

## EFFICACY OUTCOMES OF A LOW ELASTICITY POLYPROPYLENE TRANSOBTURATOR MIDURETHRAL SLING FOR THE TREATMENT OF FEMALE STRESS URINARY INCONTINENCE: FINAL DATA COMBINED FROM TWO MULTI-CENTER PROSPECTIVE CLINICAL STUDIES.

### Hypothesis / Aims of Study

The aim of these two North American multi-center studies is to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the transobturator procedure using a low elasticity polypropylene midurethral sling for the treatment of female mixed and stress urinary incontinence (SUI) over a 1 year time period.

### Study Design, Materials and Methods

Patients were prospectively enrolled at 4 centers in each of the two multi-center studies, for a total of 8 centers in the United States. Main eligibility criteria across the two multi-center studies included: women >18 years old, SUI or mixed urinary incontinence, no prior synthetic sling surgery, not pregnant, no urinary or vaginal infection, <150 mL post-void residual. After IRB approval and patient consent, pre-operative data was collected, and a monofilament polypropylene, light weight, macroporous midurethral sling (Aris<sup>TM</sup>, Coloplast, Denmark) was implanted using the transobturator technique described by E. Delorme[1]. Operative and peri-operative data was recorded. Patients had 4 follow-up visits over the course of one year. Efficacy outcome measures were: cough stress test, Stamey incontinence grade, IIQ-7, UDI-6 and quality of life (QoL). Complications were recorded at each follow-up.

### Results

117 women (mean age 55.1 y, range 29–87 y) underwent transobturator sling surgery, with a mean follow-up time of 10.7 ± 3.9 months. Of these, 57% had SUI and 43% had mixed urinary incontinence, with 49% of the total patient population having had previous anti-incontinence surgery (e.g. including bulking agents, bladder suspension). 79/116 (68.1%) patients were post-menopausal, and 59/116 (50.9%) had pelvic organ prolapse.

Patients were treated with either local (n=37), general (n=46), spinal (n=31) or spinal and local (n=3). Peri-operative measures were blood loss >200 mL (3/116); length of stay: outpatient (66/117), <23 hours (48/117), >1 day (3/117); length of catheterization: none (54/117), <23 hours (54/117), >1 day (9/117).

Post-operative outcomes show significant improvements in objective continence as well as in QoL (Table 1). The incidence of post-operative overactive bladder symptoms was observed in 2 (1.7%) patients. There were 7 patients with vaginal exposure of sling all treated successfully by local excisions.

**Table 1. Post-operative Outcomes**

	Pre-operative	6 months	1 year	p-value
<b>Negative Cough Stress Test</b>	7/117 (6%)	79/87 (91%)	90/92 (98%)	p<0.0001
<b>IIQ-7</b>	42.3	7.6	6.3	p<0.0001
<b>UDI-6</b>	55.2	15.6	15.2	p<0.0001
<b>Improved QoL</b>	NA	83/88 (94%)	87/92 (95%)	p<0.0001

### Interpretation of Results

This final analysis of merged outcome data from two multi-center, prospective studies on a transobturator midurethral sling shows that the procedure is safe and effective in treating mixed and stress urinary incontinence. The results show a low rate of retention with only a small percentage of patients requiring catheterization beyond 1 day, as well as low post-operative overactive bladder symptoms. There is significant improvement in quality of life at 6 and 12 months after surgery compared to the pre-operative values as measured by two validated questionnaires: IIQ-7 and UDI-6. Further, nearly all patients experienced an improvement in their quality of life on a 7-point verbal scale, which is maintained 1 year after surgery.

### Concluding Message

The results of this combined analysis from two North American multi-center, prospective studies using the transobturator procedure using a low elasticity polypropylene midurethral sling is both safe and effective in the treatment of female mixed and stress urinary incontinence.

## References

1. Delorme E. Transobturator urethral suspension: a minimally invasive procedure to treat female stress urinary incontinence. Prog Urol 2001; 11:1306-13013

<b><i>Specify source of funding or grant</i></b>	<b>Coloplast sponsored studies</b>
<b><i>Is this a clinical trial?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b><i>Is this study registered in a public clinical trials registry?</i></b>	<b>No</b>
<b><i>What were the subjects in the study?</i></b>	<b>HUMAN</b>
<b><i>Was this study approved by an ethics committee?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b><i>Specify Name of Ethics Committee</i></b>	<b>Protocols were approved by the Ethics Committees at each of the 8 total centers involved in these two multi-center studies:</b> 1) Cleveland Clinic - Florida IRB, Weston, FL 2) St. Mary's Good Samaritan IRB, Centralia, IL 3) Univ of Southern California IRB, LA, CA 4) Schulman Associates IRB, Fort Wayne, IN 5) Human Research Protection Office, St. Louis, MO 6) Univ Medical Center of Southern Nevada IRB, LV, NV 7) LaVeta Surgery Center IRB, LA, CA 8) HCA-HealthOne LLC IRB, Denver, CO
<b><i>Was the Declaration of Helsinki followed?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b><i>Was informed consent obtained from the patients?</i></b>	<b>Yes</b>