

MULTICENTRIC STUDY TO EVALUATE THE INTRAOBSERVER AGREEMENT OF URODYNAMIC STUDIES. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE INTERPRETATION DONE BY AN EVALUATOR PRESENT DURING THE STUDY AND DEFERRED ANALYSIS.

Hypothesis / aims of study

To compare the concordance between the interpretation of the urodynamic study performed by a trained urologist present during the study, and the deferred analysis done by the same urologist.

Study design, materials and methods

120 urodynamic studies performed in 4 referral centers in Bogotá and Medellín Colombia, with the urologist present during the study were initially analyzed. Two weeks later the same urologist received the graphics and measures of the study, without the initial analysis and identification in order to be blinded. The urologist analyzed it again. Each of the physicians was asked to analyze the uroflow phase, cystometric phase and pressure-flow study, according to the recommendations of the International Continence Society (ICS). Agreement results were analyzed using the weighted Kappa method.

Results

Concordance varies between the different urodynamic phases. The best correlation was seen in the interpretation of the uroflow and PVR. Detrusor activity, bladder sensation and compliance had high accuracy with a Kappa value greater than 0.7. ALPP had the worse correlation with a Kappa value less than 0.6

Interpretation of results

The urodynamic study is a functional study of the lower urinary tract. As a dynamic, real time study, the deferred analysis of the graphics can affect its correct interpretation, because some events that an experienced urologist can observe during its performance can be missed. Herein we intend to quantify the variations in the analysis when performed by the same observer during the procedure and in a deferred manner. Some variables, such as ALPP and the final diagnosis were constantly affected by the loss of information due to deferred analysis, in the different institutions.

Concluding message

The real time analysis of the urodynamic study is essential. Differed interpretation can generate mistakes in the analysis because important information that can be obtained during the study cannot be obtained from the graphics.

<i>Specify source of funding or grant</i>	NONE
<i>Is this a clinical trial?</i>	Yes
<i>Is this study registered in a public clinical trials registry?</i>	No
<i>Is this a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT)?</i>	No
<i>What were the subjects in the study?</i>	NONE