A 2 DAYS VOIDING DIARY. IS IT RELIABLE?

Cristina Brasil Jr; Isa Lopes Jr; Maria Luiza Veiga Jr; Anselmo Hoffman Jr; Patrícia Lordêlo Jr; Ubirajara Barroso Jr.

1-Division of Urology, Pediatric Urology Sector, Center for Voiding Disorders of Children (CEDIMI), Bahiana School of Medicine and Public Health (EBMSP)

Introduction / Aim of Study

The 3-day voiding diary has been the standard for evaluation of lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) in children. Recently, it has been proposed that 2 days would be enough. Thus, adherence to this instrument of assessment should be higher. The aim of this study is to assess the reliability of the daily 3 days compared to 3 days.

Materials and Methods

It is an analytical retrospective study. We included children diagnosed with lower urinary tract dysfunction (urofluometry, score Toronto and presence of urinary symptoms). Children with neurological problems or genetic syndromes as well those with anatomic alterations of the lower urinary tract were excluded from the study. 105 children with lower urinary tract dysfunction (LUTD) were evaluated by voiding diary 3 days. Comparing the number of voids, average and maximum volume urinated in the following sequence: day 1 and 2 vs. 3 days, 2 and 3 days vs. 3 days and 1 and 3 days vs. 3 days. T test was performed to evaluate statistical significance of differences (p < 0.05).

Results

The mean age of the patients was 7.9 ± 3.06 years, with a predominance of females 60%. Table- p values of the difference between groups of 2 days vs. 3 days voiding diary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nuber of Voids/day</th>
<th>Average voiding volume</th>
<th>Maximum voiding volume</th>
<th>Fluid intake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st + 2nd vs. 3 days</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd + 3rd vs. 3 days</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st + 3rd vs. 3 days</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Despite the same fluid intake, regarding the number of voids, average and maximum voided volume, there was no difference only when 3 days voiding diary was compared to 1st and 3rd days of the diary. The clinical implication of these results must be evaluated before using a 2 days diary as standard.
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