

TRANSOBTURATOR TENSION-FREE MID-URETHRAL SLING USING TYPE-I MACROPOROUS POLYPROPYLENE MESH VERSUS BURCH RETROPUBIC COLPOSUSPENSIONIN MANAGEMENT OF PRIMARY URODYNAMIC (TYPE-I) STRESS URINARY INCONTINENCE

**THESIS SUBMITTED AS PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF MD DEGREE
IN OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY**

By

Mohammed Ahmed Adel Mohammed Faris

Assistant Lecturer of Obstetrics and Gynecology – Ain Shams University

M.B.B.Ch – Ain Shams University – 2002

Master of Obstetrics and Gynecology – Ain Shams University – 2007

Under Supervision of

Prof. Khaled Kamal Ali

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Ain Shams University

Prof. Ismaiel Khalil El-Lamie

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Ain Shams University

Prof. Mohammed Abdel-Hameed Nasr El-Dien

Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Ain Shams University



Ain Shams University

Cairo – Egypt

2013

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

"وَمَا أُوتِيتُمْ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا"

صَدَقَ اللَّهُ الْعَظِيمُ

Acknowledgements

Foremost, all thanks and gratitude refer to **the Merciful and Compassionate ALLAH**; for, without HIS support and care, no one can accomplish success.

I would like to express my gratitude to **Prof. Khalid Kamal Ali**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University, for his wise and fatherly support, not only regarding this work, but also in my and others' whole career. He has been one of my appreciable and trustable professors since my first steps in residency. His support in the appraising and directing this work, as it currently appears, is invaluable.

My utmost respect and gratitude to **Prof. Ismaiel Khalil El-Lamie**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University; one of the pioneers of pelvic floor reconstructive surgery and originator of the idea of this work. I was honored by his appreciable assistance in the initial surgical training for this work and relevant procedures.

No word can express my appreciation and gratitude to **Prof. Mohammed Abdel-Hameed Nasr El-Dien**, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University; the inspiring surgeon to any young gynecologist; for his invaluable persistent and consistent support. His artistic surgical behavior has taken my interest in urogynecology and pelvic floor surgery.

I would like to express my special thanks to **Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Ibrahim**, Assistant Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ain Shams University, who, despite not being one of the listed official supervisors, was a fundamental and substantial member of this work. His quiet and patient, yet highly skillful behavior in training and assistance, extremely and remarkably guided me a lot in performing surgical procedures of the current work.

Furthermore, I have to thank **all members of the Urogynecology Unit, Ain Shams University Maternity Hospital**, for their invaluable support and share in the current work.

Lastly, but not the least, I am indebted with any success in my lifetime to, after ALLAH, **my wife, my parents, and siblings**, who have always been standing by my side and supporting memorally and physically.

Mohammed Ahmed Adel Faris
Cairo, Egypt
January 2013

To Omar, Laila, Yasmine and my ever-beloved Khadija

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements and Dedication	lii
Lists of Tables	vii
Lists of Figures	ix
Lists of Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	7
Review of the Literature	10
1. Functional Anatomy of Pelvic Floor and Lower Urinary Tract.	12
2. Pathophysiology of Female Stress Urinary Incontinence.	38
3. Evaluation of Women with Stress Urinary Incontinence.	51
4. Use of Biologic and Synthetic Mesh in Urogynecology and Reconstructive Pelvic Surgery	82
5. Surgical Management Options for Female Stress Urinary Incontinence	95
Patients and Methods	127
Results	147
Discussion	211
Summary and Conclusion	245
References	251
Arabic Summary	1

List of Tables

- Table-1 Types and Characteristics of Synthetic Graft Materials	86
- Table-2 Types and Characteristics of Biologic Tissue Implants	89
- Table-3 Outcomes of TVT Case Series by Duration of Follow-up	115
- Table-4 Characteristics of Included Women	151
- Table-5 Prevalence of Cystocele in Included Women	153
- Table-6 Preoperative Urodynamic Parameters in Included Women	154
- Table-7 Underlying Etiology of Stress Incontinence in Included Women	154
- Table-8 Preoperative Scores for ICIQ-UI-SF Questionnaire in Included Women	155
- Table-9 Difference between Groups regarding Initial Characteristics	156
- Table-10 Difference between Groups regarding Prevalence of Cystocele	157
- Table-11 Difference between Groups regarding Preoperative Urodynamic Parameters	159
- Table-12 Difference between Groups regarding the Underlying Etiology of Stress Incontinence	161
- Table-13 Difference between Groups regarding Preoperative Score for the ICIQ-UI-SF Questionnaire	162
- Table-14 Difference between Groups regarding Intraoperative Events	164
- Table-15 Summary of Features, Management and Prognosis of Cases with Intraoperative Complications	166
- Table-16 Difference between Approaches of Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Intraoperative Events	168
- Table-17 Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Pain	170
- Table-18 Difference between Approaches of Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Pain	171
- Table-19 Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Adverse Events	173
- Table-20 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Adverse Events	176
- Table-21 Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Hospital Stay	179
- Table-22 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Hospital Stay	180
- Table-23 Difference between Groups regarding Duration of Postoperative Catheterization	181
- Table-24 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Duration of Postoperative Catheterization	182
- Table-25 Difference between Groups regarding Objective and Subjective Outcomes	182
- Table-26 Difference between Groups regarding Patient Satisfaction through the PGI-I Scale	183
- Table-27 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Objective and Subjective Outcomes	186
- Table-28 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Patient Satisfaction through the PGI-I Scale	186
- Table-29 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Objective and Subjective Outcomes among Those who underwent Transobturator Sling Procedure [Inside-Out Approach]	190

- Table-30 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Patient Satisfaction through the PGI-I Scale among Those who underwent Transobturator Sling Procedure [Inside-Out Approach]	190
- Table-31 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Objective and Subjective Outcomes among Those who underwent Transobturator Sling Procedure [Outside-In Approach]	192
- Table-32 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Patient Satisfaction through the PGI-I Scale among Those who underwent Transobturator Sling Procedure [Outside-In Approach]	192
- Table-33 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Objective and Subjective Outcomes among Those who underwent Burch Retropubic Colposuspension Procedure	194
- Table-34 Difference between Women with Urethral Hypermobility and Those with ISD regarding Patient Satisfaction through the PGI-I Scale among Those who underwent Burch Retropubic Colposuspension Procedure	194
- Table-35 Difference between Groups regarding the ICIQ-UI-SF Score	196
- Table-36 Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding the ICIQ-UI-SF Score	197
- Table-37 Difference between Groups regarding Complications	200
- Table-38 Difference between Groups regarding Urodynamic Parameters	204
- Table-39 Summary of Features and Management of Cases complicated with Vaginal Mesh Erosion	206
- Table-40 Association between Patient's Characteristics and Objective Failure at 1 Year Postoperatively	207
- Table-41 Association between Patient's Characteristics and Postoperative Voiding Difficulty	176
- Table-42 Association between Patient's Characteristics and Persistent <i>de novo</i> Urgency at 1 Year Postoperatively	209
- Table-43 Association between Patient's Characteristics and Vaginal Mesh Erosion	210

List of Figures

- Figure-1 Coronal View of the Bony Pelvis in Female	13
- Figure-2 Sagittal View of the Bony Pelvis in Female	13
- Figure-3 Axial View of the Female Pelvic Floor	19
- Figure-4 Sagittal View of the Female Pelvic Floor	20
- Figure-5 Retropubic Space and Pelvic Fascia	21
- Figure-6 Blood and Nerve Supply of the Pelvis	23
- Figure-7 DeLancey's Levels of Pelvic Support	26
- Figure-8 Cross-section of the Female Urethra	30
- Figure-9 Anatomy of the Retropubic Space of Retzius	32
- Figure-10 Transobturator Anatomy	33
- Figure-11 Alteration in Bladder Neck Position Theory	40
- Figure-12 Intrinsic sphincter deficiency. The urethra is unable to generate enough outlet resistance to retain urine in bladder	41
- Figure-13 The Hammock Theory by DeLancey. The urethra lies on a supportive layer composed of endopelvic fascia and anterior vaginal wall.	42
- Figure-14 The Hammock Theory by DeLancey	43
- Figure-15 The Trampoline Theory	50
- Figure-16 Flow-Diagram of the Progress through the Phases of the Trial	150
- Figure-17 Bar-Chart showing Age Distribution in Included Women	152
- Figure-18 Pie-Chart showing Menstrual State in Included Women	152
- Figure-19 Pie-Chart showing Prevalence of Cystocele in Included Women	153
- Figure-20 Pie-Chart showing the Underlying Etiology of Stress Incontinence in Included Women	155
- Figure-21 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Age	157
- Figure-22 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding BMI	157
- Figure-23 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Prevalence of Cystocele	158
- Figure-24 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Preoperative VLPP	160
- Figure-25 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Preoperative Qmax	160
- Figure-26 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding the Underlying Etiology of Stress Incontinence	161
- Figure-27 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Preoperative Score for the ICIQ-UI-SF Questionnaire	162
- Figure-28 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Groups regarding Duration of the Procedure	165
- Figure-29 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Groups regarding the Procedure-related EBL	165
- Figure-30 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Duration of the Procedure	169
- Figure-31 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding the Procedure-related EBL	169
- Figure-32 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Pain [after excluding Cases with Major Concomitant Procedures]	171

- Figure-33 Box-Plot Chart Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Pain [after excluding Cases with Major Concomitant Procedures]	172
- Figure-34 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Overall Postoperative Adverse Events	174
- Figure-35 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Voiding Difficulty	174
- Figure-36 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative <i>de novo</i> Urgency	175
- Figure-37 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Thigh Pain or Paresthesia	175
- Figure-38 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Overall Postoperative Adverse Events	177
- Figure-39 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Voiding Difficulty	177
- Figure-40 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative <i>de novo</i> Urgency	178
- Figure-41 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Postoperative Thigh Pain or Paresthesia	178
- Figure-42 Box-Plot Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Postoperative Hospital Stay	180
- Figure-43 Curve showing Difference between Groups regarding Objective Cure Rates at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	184
- Figure-44 Curve showing Difference between Groups regarding Subjective Cure Rates at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	184
- Figure-45 Curve showing Difference between Groups regarding Patient Satisfaction Rates through the PGI-I Scale at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	185
- Figure-46 Curve showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Objective Cure Rates at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	187
- Figure-47 Curve showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Subjective Cure Rates at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	187
- Figure-48 Curve showing Difference between Approaches of the Transobturator Sling Procedure regarding Patient Satisfaction Rates through the PGI-I Scale at 1-month, 6-month and 1-years Postoperative Follow-ups	190
- Figure-49 Curve showing Difference between Groups regarding the Median ICIQ-UI-SF Score Initially, as well as 1 month, 6 months and 1 year Postoperatively	198
- Figure-50 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Rates of Recurrent UTI 1 month, 6 month, and 1 year Postoperatively	201
- Figure-51 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Rates of Recurrent Vaginitis 1 month, 6 month, and 1 year Postoperatively	201
- Figure-52 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Rates of Voiding Difficulty 1 month, 6 month, and 1 year Postoperatively	202

- Figure-53 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Rates of <i>de novo</i> Urgency 1 month, 6 month, and 1 year Postoperatively	202
- Figure-54 Bar-Chart showing Difference between Groups regarding Rates Upper Thigh Pain 1 month, 6 month, and 1 year Postoperatively	203
- Figure-55 Difference between Groups regarding Initial and Postoperative Maximum Flow Rate (Qmax)	205
- Figure-56 Difference between Groups regarding Initial and Postoperative Maximal Urethral Closure Pressure (MUCP)	205

List of Abbreviations

95% CI	95% confidence interval
AFL	Autologous fascia lata
AHCPR	Agency for Health Care Policy and Research
ALPP	Abdominal leak point pressure
ARF	Autologous rectus fascia
AUA	American Urology Association
BMI	Body mass index
CFL	Cadaveric fascia lata
CIC	Clean intermittent catheterization
DA	Dermal allograft
DI	Detrusor instability
DO	Detrusor overactivity
EBL	Estimated blood loss
EMG	Electromyography
FD-CFL	Freeze-dried cadaveric fascia lata
FVC	Frequency volume chart
ICIQ	International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire
ICIQ-UI-SF	International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire – Urinary Incontinence – short form
ICS	International Continence Society
IQR	Interquartile range
ISD	Intrinsic sphincter deficiency
IUGA	International Urogynecological Association
LPP	Leak point pressure
LUT	Lower urinary tract
LUTD	Lower urinary tract disease
LUTS	Lower urinary tract symptoms
MCC	Maximum cystometric capacity
MMK	Marshall-Marchetti-Krantz Procedure
MMPs	Matrix metalloproteinases
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
mRNA	Messenger ribonucleic acid
MUCP	Maximum urethral closure pressure
MUI	Mixed urinary incontinence
NICE	National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence
NIH	National Institute of Health
NPV	Negative predictive value
OAB	Overactive bladder

Pdet @ Qmax	Detrusor pressure at maximum flow rate
PGI-I	Patient Global Impression of Improvement
POP-Q	Pelvic organ prolapse quantification system
PPV	Positive predictive value
PVR	Post-void residual urine volume
Qave	Average uroflow rate
Qmax	Maximal uroflow rate
RCOG	Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
RR	Relative risk
SD	Standard deviation
SIS	Small intestinal submucosa
SUI	Stress urinary incontinence
TVT	Tension-free vaginal tape
UDS	Urodynamics study
UI	Urinary incontinence
UTI	Urinary tract infection
UUI	Urge urinary incontinence
VAS	Visual analogue scale
VLPP	Valsalva leak point pressure

Introduction

<h2>Introduction</h2>

Stress urinary incontinence (SUI) is estimated to affect up to one-third of women older than the age of 18 years old, with a median age of 45 years **(Hunnskaar et al., 2004)**. Surgery for stress urinary incontinence (SUI) represents one of the most common indications for surgery in women. Approximately 4% of women will undergo surgery for SUI during their lifetime **(Olsen et al., 1997)**.

Over 1,000 surgical procedures for treating SUI have been described. However, only a small number of these procedures have both withstood the test of time and held up scientific scrutiny **(Barber, 2008)**.

In 1949, Marshal, Marchetti and Krantz described a retropubic procedure (MMK), in which the rectus fascia was divided to allow access to the supportive tissue at the bladder neck, which is then fixed to the periosteum of the pubic bone. In 1961, Burch described a similar operation, in which these supporting tissues were anchored laterally to Cooper's ligament instead of the pubic bone, obviating the risk of osteitis pubis, an uncommon but debilitating complication associated with the MMK procedure. These procedures involved suspending and stabilizing the bladder neck and proximal urethra in a high retropubic position, thereby preventing their descent during times of increased intra-abdominal pressure. These techniques were effective, with mean 3-7-year continence rate of 77% **(Walters and Daneshgari, 2004)**.

More recently, suburethral pubovaginal sling operations have become popular amongst urologists and gynecologists. In 1942, Aldridge developed the first suburethral sling using rectus fascia. This avoided the need for a laparotomy, therefore decreasing morbidity, but a second incision was still required either abdominally (to harvest rectus fascia) or on the inner thigh (for fascia late) **(Aldridge, 1942)**. Published studies show long-term cure rates to be similar to Burch procedure, with sustained continence in about 85% of patients. In an attempt to obviate the need for a second incision to harvest fascia, many have evaluated the efficacy of cadaveric fascia, xenografts and synthetic materials e.g. Mersilene, Gortex, silicone and polypropylene, as the sling material **(Walter and Daneshgari, 2004; Bhargava and Chapple, 2004; Shindel and Klutke, 2005)**.

Modern surgical therapy of female SUI is no longer focused on the proximal urethra and bladder neck, but on providing additional support at the mid-urethra to restore continence. This has led to introduction of mid-urethral sling procedures. Tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) is a standard minimally invasive procedure used to treat SUI since 1995 when it was first described by **Ulmsten et al (1995)**. The TVT procedure used a “bottom-up” retropubic route of sling passage, and was soon followed by suprapubic arch (SPARC) sling system, using similar methods via a “top-down” approach through the retropubic space toward the midurethra. TVT has shown to have similar effectiveness to colposuspension but with fewer complications (**Cody et al., 2003**). Although success ranges from 84 to 95%, complications described include bladder, bowel, and major blood vessel injuries, as well as postoperative voiding difficulties (**de Tayrac et al., 2004**) and de novo urgency and urge incontinence (**David-Montefiore et al., 2006**).

In 2001, Delorme described a method of inserting the tape, which passes through the obturator foramen (termed transobturator tape), thus theoretically avoiding some of the complications such as bladder perforation (**Delorme, 2001**). In this “outside-in” technique, after the initial anterior vaginal incision and dissection, the tape is introduced from the skin of the groin into the obturator foramen and comes out in the vaginal incision. In 2003, de Leval introduced a modified technique, which is the “inside-out” approach of the transobturator sling procedure, in which the needle is passed in a reverse route, i.e. in through vaginal incision and out through the obturator foramen.

In the preliminary study, Delorme showed that there was a high success rate, no bladder perforations and few perioperative complications via the transobturator route, and this procedure was subsequently widely-adopted before proper evaluation of its effectiveness and complications. There have been several non-comparative studies that have reported good short-term and medium-term (**de Leval et al., 2005; Neuman, 2006; Latthe et al., 2008**) success rates with transobturator sling procedures with either route.

Burch retropubic colposuspension (with its modifications) remains the widely-used and gold-standard surgical procedure for urodynamic stress incontinence in Ain Shams University Maternity Hospital, however. The major obstacle of adopting the modern midurethral sling procedures (whether retropubic or transobturator) as the gold-standard procedures is the high cost