312

Authors: Christopher W. Graham*, Roger R. Dmochowski**

Institution: *Urology Specialists of San Antonio, **North Texas Center for Urinary Control LOWER URINARY TRACT SYMPTOMS QUESTIONNAIRES FOR FEMALES

Aims of Study:

No questionnaires for the evaluation of female lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) has emerged as the standard for clinical or research use. These questionnaires generally serve to discriminate between stress and urge incontinence, to quantify the amount of incontinence, or to assess the impact of incontinence on the patient.

Methods:

We review psychometrically validated, English-language LUTS questionnaires. This can serve as a foundation for further development of standardized questionnaires for female LUTS.

Results:

NAME	VALIDITY TESTING ¹
Sensitivity 0.7 Specificity 0.52	
	Accuracy 0.68
Detrusor Instability Score	Sensitivity 0.83-0.86
Gaudenz Incontinence	Pad test: r _p 0.58-0.70
Questionnaire (English Version)	Convergent and discriminant
Stress Incontinence	Validity good
Questionnaire	Patient reported severity: r _s 0.59
Severity Index	Pad test: r _s 0.54
	Convergent and discriminant
Severity Index & Symptom Impact	Validity good
Index	Voiding diary: r _s 0.85-0.97
Bristol Female Lower Urinary	Pad test: r _s 0.31-0.67
Tract Symptom Questionnaire	Leak Events: r 0.23-0.34
Incontinence Impact	Pad test: r 0.19-0.34
Questionnaire (IIQ) & Urogenital	IIQ & IIQ-7 r _p 0.97
	UDI and UDI-6 r _p 0.93
Distress Inventory (UDI)	Convergent and discriminant validity
IIQ-7 & UDI-6 Urge IIQ & Urge Udi	Cp 0.85 between these two indices
Interstitial Cystitis Severity Index & Problem	Domains of Short form-36: r 0.35-0.67
Index Incontinence Quality of Life	Domains of Psychological
	General Well-Being Schedule r 0.45-0.62
Urge Impact Score	Number of Leaks: r 0.44IIQ r 0.49

 $^{^{1}}$ Unless specified, validity is by correlation of index (or domains) with listed parameter. r_s is Spearman's correlation coefficient, r_p is Pearson's correlation coefficient, and r is alternate correlation.

Conclusions:

While no one instrument appears to be best suited to the overall assessment of female voiding dysfunction, those which address several domains in a shorter format are more facile and provide sensitivity and specificity approximating longer questionaires.