Low-Intensity Shock Wave Therapy (Li-ESWT) in Erectile Dysfunction (2015–2025)

Restorative approach for vasculogenic ED

Focus: angiogenesis, endothelial repair

Reviewed last decade of evidence

Background

- ED: multifactorial, affects QoL and relationships
- First-line: PDE5 inhibitors, lifestyle, counseling
- Li-ESWT: unique restorative therapy, not symptomatic
- Aims to reverse endothelial and vascular dysfunction

Reference: Burnett AL, J Urol, 2018

Rationale for Li-ESWT

- Originated from musculoskeletal and vascular medicine
- Low-energy shock waves induce controlled microtrauma
- Hypothesis: triggers biological healing pathways
- First used in ED research ~2010

Reference: Gruenwald I, J Urol, 2012

Mechanism: Biophysical Effects

- Acoustic pulses cause cavitation & shear stress
- Activate mechanotransduction pathways in tissues
- Result: endothelial nitric oxide release
- Improves penile blood flow

Reference: Qiu X, J Sex Med, 2013

Mechanism: Angiogenesis

- Upregulation of VEGF, eNOS, proliferative factors
- Increases neovascularization in corpus cavernosum
- Enhances smooth muscle and endothelial regeneration
- Shown in diabetic and nerve-injury animal models

Reference: Li H, J Urol, 2016

Mechanism: Nerve & Tissue Effects

- May promote peripheral nerve sprouting
- Reduces fibrosis in cavernous tissue
- Activates stem/progenitor cell homing
- Human mechanistic evidence still limited

Reference: Li H, J Urol, 2016

Clinical Evidence: Early RCTs

- Gruenwald 2012: improved IIEF vs sham
- Kitrey 2016: PDE5i nonresponders converted to responders
- Significant short-term gains, esp. mild ED
- Small sample sizes

Reference: Gruenwald I, J Urol, 2012; Kitrey ND, J Urol, 2016

Clinical Evidence: Recent Trials

- Several RCTs 2018–2023: modest but consistent IIEF rise
- Improvements ~3–5 points on IIEF-EF domain
- Greater benefit in mild/moderate vasculogenic ED
- Severe ED shows limited improvement

Reference: Bocchino AC, Int J Impot Res, 2023

Observational Studies

- Large series show improved EF & satisfaction
- Many report conversion of PDE5i failures to responders
- Durability often <12 months without retreatment
- Lack of sham control = bias risk

Reference: Chung E, World J Mens Health, 2021

Meta-Analyses (2017–2020)

- Confirm statistical improvement in IIEF & EHS
- Effect sizes small–moderate
- High heterogeneity across studies
- Durability beyond 6–12 months unclear

Reference: Capogrosso P, J Sex Med, 2019

Meta-Analyses (2021–2024)

- Umbrella review: best outcomes in mild vasculogenic ED
- IIEF +4–5 points vs sham at 3–6 months
- EHS improved ~0.5 point
- Clinical significance debated

Reference: Medrano-Sánchez EM, J Pers Med, 2024

Treatment Protocols: Variability

- Energy flux density: 0.05–0.25 mJ/mm²
- Shocks: 1,500–3,000 per session
- Sessions: 4–12, typically over 6 weeks
- Total shocks: 6,000–80,000

Reference: Chung E, World J Mens Health, 2021

Treatment Protocols: Devices

- Electrohydraulic, electromagnetic, piezoelectric
- Focused vs radial vs linear waves
- Targets: penile shaft + crura ± glans
- Lack of head-to-head device trials

Reference: Hayon S, Sex Med Rev, 2024

Combination Therapies

- Li-ESWT + PDE5i shows synergistic effect
- Some nonresponders regain responsiveness
- Early trials: L-arginine + tadalafil prolong benefit
- Still experimental

Reference: Gallo L, Investig Clin Urol, 2022

Safety Profile

- Adverse effects rare, mild, self-limiting
- Pain, bruising, transient dyspepsia
- No serious adverse events reported
- Safe at therapeutic energies

Reference: Bocchino AC, Int J Impot Res, 2023

Guidelines: AUA

- AUA 2018: investigational, not standard care
- Evidence level: Grade C
- Not recommended outside research/clinical trials

Reference: Burnett AL, J Urol, 2018

Guidelines: ESSM & Others

- ESSM 2019: efficacy doubtful, needs more research
- Asia-Pacific 2021: safe, promising, but heterogeneous data
- Consensus: selective use, informed consent required

Reference: Capogrosso P, J Sex Med, 2019; Chung E, World J Mens Health, 2021

Special Populations: Diabetes

- Diabetic ED patients show smaller response
- Some benefit in well-controlled, moderate ED
- Likely less durable than in non-diabetics
- Mechanistic plausibility: microvascular repair

Reference: Mason MM, Andrology, 2023

Special Populations: Post-Prostatectomy

- Li-ESWT may aid early EF recovery
- Meta-analysis: small short-term improvement
- No significant long-term benefit
- Role in penile rehab still uncertain

Reference: Ryu JK, J Clin Med, 2022

Future Directions

- Standardize protocols & dosimetry reporting
- Larger multicenter RCTs with long-term follow-up
- Identify predictors of response
- Explore combined therapies (PDE5i, rehab)

Reference: Desai J, Br Med Bull, 2025

References

- Bocchino AC, Pezzoli M, Cocci A, Martínez-Salamanca JI, et al. *Low-intensity extracorporeal shock wave therapy for erectile dysfunction: Myths and realities*. Int J Impot Res. 2023;35(1):** (DOI and pages to be filled).pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.govpmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Chung E, Lee J, Liu CC, Taniguchi H, Zhou HL, Park HJ, et al. *Clinical practice guideline recommendation on the use of low-intensity extracorporeal shock wave therapy to treat erectile dysfunction: The Asia-Pacific Society for Sexual Medicine position statement*. World J Mens Health. 2021;39(1):1–8. doi:10.5534/WJMH.200077. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Gallo L, Shindel AW, Moreland RB, et al. *Adjuvant daily L-arginine and tadalafil improve efficacy and duration of low-energy shockwave therapy for ED: a randomized trial*. Investig Clin Urol. 2022;63(1):70–78.icurology.org
- Burnett AL, Nehra A, Breau RH, Culkin DJ, et al.; AUA Erectile Dysfunction Guideline Update Panel. *Erectile dysfunction: AUA guideline (2018 update)*. J Urol. 2018;200(3):633–641. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000000045. auanet.org
- Capogrosso P, Frey A, S. Jensen CF, Rastrelli G, Russo GI, Torremade I, et al.; ESSM Guidelines on Sexual Medicine: Sexual Medicine Panel. *Low-intensity shock wave therapy in sexual medicine – clinical recommendations from ESSM*. J Sex Med. 2019;16(10):1490–1505. doi:10.1016/j.jsxm.2019.07.016. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

References

- Desai J, Huyghe E, Maffulli G, et al. *Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for erectile dysfunction: Rethinking study design, implementation, and analysis*. Br Med Bull. 2025;154(1):ldaf004. doi:10.1093/bmb/ldaf004. pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.govpmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Medrano-Sánchez EM, Peña-Cantonero B, Candón-Ballester P, Blanco-Díaz M, Díaz-Mohedo E. *Effectiveness of low-intensity extracorporeal shock wave therapy in erectile dysfunction: An analysis of sexual function and penile hardness at erection – an umbrella review*. J Pers Med. 2024;14(2):177. doi:10.3390/jpm14020177. mdpi.com
- Ryu JK, Kang DH, Kim JW, Chung DY. *Efficacy of low-intensity extracorporeal shock wave treatment in erectile dysfunction following radical prostatectomy: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. J Clin Med. 2022;11(10):2775. doi:10.3390/jcm11102775. pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Mason MM, Pai RK, Masterson JM, et al. *Low-intensity extracorporeal shockwave therapy for diabetic men with erectile dysfunction: A systematic scoping review*. Andrology. 2023;11(2):270–281. doi:10.1111/andr.13197. pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- Chung E, et al. *WJMH Position Statement.* World J Mens Health. 2021;39(1):1–8. doi:10.5534/WJMH.200077. (Asia-Pacific Society position)pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov