

738

Sakalis V¹, Floyd Jr M S¹, Price C¹, Hartwell B¹, Guy P J¹, Davies M C¹

1. *Salisbury District General Hospital*

MANAGEMENT OF STRESS URINARY INCONTINENCE WITH MID URETHRAL TAPES IN SPINAL CORD INJURED FEMALES

Hypothesis / aims of study

The exact incidence of stress urinary incontinence in spinal cord injured females remains unknown. The impact of incontinence on quality of life in these patients is significant as pressure sores and dermatitis may occur. We report the results of mid urethral tape surgery in spinal cord injured females.

Study design, materials and methods

A retrospective chart review was carried out of all mid urethral tapes performed in spinal cord injured females over 8 years (2007-2015). Quality of life was assessed with the international Consultation on Urinary Incontinence Questionnaire (ICIQ –UI). All patients had preoperative videourodynamics.

Results

A total of 22 patients were identified of whom follow up details were available for 17. A total of 12 TVT and 5 TOT procedures were undertaken during the period examined. The mean age at operation was 54.5 years (range 26-73 years). The average length of follow up was 54.5 months (range 6-92 months).

Interpretation of results

Pre operative assessment demonstrated that 14/17 patients (82.3%) cited stress incontinence as a severe problem. Post operative assessment revealed that 5/17 (30%) were completely dry, 9/17 (53%) leaked one a week and 2/17 (12%) leaked twice a week or more. Only 1/17 (5%) reported leaking several time or more per day. Pre operative mean ICIQ score was 16.1 (Range 6-21) and 3.75 postoperatively (Range 0-18) $p < 0.001$. A total of 16/17 patients (94%) reported an improved quality of life postoperatively.

Concluding message

Mid urethral tape surgery in female spinal cord injured patients is an effective surgical treatment of stress incontinence with improvements in continence and QOL noted. The results are comparable to those seen in the non spinal cord injured patient.

References

1. none

Disclosures

Funding: No funding was applied for. Ethical Approval; registered as an audit with the Salisbury NHS Foundation Trust Audit Department **Clinical Trial:** No **Subjects:** HUMAN **Ethics not Req'd:** Registered as an audit with Hospitals Audit Department. **Helsinki not Req'd:** It was retrospective case review involving case notes only. It was not a clinical trial. **Informed Consent:** No