

## EARLY RESULTS OF COMPARISON OF CONTASURE-NEEDLESS® AND TOT OUTSIDE-IN MIDURETHRAL SLINGS

### Hypothesis / aims of study

Tension free tape is now commonly used with satisfactory treatment results with less complications in stress urinary incontinence(SUI). Single incision TOT method is another method treating SUI without penetrating obturator membrane but anchors to the muscular plane. In this study, we aimed to compare the treatment results between Contasure-needless® (needless sling) and TOT outside-in technique.

### Study design, materials and methods

One hundred and three women with SUI were enrolled to this study. They were randomly divided into two groups according to their operative procedure (needless sling 52, TOT outside-in 51). All operative procedures were conducted by single surgeon. Patients' epidemiological information, three-day frequency-volume chart, uroflow(UFR)with post void residual(PVR) volume, symptom questionnaire, operation related complications, operative time, post-operative voiding symptoms were reviewed and analyzed.

### Results

Mean age of patients were 52.90± 9.97(NDL) 56.95± 9.64(TOT) (P=0.088). Pre-operative voiding characters were not significantly different between two groups (p>0.05, Table). Mean operation time, post-operative 4 weeks follow-up voiding characters were not significantly different (p>0.05, Table). There had been no significant complications in both groups. There were three recurrence of incontinence (1 in TOT group, and 2 in needless group) during the follow up period. The types of incontinence of recurrent patients were mixture of stress and urge incontinence with dominant nature of urge incontinence.

|            | Age<br>(years<br>old) | Preop. VV        | Preop<br>.Qmx   | Preop.<br>PVR  | Postop.<br>VV     | Postop.<br>Qmx | Postop.<br>PVR | Preop.<br>VLPP  | Op.<br>duration(min) |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| NDL        | 52.9±<br>9.97         | 254.3±<br>126.78 | 19.7±<br>13.69  | 43.1±<br>25.08 | 254.3 ±<br>180.76 | 19.7±<br>12.31 | 43.1±<br>48.64 | 95.9±<br>26.22  | 29.3 ± 6.16          |
| TOT        | 56.95±<br>9.64        | 191.7±<br>208.37 | 20.2 ±<br>14.35 | 63.7±<br>31.67 | 191.7±<br>85.13   | 20.2 ±<br>3.26 | 63.7±<br>54.17 | 100.4±<br>17.08 | 25.7± 18.48          |
| P<br>value | 0.088                 | 0.38             | 0.401           | 0.436          | 0.47              | 0.39           | 0.298          | 0.058           | 0.167                |

VV : voiding volume (mL)

Qmx : maximal flow rate (mL/sec)

PVR : post-void residual urine volume (mL)

VLPP : Valsalva leak point pressure (cmH<sub>2</sub>O)

### Interpretation of results

There were no significant differences in treatment results between needless sling and TOT outside-in technique. Duration of operation was similar without any significant difference. Patient's self satisfaction was satisfied enough with the treatment in both groups.

### Concluding message

Contasure-needless® sling and TOT outside-in sling technique both provide similar outcomes in short-term follow-up. Although, longer-term data should followed, the Contasure-needless® sling technique can also be considered as effective operative method in selected group of stress incontinence patients.

### References

1. Ghoneim G, Stanford E, Kenton K et al. Evaluation and outcome measures in the treatment of female urinary stress incontinence: International Urogynecological Association (IUGA) guidelines for research and clinical practice. Int urogynecol J 2008;19:5-33.
2. Tardiu LA, Franco EM, Vicens JML. Contasure-needless compared with transobturator-TVT for te treamtnet of stress urinary incontinence. INT Urocynecol J (Published online 02 March 2011)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Specify source of funding or grant                           | none   |
| Is this a clinical trial?                                    | No   |
| What were the subjects in the study?                         | HUMAN  |
| Was this study approved by an ethics committee?              | No   |
| This study did not require ethics committee approval because | 1.Subject devices are already used in clinical field with approval.<br>2.Although devices(sling malterials) were randomly selected, subject population wanted to get operation and agreed to using their data to study analysis. |
| Was the Declaration of Helsinki followed?                    | Yes  |
| Was informed consent obtained from the patients?             | Yes  |