mentioned the randomization method. A common problem with all the studies included in this review is that there was no clear concealment and blinding statement. All of the studies are completed and have relatively small loss to follow-up rates. Mazdak et al. didn’t mentioned recurrence criteria resulting high risk in selective reporting, but other studies mentioned2,4,8.

Results and heterogeneity of the studies
All selected articles stated that Mitomycin-C had a significant effect on preventing or delaying urethral stricture recurrence post internal urethrotomy. All studies reported that the time-based recurrence rates in the two groups differed, where lower recurrence rates were found in the group given Mitomycin-C2,4,7,8. From study characteristic that is quite different and small number of studies, we choose to use random-effects model in forest plot showed in Figure 3. This forest plot suggests that there were significant differences between cases and control group. It showed from risk ratio is 0.41 with 95% confidence interval of 0.25 until 0.68, with p value <0.05. As for side effects are reported minimal and insignificant2,8.

Discussion
All the studies included in this review treated the two groups equally and had relatively small loss-to-follow-up rates. A common problem with all the studies included in this review is that there was no clear blinding statement. Mazdak et al.4 and Moradi et al.8 study stated that their studies are randomized. But, the randomization procedure was not stated in the study method. On the other hand, although Ali et al.2 had randomized its subjects, age characteristics in the two groups were significantly different. Mazdak et al.4 also didn’t mentioned recurrence criteria, which could result in high risk bias. There was also a relevant study by Azzawi et al.9 that matches our inclusion criteria. But we are unable to access the full text, so we decide to exclude it. As for heterogeneity, from the calculation might not be important difference (I²=27%, p = 0.19). But the small number of studies, that calculation may not work well. From the studies we could notice the difference in age and methods in administering Mitomycin-C, those difference might add up the heterogeneity.

All studies support the use of mitomycin-C to prevent or delay anterior urethral stricture after internal urethrotomy, which in this review defined by a patient having obstructive symptoms, obvious stricture at retrograde urethrography, or uroflowmetry.

Figure 2. Risk of Bias Summary.

Figure 3. Forest plot for recurrence rate. Test for heterogeneity Tau-square = 0.09; chi-square = 4.78; df = 3; p-value = 0.19; I-squared = 37%.
with maximum flow rate lower than 12 mL/s, and every stricture in this review are all primary stricture. This was confirmed by a less rate of recurrence rate in Mitomycin-C patients; we found that those who had Mitomycin-C administered had lower incidence of recurrence during one year and 18 months of follow up (RR = 0.32, P < 0.001). This was also confirmed by a series of cases by Farrell et al., Farrell et al., and Sourial et al. Mazdak et al. injected mitomycin-C into the urethral submucosa and reported that patients with mitomycin-C injection had lower rates of stricture recurrence. Opposing this study, some researchers proposed that submucosal injection could increase the complication rate and reduce the duration of the effective dose within the tissue, which yielded a scientific discussion. Ayildiz et al. assessed the efficacy of Mitomycin-C for preventing urethral scar by applying the agent topically to the traumatized region in rats. They concluded that mitomycin-C applied locally reduced fibrosis significantly in a dose-independent manner.

Although all studies support the use of Mitomycin-C to prevent or delay post urethrotomy urethral stricture and the side effects reported in the studies reviewed are minimal, in Ali et al. and Moradi et al. are insignificant, but Mazdak et al. didn’t assess any side effects, the results of this review need to be followed up with caution. The limitation of this study can be seen from only a few studies that discuss this topic. Some of the existing studies are not enough to be generalized to a wider population, given that selected studies were carried out in Iran and Pakistan. Therefore their application needs to be carried out wisely and cautiously. Research related to this in the future can still be done with different populations.

Due to short period of follow up time in all studies, some authors concluded that the study of Mitomycin-C needed firm results regarding long term success. Mazdak et al. added that stricture may recur within two years after internal urethrotomy.

**Conclusion**

Mitomycin-C could be used as a potential additional treatment for anterior urethral strictures after internal urethrotomy. However, further studies are required to investigate the safety and efficacy of this method for treating anterior urethral strictures, as only a limited number of studies presently exist.
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**Abstract**

1. EBSCOhost and Ovid are not databases. They are search interfaces or search engines for
other databases. Please add the name of the databases that you search using these two tools.

2. Please add the exact search date (dd/mm/yyyy).

3. Please state the reason for not using Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for assessing risk of bias of RCTs.

4. Please add rationale for using fixed effect model.

5. The conclusion is so strong. With limited evidence, it is not easy to say that MMC has safety, efficacy, or long-term efficacy.

**Methods**

1. The search date is older than a year (17 months old). Please update the search. I spent a few minutes and identified following recent studies:

   - Azzawi (2018)\(^1\)
   - Islam *et al.* (2019)\(^2\)

2. EBSCOhost and Ovid are not databases. They are search interfaces or search engines for other databases. Please add the name of the databases that you search using these two tools.

3. The search strategy reported for PubMed needs serious attention by a search expert such as a librarian or information specialist and through using PRESS checklist for peer-reviewing search strategies. If authors have no access to such person they can post a task on taskexchange.cochrane.org and request a volunteer to help them in exchange to offering Acknowledgement or Authorship, depending on their contribution.

4. When the number of results is little, usually the authors should seek other sources such as references of included studies, citations to relevant studies, contacting the authors of relevant studies, etc. Depending on amount of time and resources available for the team, I request them to use other methods to make sure no studies are missing.

5. Please structure Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria to subheadings: Patients, Intervention, Control/Comparison, and Primary and Secondary Outcomes.

6. I wondered why side effects of interventions have not been listed as collected outcome data.

7. Please add separate headings for Screening, Data Extraction, Assessment of Risk of Bias, and explain their processes.

8. Please follow the PRISMA reporting guideline items one by one.

9. Please state the reason for not using Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for assessing risk of bias of RCTs while it is available within RevMan.
10. Please share your RevMan file as Appendix in Open Science Framework so that the readers could reproduce your analysis.

11. Please add rationale for using fixed effect model.

**Results**

1. Please follow the original PRISMA flow diagram in which duplication is before screening.

2. I2 is not the only way to notice heterogeneity. Actually, I2 may not work well with small sample size and low number of studies. The other ways is to look at the heterogeneity in study details such as characteristics of population (age – compare Age in Moradi with age in Mazdak -, sex, etc.), interventions (method of administration or dosage), and outcomes (methods of measurement). Also N/As in the table are missing details that you may get contacting the authors and they may contribute to heterogeneity. Based on what I see in your description, the method of administration is different among studies plus age of the patients varies across studies.

**Discussion**

1. The first four paragraph of the discussion are not discussing the results and they seem to be relevant to Background.

2. Impact of small sample size, heterogeneity of included studies, adverse effects, subjectivity of outcome measure, not using placebo for control group on interpreting these results are some of the items that could have been discussed here. I also refer the authors to a commentary written by Ng and Chan on Mazdak et al. as the first RCT. I thank the authors for listing some of the limitations this reviews. I think a new version of this review should be submitted, before being approved.
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- The first publication was in 2007. Yet, MMC injection is not implemented in clinical practice for prevention of urethral stricture. It should be discussed why this is the case. It has been stated clearly that the evidence for MMC injections are not enough for it to be implemented in clinical practice. Therefore, we require further research.

We are open to any suggestion for improving this study, thank you

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.
The benefits of publishing with F1000Research:

- Your article is published within days, with no editorial bias
- You can publish traditional articles, null/negative results, case reports, data notes and more
- The peer review process is transparent and collaborative
- Your article is indexed in PubMed after passing peer review
- Dedicated customer support at every stage

For pre-submission enquiries, contact research@f1000.com