

DETRUSOR INJECTIONS WITH BOTULINUM A TOXIN – COMPARISON OF PATIENTS WITH CONGENITAL SPINAL CORD DEFECTS AND TRAUMATIC SPINAL CORD INJURIES

Hypothesis / aims of study

Multifocal intramural detrusor injections with botulinum A toxin are an effective treatment for refractory neurogenic detrusor overactivity in spinal cord injured patients [1,2]. Comparable efficacy in children with neurogenic conditions was reported [3,4].

This study compares our experience in patients with congenital or traumatic spinal cord injuries (SCI).

Study design, materials and methods

Thirty-eight patients with congenital spinal defects and 71 patients with SCI were selected from our data base of detrusor injection treatments with botulinum A toxin. The patient data are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Demographic data	Congenital						SCI	
	Myelomeningocele		Spina bifida		Other			
Male	12		9		2		55	
Female	8		5		2		16	
Total	20		14		4		71	
Complete lesion	5		4		-		46	
Incomplete lesion	15		10		4		25	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Age (years)	18.9	6-35	21.6	10-40	17.4	4-30	37.8	19-77
Duration of injury	equal to age						8.9	0.2-40

The injection technique used has been described earlier [1,2]. Botox[®] was dosed at 100-300 UI depending on age and Dysport[®] at 750 UI and 1000 UI.

The urodynamic parameters cystometric capacity, overactivity volume (volume at first occurrence of detrusor overactivity), and detrusor compliance, the clinical continence volume, clinical functional capacity, and clinical maximum capacity, the anticholinergics dosage, and the patients' subjective satisfaction were recorded before and after treatment.

Statistical comparisons were made by t-tests between the patient groups and by paired t-tests between pre- and post-treatment data. The incidences of incontinence and of anticholinergics use were compared by the χ^2 -test. In all cases the two-sided significance level was set at $p=0.05$.

Results

At baseline all patients used aseptic intermittent catheterisation for bladder emptying, the majority was on high dose anticholinergics.

The average total follow up from the first treatment was 26.1 months for congenital patients and 61.6 months for SCI patients. During this period the congenital patients received an average of 1.8 (1-4) treatments and the SCI patients 2.7 (1-7) treatments. Only 13/38 patients with congenital pathology opted for one or more repeat treatments, against 52/71 of the SCI patients. This difference is significant ($p=0.0000$). The average interval between the first and the second treatment was 9.7 (2-18) months in the congenital and 11.2 (1-33) months in the SCI patients. The difference was not significant ($p=0.4764$). A third injection was performed in 5 congenital patients after 9.5 (5-13) months and in 34 SCI patients after 10.3 (3-23) months. These differences again are not significant (incidence $p=0.0764$, interval $p=0.7040$).

The comparisons between the pre- and the post-treatment data after the first treatment are given in table 2.

Table 2. Result of treatment.

	Congenital (n=38)			Acquired (n=71)			Between groups		
	Pre	Post	p	Pre	Post	p	pre	post	
Cystometric capacity (ml)	265	276	0.4948	310	393	0.0003	0.2500	0.0016	
Overactivity volume (ml)	Not present	7	8	0.7732	11	12	0.8198	0.6948	0.5936
	Present	132	224	0.0032	211	310	0.0039	0.0047	0.0240
Detrusor compliance (ml/cm H ₂ O)	11.6	14.6	0.0091	26.7	34.3	0.4557	0.0000	0.0007	
Clinical continence volume (ml)	191	256	0.0031	253	368	0.0000	0.1156	0.0106	
Clinical functional capacity (ml)	241	298	0.0035	300	383	0.0013	0.1506	0.0213	
Clinical maximal capacity (ml)	316	359	0.2401	367	473	0.0013	0.3461	0.0205	
Anticholinergics use	30	21	0.0280	65	27	0.0000	0.0609	0.0841	
Anticholinergics dose reduction	4			15					
Satisfaction (very) good/minimal/not	12/9/13			49/12/10					
		Mean	Range		Mean	Range			
Follow up interval (months)		5.0	1-12		6.9	1-22			

Interpretation of results

The treatment with botulinum A toxin detrusor injections in patients with congenital spinal defects appears less promising than in patients with traumatic spinal cord injury. Although the average interval between the first and the second treatment is comparable, a much larger proportion of patients does not continue botulinum treatment within a relatively short period.

This might be explained by the fact that the improvement of the patients' condition and the patients' satisfaction all are much smaller than for traumatic spinal cord patients (table 2).

The fact that at baseline the overactivity volume and the detrusor compliance in this study group is much smaller than in patients with traumatic spinal cord injury might suggest a reason for the low response.

Concluding message

Basic research might be suggested to search for the reason of this difference in response to botulinum A toxin injections in the detrusor. After that a possible adaption of the toxin dosage or the injection modalities may be considered.

References

1. Botulinum A toxin in the treatment of detrusor hyperreflexia in spinal cord injured patients: A new alternative to medical and surgical procedures? *Neurourol Urodyn* 1999; 18: 401-402
2. Botulinum-A toxin for treating detrusor hyperreflexia in spinal cord injured patients: a new alternative to anticholinergic drugs? Preliminary results. *J Urol* 2000; 164: 692-697
3. Botulinum-A toxin detrusor injection as a novel approach in the treatment of bladder spasticity in children with neurogenic bladder. *Eur Urol* 2003; 44: 139-143
4. Botulinum A toxin injection into the detrusor: A safe alternative in the treatment of children with myelomeningocele with detrusor hyperreflexia. *J Urol* 2004; 171: 845-848