Robinson R¹, Moore K¹, Haq A¹
¹ Preston Hospital

DYSPORT® VERSUS BOTOX® IN THE TREATMENT OF IDIOPATHIC DETRUSOR OVERACTIVITY: A FINANCIAL AND OUTCOME EVALUATION

Hypothesis / aims of study
To compare the outcome of two types of botulinum toxin A: Dysport® (Ipsen Ltd, Slough, UK) and Botox® (Allergan Inc., Irvine, USA), in the treatment of patients with urodynamically proven idiopathic detrusor overactivity.

Study design, materials and methods
Outcomes were retrospectively reviewed in patients with urodynamically proven idiopathic detrusor overactivity, dissatisfied with oral anticholinergic agents, receiving their first dose of either 500 units Dysport® or 200 units Botox®. In all cases, the botulinum toxin A was diluted in 20ml Normal Saline and administered as 20 suburothelial injections above the level of the trigone, under general anaesthetic. Flow rate and post void residual were assessed at 6 weeks post injection and patient satisfaction at 3 months.

Results
Median age of patient in the Dysport® group was 59 years (24-83) compared with 66 years (19-81) in the Botox® group. Following treatment, median post void residual in the Dysport® group was 88.5ml with 19% of patients needing to newly perform CISC and one patient required long term catheterisation. Two subjects did not have a favourable outcome following Dysport® injection. This compares favourably with the Botox® group where median post void residual was 85mls and 18% needed to start CISC. Two patients treated with Botox® reported no change in their symptoms.

Interpretation of results
There is no identifiable subjective or objective outcome difference between the two treatment groups in the management of idiopathic detrusor overactivity.

Concluding message
At current U.K prices, there is a substantial cost saving of £119.40 using Dysport® compared to Botox® at these specific doses.
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