

## THE “BOTHER” OF URINARY INCONTINENCE

### Hypothesis / aims of study

Patient reported measures are increasingly used to assess urogynecological symptoms and monitor therapies. Questionnaires play an important role in clinical research, but are rarely used in routine clinical settings because of the administrative workload involved. Physician administered Visual Analogue scales (VAS) may be a practicable alternative to assess bother related to urogynecologic disorders (1). There is little data however on how VAS bother scales correlate with symptoms and objective clinical findings. We undertook this study to explore the relationship between VAS bother scores for stress urinary incontinence (SUI) and urge urinary incontinence (UUI), and demographic factors, symptoms and clinical findings.

### Study design, materials and methods

All patients attending a tertiary urogynecological unit for investigation of lower urinary tract or pelvic floor disorders between January 2012 and January 2013 were included in this study. In addition to a standardised interview included evaluation of symptoms and obstetric and gynaecological history, we used visual analogue scales (VAS) to assess the bother of SUI and UUI on a continuous scale, with 0 referring to “no bother at all” and 100 referring to “worst conceivable bother”.

All patients underwent multi-channel urodynamic testing to assess bladder sensation and capacity, detrusor overactivity, urodynamic stress incontinence, abdominal leak point pressure (ALPP) and maximum urethral pressure (MUP). 4D translabial ultrasound, supine and after voiding, was used to record valsalva cine loops, which were analysed at a later date by the first author, blinded to all clinical data. Urethral rotation, retrovesical angle and funneling were measured as previously described (2). A cystourethrocele was defined by the combined finding of proximal urethral rotation of  $\geq 45$  degrees and an open retrovesical angle ( $\geq 140$  degrees). Patients with prior incontinence and/or prolapse surgery (n=118) were excluded from the evaluation of imaging data. Statistical analysis was carried out with SAS v 9.3. Linear regression and multiple regression were performed. A p value  $<0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

### Results

During the inclusion period 505 patients were seen. 74% (n=375) reported symptoms of SUI, with a mean bother of 5.6, and 74% (n=371) symptoms of UUI, with a mean bother of 6.4. In women reporting no symptoms the bother was assumed to be 0. Sixty percent of women (n=303) reported symptoms of both SUI and UUI, and 12% (n=62) no urinary incontinence. VAS bother scores yielded an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC, single measures, absolute agreement definition) of 0.96 (CI 0.92-0.98) for SUI and 0.92 (CI 0.85-0.96) for UUI when retested approximately one hour after the first assessment (n=40), indicating excellent repeatability. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics including urodynamic and sonographic findings, and associations with bother VAS data.

			Bother of SUI (VAS 0-100)		Bother of UUI (VAS 0-100)	
			$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value	$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value
Age	56	14	-0.4 (-0.6, -0.2)	0.0007	0.4 (0.1, 0.6)	0.001
Body Mass Index	29.0	6.2	0.7 (0.2, 1.2)	0.006	1.1 (0.6, 1.7)	$<0.0001$
Menopausal status	312/504	62%	-9.6 (-15.8, -3.3)	0.0003	11.3 (4.7, 17.9)	0.0008
Parity	2.6	1.4	1.5 (-0.7, 3.8)	0.17	3.5 (1.2, 5.9)	0.003
Prev. incontinence / prolapse surgery	118/505	23%	-9.5 (-17.2, -2.4)	0.01	10.3 (2.7, 17.9)	0.008
Previous hysterectomy	146/505	29%	1.4 (-5.3, 8.2)	0.7	10.1 (3.0, 17.2)	0.005

Table 1: Bother and demographic variables: Data is given as mean (SD) or number (percent). Linear regression,  $\beta$  gives the mean (95% CI) increase in VAS bother (in mm), for every one unit increase of explanatory variable

On univariate analysis bother of SUI was negatively associated with symptoms of prolapse and voiding dysfunction, and positively related to the diagnosis of USI, a low ALPP and the ultrasound findings of cystourethrocele and funneling. Bother of UUI was positively associated with the symptoms of Nocturia and Frequency and the findings of Detrusor Overactivity, but also USI, a low MUP and/ or ALPP. These associations remained highly significant on multivariate analysis, controlling for age, BMI, parity, previous incontinence/prolapse surgery and previous hysterectomy.

			Bother of SUI (VAS 0-100)		Bother of UUI (VAS 0-100)	
			$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value	$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value
Bother of SUI	4.2	3.5			3.9 (3.0, 4.7)	$<0.0001$
Prolapse symptoms	257/505	51%	-9.4 (-15.5, -3.4)	0.002	-1.1 (-7.5, 5.4)	0.75

Nocturia	249/503	50%	-0.5 (-6.6, 5.6)	0.88	18.5 (12.2, 24.7)	<0.0001
Frequency	179/503	36%	-0.9 (-7.3, 5.5)	0.77	10.8 (4.1, 17.5)	0.002
Voiding Dysfunction	180/504	36%	-11.9 (-18.2, -5.6)	0.0002	-4.0 (-10.7, 2.8)	0.25

Table 2: Bother and symptoms (n=505).

			Bother of SUI (VAS 0-100)		Bother of UII (VAS 0-100)	
			$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value	$\beta$ (95% CI)	p-value
USI	341/492	69%	24.7 (18.4, 31.0)	<0.0001	11.0 (4.0,18.0)	0.002
MUP (cm H <sub>2</sub> O)	42.7	20.4	-1.0 (-0.2, 0.1)	0.5	-0.2 (-0.4,-0.1)	0.002
Low ALPP (<50 cm H <sub>2</sub> O)	61/492	12%	14.7 (5.5, 24.0)	0.002	18.7 (8.9,28.4)	0.0002
Detrusor Overactivity	148/492	30%	-0.1 (-6.8, 6.6)	0.9	25.5 (18.7,32.2)	<0.0001
Maximal bladder capacity (ml)	446	93	0.03 (-0.01,0.08)	0.13	-0.4 (-0.09, 0.01)	0.07
Cystourethrocele Green II*	173/369	47%	16.4 (9.4, 23.4)	<0.001	0.03 (-7.54,7.59)	0.99
Funneling*	155/369	42%	7.6 (0.4, 14.9)	0.04	-1.6 (-9.3, 6.1)	0.68

Table 3: Bother and findings on urodynamics and imaging examination (n= 505). \*n= 387 for imaging data due to the exclusion of 118 women with prior incontinence or prolapse surgery

#### Interpretation of results

VAS bother scores for USI and UII were highly repeatable and strongly associated with symptoms and signs of lower urinary tract and pelvic floor dysfunction. These associations remained highly significant after controlling for demographic variables.

#### Concluding message

Physician administered VAS bother scores are a practicable, reliable and valid tool to assess symptoms of urinary incontinence.

#### References

1. Lukacz ES, Lawrence JM, Burchette RJ, Luber KM, Nager CW, Buckwalter JG. The use of Visual Analog Scale in urogynecologic research: a psychometric evaluation. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2004
2. Dietz HP, Nazemian K, Shek KL, Martin A. Can urodynamic stress incontinence be diagnosed by ultrasound? Int Urogynecol J. 2013

#### Disclosures

**Funding:** The project was supported with a grant from the University of Graz **Clinical Trial:** No **Subjects:** HUMAN **Ethics Committee:** Nepean Blue Mountains Local Health District. Human Research Ethics Committee. **Helsinki:** Yes **Informed Consent:** No