

Maximum urinary flow differences between free-flow and pressure-flow study in women: effect of bladder outlet obstruction versus detrusor underactivity.

Mytilekas V-K, Ioannidou E., Georgopoulos P., Apostolidis I., Kalaitzi M., Ioannidis E., Apostolidis A.

2nd Department of Urology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece



Hypothesis / aims of study

- ❖ Pressure recording urethral catheter during pressure-flow (P-F) study may increase the outflow resistance and subsequently reduce the maximum flow during invasive urodynamic study (UDS).
- ❖ Our main purpose was to examine the differences in maximum flow rate between free uroflow (f-Qmax) and P-F study (Qmax) in women.
- ❖ Consequently, we investigated whether a urodynamic diagnosis of bladder outlet obstruction (BOO) as opposed to detrusor underactivity (DU) could have a greater impact on the Qmax differences.

Study design, materials and methods

- ✓ Retrospective study
- ✓ Women submitted to invasive UDS due to LUTS and/or incontinence which were refractory to conservative treatment and/or pharmacotherapy.
- ✓ Based on previous work aiming to optimize the diagnosis of BOO versus DU in women (1,2) we categorized women based on:
 - the bladder outlet obstruction index (BOOI)
 - the urethral resistance association (URA) into three groups:
 - ❖ **Definitive obstruction** (Group A: URA ≥ 20+BOOI ≥ 20)
 - ❖ **Equivocal obstruction** (Group B: BOOI = 1-19 + URA=1-19)
 - ❖ **Without obstruction** (Group C: BOOI ≤ 0).

Group C women, based on bladder voiding efficiency during free uroflow (f-BVE) were further divided into:

- ❖ Pure Underactive (**Pure DU**) (f-BVE < 80%)
- ❖ Non obstructive - Non underactive (**non BOO-non DU**) (f-BVE ≥ 80%)
- ✓ Unpaired t test and one way ANOVA were used for statistical analysis.

Interpretation of results

- ✓ The **pressure recording urethral catheter** (6 Ch) used for the pressure-flow study **reduce the maximum flow** during invasive urodynamic study by approximately **25%**.
- ✓ The **degree of outflow resistance** may produce **a further reduction** in maximum flow during P-F while
- ✓ **Detrusor underactivity** seems to have **no impact on f-Qmax** during an invasive urodynamic study

Results

Table 1

- A total of 253 women were included in the analysis.
 - ❖ **19.36%** (n=49/253) were definitively **obstructed**,
 - ❖ **27.7%** were **equivocally obstructed**
 - ❖ **53%** (134/253) were **not obstructed**.
- The mean **Qmax reduction** during P-F study was **25.5%**.
- The **highest reduction** was observed **among obstructed women**.
- The increase of outflow resistance as expressed with BOOI and URA was correlated with a statistically significant reduction of Qmax during P-F study (One way Anova, p=0.001).

Table 2

- Direct comparison between those with pure DU and those with non BOO-non DU, interestingly found:
 - ❖ there **was no difference** between f-Qmax and Qmax among **underactive women**
 - ❖ the mean **reduction** among **NO BOO-NO DU** was **24%**.

Group	Mean f-Qmax	Mean Qmax	P value	Mean reduction(%)
A (n=49)	9.87	5.88	0.0036	40.4
B (n=70)	15.30	9.99	<0.0001	34.7
C (n=134)	25.72	20.39	0.0002	20.7
Total (n=253)	19.75	14.70	<0.0001	25.5

Table 1. Mean differences between f-Qmax and Qmax between the 3 main groups of women.

Group	Mean f-Qmax	Mean Qmax	Pvalue	Mean reduction (%)
Pure DU (n=27)	16.44	16.00	0.866	2.68
Non BOO/non DU (n=107)	28.12	21.34	<0.0001	24.09

Table 2. Mean differences between f-Qmax and Qmax in pure underactive compared to non obstructed - non underactive women.

Conclusions

- ✓ A reduction of at least 20% between Qmax during UDS and f-Qmax during uroflow in women is almost always expected.
- ✓ A reduction of Qmax during P-F study may be indicative of outflow obstruction as opposed to detrusor underactivity, while the higher the reduction the higher could be the degree of BOO.

References

- 1) Mytilekas K.V., Oeconomou A., Sokolakis I., et al. Defining voiding problems in women: Bladder outlet obstruction versus detrusor underactivity. Eur Urol Suppl. 2014;13(e688)
- 2) K.V. Mytilekas, E. Ioannidou, M. Kalitzi, et al European Urology Supplements, Volume 14 Issue 2, April 2015 (Abstract 354)