

Table E-1 Shock wave parameters for the lithotripter used in the study

Physical parameter	Unit	Dornier Epos Ultra Level 2	Dornier Epos Ultra Level 3	Dornier Epos Fluoro Level 3	Dornier Compact S Level 1	Siemens Sonocur Level 2	Siemens Sonocur Level 3	Storz Minilith Level 3	Wolf Piezason 300 Level 5	Siemens Lithostar UTM Level 1
Generator type	--	EM	EM	EM	EM	EM	EM	EM	PE	EM
P ₊	Mpa	10.6	13.7	16.0	29	7.9	11	20	40	6
f _x (-6dB)	mm	7.4	6.0	9	3.0	5.7	5.5	4.75	3	n.a.
f _y (-6dB)	mm	7.4	6.0	9	3.0	5.7	5.5	4.75	3	n.a.
f _z (-6dB)	mm	34	33	90	38	57	56	30	20	n.a.
f _x (5Mpa)	mm	8.2	6.3	18	11	3	5	14	10	n.a.
f _y (5Mpa)	mm	8.2	6.3	18	11	3	5	14	10	n.a.
ED ₊ (old method)	mJ/mm ²	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.08
ED ₊ (new method)		0.06	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.04	0.07	0.22	0.08	n.a.
ED	mJ/mm ²	0.11	0.22	0.11	0.12	0.09	0.16	0.32	0.20	n.a.
E ₊ (-6dB)	mJ	1.5	1.6	3.2	0.6	0.7	1.1	1.65	0.6	n.a.
E ₋ (6dB)	mJ	2.7	2.9	4.5	0.75	2	3	4.9	1.4	n.a.
E ₊ (5Mpa)	mJ	1.9	8.5	7.0	4.2	0.5	1	3.1	6.3	n.a.
E ₋ (5Mpa)	mJ	3.4	15	11	6	2	3	22	15.8	n.a.
E ₊ (5mm)	mJ	0.9	1.4	1.1	1.4	0.5	0.9	1.4	1.6	n.a.
E ₋ (5mm)	mJ	2.0	2.6	1.9	1.7	1.3	2	5.3	3.9	n.a.

EM = Electromagnetic, PE = Piezoelectric, n.a. = not available

Table E-2 Success rates twelve weeks after intervention by center

	ESWT			Placebo			Difference of success rates with 95% CI	Odds ratio with 95% CI
Center	n	success	failure	n	success	failure		
1	31	15	15	30	11	19	13.3% [-13.7%;39.0%]	1.73 [0.548;5.50]
2	22	3	18	21	4	17	-4.8% [-35.4%;26.5%]	0.708 [0.0909;4.92]
3	22	2	17	21	2	14	-2.0% [-38.7%;28.3%]	0.824 [0.0536;12.8]
4	15	1	11	14	2	8	-11.7% [-57.7%;29.1%]	0.364 [0.00566;8.52]
5	8	3	5	9	2	7	15.3% [-34.6%;66.7%]	2.10 [0.162;32.9]
6	7	2	5	8	1	7	16.1% [-36.2%;71.2%]	2.80 [0.107;188]
7	6	0	6	6	3	3	-50.0% [-89.2%;14.9%]	0 [0;2.11]
8	5	1	4	5	1	4	0.0% [-63.0%;63.0%]	1.00 [0.0102;97.9]
9	5	4	1	4	0	4	80.0% [9.8%;99.5%]	∞ [0.780;∞]
10	4	0	4	6	2	2	-50.0% [-93.8%;30.7%]	0 [0;5.05]
11	5	1	3	5	1	3	0.0% [-69.0%;69.0%]	1.00 [0.00958;104]
12	1	0	1	2	1	1	-50.0% [-98.8%;77.5%]	0 [0;78.0]
13	2	0	2	3	0	1	0.0% [-98.8%;95.4%]	n.d.
14	0	0	0	1	1	0	n.d.	n.d.
15	1	0	0	2	0	1	n.d.	n.d.
Total	134	32	92	137	31	91	inhomogeneity: p=0.1696	1.08 [0.599;1.96]

n.d. = not defined

Table E-3 Success rates twelve weeks after intervention by device

	ESWT			Placebo			Difference of success rates with 95% CI	Odds ratio with 95% CI
Device	n	success	failure	n	success	failure		
A	34	15	17	35	11	21	12.5% [-13.7%;37.5%]	1.68 [0.550;5.22]
B	29	4	22	29	3	21	2.9% [-22.8%;32.3%]	1.27 [0.189;9.70]
C	24	1	23	24	9	13	-36.7% [-63.9%;-8.0%]	0.0628
D	22	3	18	21	4	17	-4.8% [-35.4%;26.5%]	0.708 [0.0909;4.92]
E	8	3	5	9	2	7	15.3% [-34.6%;66.7%]	2.10 [0.162;32.9]
F	9	1	5	9	0	5	16.7% [-39.6%;77.7%]	∞ [0.0214;∞]
G	5	4	1	4	0	4	80.0% [9.8%;99.5%]	∞ [0.780;∞]
H	3	1	1	5	1	3	25.0% [-64.7%;98.8%]	3.00 [0.0192;313]
I	0	0	0	1	1	0	n.d.	n.d.
Total	134	32	92	137	31	91	inhomogeneity: p=0.0085	1.08 [0.597;1.96]

n.d. = not defined