Use of Biological Materials in Female Pelvic Floor Reconstruction. What's new?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>Biochemical evidence in tissue repair</td>
<td>Ajay Singla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:20</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>What does research say about biological materials</td>
<td>Dirk de Ridder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Clinical evidence in use of biological materials</td>
<td>Rahmi Onur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>Mesh complications</td>
<td>Paulo Palma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aims of course/workshop**
The aim of this workshop is to familiarise the audience regarding various biological materials which are in use in female pelvic floor reconstruction. What are the complications observed and FDA warning.

**Educational Objectives**
This has a great educational value for people who are using these products which are made available by the industry. We should be careful regarding their problems.
“Bio”-meshes

Dirk De Ridder
Jan Deprest

Interdepartemental Center for Surgical Technologies
Faculty of Medicine,
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

Our laboratory has been supported by unconditional grants from Bard, Cook, Tyco, Ethicon, AMS

Implants

Xenografts
End 1990s
FDA approved for urogynaecology
CE marked

Non-cross linked
Small intestinal submucosa « SIS »
InteXen (LP)

Cross linked
Pelvicol
Pelvisoft

different host response, local side effects and durability?

In vivo animal studies

Rat (3-90 d) and rabbit model (30d-2 yrs)
Xenografts – experimental data

Host response to acellular collagen matrix

Weak inflammatory response
Less pro-inflammatory profile
Poor integration
Poor vascularization and collagen deposition

Polypropylene provokes “pro-inflammatory” response = rejection
Xenografts induce anti-inflammatory cytokines = “tolerance”
Tensiometry of explant (in vivo)

- 4467 Instron tensiometer
- Specimen: 1 x 5 cm
- Crosshead speed: 2 cm/ min
- Measurement:
  - maximum load to disrupt (N)
- Location of disruption:
  - in mesh
  - or at interface

Uni-directional stress/strain plot

- Elastic area
- Plastic area
- Permanent deformation

Main purpose:
- Failure level
- Determination of stress, strain, and stiffness

\[ E = \frac{(\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)}{(\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1)} \]

Cross linked products

- Pelvicol
- Pelvisoft

**Structure of implant**

InteXen  
Pelvisoft

---

**Non-cross linked products**

---

**Experimental long term studies**

---
Rabbits - explant strength

- Overall comparable performance
- Reherniations in both bio-groups
- 25% of SiS implants tear at the implant
- Loss of elasticity

Claerhout et al, AJOG 2008
Trabuco et al, AJOG 2008

Long term inflammatory changes

Conclusions - 1

Xenografts “ideal template” for remodelling?
- Experimental evidence for induction different host response
- Non-cross linked materials
  - Poor early tensiometric resistance
  - Also disrupt more easily in the implant
- Cross linked
  - Stronger on tensiometry
  - Occasional degradation and loss of elasticity

Ideal biomesh not designed yet
### Clinical data – anterior compartment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
<th>Anterior Stage II</th>
<th>Anterior Stage III</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Posterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leboeuf 19</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>15.0 mo</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urol 2004</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaliha 14</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>24.0 mo</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int J Urogynaecol 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case control study</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meschia 98</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>12.0 mo</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urol 2007</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ba >-1

### Clinical data – anterior compartment recurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Anterior Stage II</th>
<th>Anterior Stage III</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Posterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leboeuf 19</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urol 2004</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaliha 14</td>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int J Urogynaecol 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case control study</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td>After 2 years no anatomic differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meschia 98</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urol 2007</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Ant colp</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ba >-1

### Meta-analysis

Meta-analysis results are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of study</th>
<th>Average effect size</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.50-0.80</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.40-0.70</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjuvant materials in anterior vaginal wall prolapse surgery: a systematic review of effectiveness and complications**

**Sacrocolpopexy using xenografts**

Observational cohort study consecutive laparoscopic sacropexies

- 50 xenografts (21 SIS, 29 Pelvicol)
- 100 polypropylene
  - 50 before the cases
  - 50 after the cases

Follow up

- Yearly telephone interview (Kobashi, 1991)
- 95% clinical assessment for study (Claerhout, 08)
- POP-Q, QoL (Kings)

Claerhout et al, Europ Urol 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>@ 32 months follow up</th>
<th>SIS 21</th>
<th>Pelvicol 29</th>
<th>Polypropylene 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective failure (C≥1)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reoperation vault prolapse</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection/exposure</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reoperation GRC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (3.5%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparable demographics - no significant functional differences in prolapse, urinary, defecation and sexual function

(Degrassiet al, submitted Obstet Gynecol 2008)

Time to recurrence

- PP: 14 mo
- SIS: 30 mo
- Pelvicol: 24 mo
Clinical data – vault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Follow up</th>
<th>Vault recurrence</th>
<th>Anterior</th>
<th>Posterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quiroz et al AJOG 2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>1.1 yr</td>
<td>11%* (8% reop)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Polypr</td>
<td>1.1 yr</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman et al Urol 2006</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fascia</td>
<td>1.1 yr</td>
<td>(1/15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecutive cases</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Polypr</td>
<td>7.1 mo</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pelvicol</td>
<td>7.1 mo</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage II recurrence

Clinical data – posterior compartment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Follow Up</th>
<th>Posterior Stage II</th>
<th>Local problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraiso et al</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Posterior repair</td>
<td>17.5 mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am J Obstet Gynecol 2006</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Site specific repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized trial</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>+SIS augment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

- No graft complications
- Faster and more severe failure with graft

* Bp ≥ 2
Conclusions - 2

- The results are at present conflicting
  - Even RCT material typically dubious in nature
  - Variety of materials and techniques
  - Inherent short follow up with new material

- Anterior: argument for graft augmentation
  - Underpowered for functional benefit
  - Same results with synthetic material (absorable) - €

- Middle and posterior: point not proven
  - Local complications not included
  - Point at importance of long term follow up for anatomical endpoint
  - Even arguments against...

(These) materials should be used within trials
(? PRIOR TO THEIR SALES (?)}
Biomaterials in Female Pelvic Floor Reconstructive Surgery

Ajay K Singla, MD, FACS, FICS
Associate Professor
Department of Urology and Gynecology
Wayne State University

Total Female Population In U.S.
- 20 million 30-39 years
- 21.4 million 40-49 years
- 15.8 million 50-59 years
- 10.7 million 60-69 years

Total procedures per year 180,000

Incontinence - Incidence
- 6.5 million women in US has SUI
- 10-35% of women 15-54 years age
- 30-50% of women over 60 years age
- 15-20% of women with recurrent SUI
- 15-20% of women with urge incontinence or other dysfunction following surgery
- De novo urge incontinence in 10%-30%
- Bladder outlet obstruction in 2.5%-24%

Cost of Incontinence
- $23.9 billion for evaluation & treatment
- $4.2 billion for Home Health Care associated with incontinence
- Total of $28.1 billion spent on incontinence in 1995 in United States

SUI Surgery Prevelance
- prevalence of in-patient SUI surgery US 1
  - 48,345/yr 1979
  - 135,000/yr 1998
  - 103,467/yr 2004
- ASC visits for SUI 2
  - 15/100,000 1994
  - 34/100,000 2000

Prevelance of Pelvic Organ Prolapse (POP) Surgery
- prevalence of vaginal prolapse surgery US 1,2
  - >200,000/yr
  - .29% reoperation rate within 4 yr

- Life time risk to undergo surgery for POP/SUI 11.1% 2

Science Behind Biomaterial Use
Pelvic organ support & Continence rely on:
Endopelvic fascia
Ligament support
Pelvic floor muscles

8 Biochemical basis for Pelvic floor support
connective tissue fibroblast

- collagen type I & III
- compliance
- elastin
tensile strength & flexibility
- fiber stabilization
- cross linking proline & hydroxyproline amino acids

9 Science Behind Biomaterial Use
- Decrease in total collagen content in women with POP and SUI as compared to controls
- Increase in matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) – a collagen degradation enzyme
- Decrease inhibitors of MMP expression in vaginal tissues
- Increase in degradation of elastin in women with POP and SUI
- Decrease in alpha1-antitrypsin mRNA level – elastin degradation inhibitor

10 Historical Perspective
- Goebel 1910 Pyramidalis Ms
- Price 1933 Rectus fascia (attached)
- Aldridge 1942 Rectus fascia strips (paired)
- McGuire 1978 Rectus fascia
- Blavais 1991 Fascial strip (free)
- Beck 1988 Fascia Lata
- Raz 1989 Vaginal wall
- Handa 1996 Cadaveric fascia Lata

11 Types of biomaterials
- Absorbable
  - Autograft (autologous)
  - Allograft
  - Xenograft
  - Absorbable synthetic mesh
- Non-absorbable
  - Synthetic mesh

12 Autograft
- Rectus fascia
- Fascia lata
- Rectus muscle
- Gracilis muscle
- Vaginal mucosa

13 Allograft
- Fascia lata
  - FasLata
  - Suspend
Dermis
  – Urogen
  – Axis
  – Repliform
  – Dermal Allograft

Xenograft
  – Porcine dermis
    – DermMatrix
    – Pelvicol
  – Porcine SIS
    – Stratisis
    – FortaFlex
    – FortaPerm
  – Bovine pericardium
    – Veritas

Types of Synthetic Mesh
  – Absorbable
    – Vicryl (polyglactic acid)
    – Dexon (polyglycolic acid)
  – Non-absorbable
    – Nylon
    – Silastic
    – Dacron (mersilene)
    – Marlex
    – Gore-Tex
    – Prolene

Synthetic material
  – Pore size (macroporous vs microporous)
  – Construction (monofilament vs multifilament)
  – Weave (woven, knitted, thermal bonded)
  – Flexibility or elasticity
  – Additives or coatings (silicone, antibiotics, collagen)

Most meshes manufactured for sling surgery are: Monofilament, loosely woven or knitted, elastic, macroporous polypropylene (standard of care)

Classification of Synthetic Mesh
  – Type I – macroporous / monofilament
    – Atrium, Marlex, Prolene and Trelex
  – Type II – microporous / multifilament
    – Gore-Tex
  – Type III – macroporous with multifilament
    – Teflon, dacron (mersilene), woven polypropylene and PTFE
  – Type IV – Mesh with submicronic pores coated with silicone

History of Cadaveric fascia
  – More than 200,000 soft tissue allograft transplants done annually in US
Cadaveric fascia has been in clinical use for 3 decades

- Ophthalmological uses
  - Orbital floor reconstruction
  -

- Orthopedic uses
  - Anterior cruciate ligament repair

**Donor Screening**

- HIV 1&2 Ab
- Hepatitis B Ag & Ab
- Hepatitis C Ab
- HTLV 1/11 Ab
- Syphilis
- HIV DNA by PCR

**Tissue Processing**

- Most common: Freeze dried (Incubation in 70% isopropyl alcohol → Frozen → gamma irradiation @ 25 Kgy)
- Freeze dried (Urogen, FasLata, Dermal allograft, Stratisis, Repliform)
- Fresh Frozen (DermMatrix, Stratisis)
- Solvent dehydrated and gamma irradiated (suspend and axis tutoplast)
- Cryopreservation and amorphous freeze drying (Repliform)

**Processing and Strength**

- Sutaria and Staskin:
  - Comparison of tensile strength between freeze dried alone, freeze dried and gamma irradiated, solvent dehydrated-gamma irradiated
  - No statistical difference was noted using tensiometer

*J Urol* 163A 1194,2000

**Tissue strength**

- Lemer et. Al:
  - Maximum load to failure (MLF), stiffness assessed in autologous, freeze-dried, solvent dehydrated fascial grafts and dermal graft using tensiometer
  - MLF and stiffness equivalent in autologous and solvent dehydrated fascial graft and dermal allografts
  - Freeze dried allografts had lower MLF and were less stiff

*Neurourol* 18:497, 1999

**Tissue Strength**

- Choe et.al:
  - Comparison of tensile strength (MLF) between allograft (freeze-dried gamma irradiated cadaveric fascia lata, cadaveric dermis), autologous (dermis, rectus fascia, vaginal mucosa) and synthetic (Gore-tex and prolene) mesh using tensiometer.
  - Cadaveric fascia lata > cadaveric dermis > Gore-tex > prolene > human dermis > human rectus fascia > vaginal mucosa.

*UROLOGY* 58(3), 2001
Safety of Cadaveric tissue

- Risk of HIV transmission from blood transfusion
  - 1/400,000 to 1/600,000
- Risk of HIV transmission from donor tissue
  - 1/1,667,600

One documented case of HIV transmission from bone allograft in 1985

Safety of Cadaveric tissue

- Prions ("slow virus"):  
  - Naturally occurring protein molecules located in CNS  
  - PrPc prions are mutated due to infectious agent  
  - Originally discovered after cannibalistic tribe in New Guinea found to die from progressive destructive brain disease.

Prion diseases

- Kuru  
  - Primates
- Creutzfeldt-Jacob  
  - Primates
- Scrapie  
  - Sheep
- BSE (mad cow)  
  - Cattle
- vCJD (injected tainted beef)  
  - Man
- Risk of transmission unknown

Prion diseases

- No known cure  
  - Inactivation is resistant to  
    - Heat exposure  
    - Gamma irradiation
  
- Alkaline treatment is thought to inactivate prions

Bacterial Contamination

- Study of 36 women undergoing cadaveric fascia lata sling
  
  - Cultures of allograft sent immediately prior to surgery:  
    - 5/36 grew organisms  
    - One developed superficial wound infection  
    - Clinical significance of these findings unclear
  
  Gerber, et.al, Urol 163A:735,2000

DNA contamination

- 4 different types of human fascia lata allograft, all processed by 4 different techniques extracted for DNA content.  
- Total DNA concentrations ranged from 0.3 – 3.0 mcg/mg tissue

Sadhukhan et.al. J Urol 161A:396,1999

Tissue Reaction
30 female rabbit bladders exposed to
- Synthetic sling vs. cadaveric fascia vs. control
- Histologically examined at 6 and 12 weeks

**Tissue Reaction**

**Cadaveric fascia failure**
- 12 women failed cadaveric fascia (12%)
- Allografts were freeze dried and irradiated
- 3x10 cm strips used for PVS in 35 women
  » 6 failed (1 week to 4 months)
- 6x 16 cm strips used for sacrocolpopexy (67)
  » 6 failed (7–11 months)


**Cadaveric fascia failure**
- Findings at re-operation:
  - Graft remnants found in 7 patients
    » Often thin and attenuated
  - No tissue found, only suture in 5 patients

**Cadaveric fascia failure**
- Histology:
  - Some areas with appropriate remodelling, linear orientation of fibrocytes within connective tissue, except high tensile strength
  - Other areas haphazardly arranged, non-inflammatory scar-like tissue, some areas with inflammatory response, still other areas with tissue degeneration.

**Allograft Concerns**
- Transmission of bacterial or viral disease
- Transmission of prions
- Durability
- Degradation of allograft
- Inconsistent quality from some tissue banks
- Cost
- Depletion of tissue banks
- Increased operative time and patient morbidity
- Unpredictable host response

**Synthetic Material**
- Type of Material:
  - Monofilament
  - Prolene
  - Multifilament
  - Mersilene
  - Gore-tex
37. Synthetic Material
   - Pore Size:
     - Larger pores > tissue bonding
     - Prolene > mersilene > marlex > Gore-tex

38. Synthetic Material
   - Advantages:
     - Abundant – “off the shelf”
     - Decreased operative time
     - Durable – permanent
     - Cost – inexpensive
     - Independent of tissue re-modeling
     - Resistant to degradation
     - Long term preservation of tensile strength
   - Risks:
     - Infection
       - Prolene 0-3%, Mersilene & Gore-tex 5-23%
     - Erosion
     - Failure of remodeling

39. Ideal Material
   - Biocompatible
   - Acellular
   - Abundant collagen
   - Abundant elastin
   - Preserved extracellular matrix
   - High tensile strength
   - Durable
   - Free of Infection and erosion
   - Inexpensive

40. Applications In Urology
   - Sling surgeries in women for SUI
   - Sling surgeries in men for SUI
   - Pelvic floor reconstruction in women
   - Urethral reconstruction in men
   - Penile reconstructive surgeries
   - Bladder reconstruction/replacement?

41. Future Sling Materials
   - Hybrid Sling Materials
     - Combination of allograft and synthetic material
     - Combination of xenograft and synthetic material
   - Engineered Tissues
Methodology

We evaluated 4 different sling materials
- Small intestinal mucosa (SIS) (Cookbiotech)
- Fascia lata (FL) (Coloplast Corp)
- Fascia dermis (FD) (Coloplast Corp)
- Pelvicol (P) (C.R.Bard)

All currently used in patients clinically

Methodology

Biomaterial was implanted intraperitoneally at the bladder neck of female Balb/c mice (n = 64)

Animals were sacrificed at 2, 4, 8, or 12 weeks post-implantation

Bladder and implants were extracted and fixed for histological analysis

Methodology

Implant Histological Analysis:

- Cell Count (cells/μm²)
- Cell Morphology (aspect ratio)
- Capsule formation (collagen deposition)
- Capsule thickness (um)
- Angiogenesis (CD31)

Capsule Thickness: 2 Weeks Implantation

Capsule Thickness: 12 Weeks Implantation

Cell Number

None of the implants displayed a significant change individually in cell number during the 12 weeks

However, Pelvicol had significant decrease in cell number as compared to all other groups

Cell Morphology

Aspect ratio correlates with cell morphology
- Smaller round cells indicate inflammatory cells
- Longer cells indicate a fibroblastic type of cell

At specific time points there was significance between groups
However, no implant had a significant change over the 12 weeks
Capsule Thickness

- Capsule thickness generally measures the severity of the inflammatory response
- SIS was the only group to show a significant decrease in capsule thickness over 12 weeks
- P had thinnest capsule at all time points

Capillary Formation at 12 Weeks

Angiogenesis

Summary

Conclusion

- Important for a graft to become incorporated as endogenous tissue and not lead to encapsulation
  - Angiogenesis allows for cells and nutrients to enter the matrix and ultimately implant survival.
  - At 12 weeks, SIS demonstrated minimal implant encapsulation and complete cell infiltration throughout the implant
  - Indicating improved biocompatibility as compared to the other tissues

Conclusion

- In comparing biological tissues for pelvic reconstruction we were able to assess the biocompatibility within the urological environment
- Through commercial processing, tissues are claimed to be devoid of cells
  - However, other antigens may be present which elicit inflammatory reactions, thus limiting the implant incorporation and use for long term urological therapies.

In Vivo comparison of biomaterials in rabbit model

- Cadaveric fascia lata
- Porcine SIS
- Porcine dermis
- Autologous
- Polypropylene mesh

In Vivo comparison of biomaterials in rabbit model

- Tensile strength (force required to break)
- Stiffness (force required to stretch sling)
- Shrinkage (% decrease in surface area)
- Distortion (ratio of the area of sling to the area of its minimal enclosing rectangle-rectangular fit factor)

In Vivo comparison of biomaterials in rabbit model

- At 12 weeks tensile strength and stiffness were greatly decreased from baseline in all materials except polypropylene mesh and autologous fascia.
- Polypropylene mesh gained stiffness with time.
- Autologous fascia and SIS experienced significant shrinkage at 12 weeks.
Autologous fascia became highly distorted at 12 weeks.

conclusions
- Significance of tensile strength is unknown
- Stiffness is more important than tensile strength.
- The stretching of a sling with time is more likely scenario than breakage and may be responsible for the recurrence of incontinence
- Low tensile strength may explain difficulty in manipulating sling tension for recurrent incontinence
- Stiffness of mesh increased with incorporation of surrounding tissue
- The biomechanical results support the use of polypropylene mesh for sling surgery relative to other non-autologous materials.

NICE Review

Objective Failure Rate

Objective Failure Rate

Failure rate for anterior prolapse
- No mesh – 28.8%
- Synthetic non-absorbable mesh – 8.5%
- “The objective failure when using non-absorbable synthetic mesh was significantly lower than without mesh/graft”

Low Rate of Erosion

Erosions
- Clearly a risk – 10% in literature
- With better surgical technique/more care with the vaginal wall dissection current studies demonstrate a much lower incidence – 2.5%

How well do we do with traditional prolapse repairs?
- Randomized trial
- Median follow up of 23 months
- Findings – Success rates
  - Anterior plication – 30%
  - Plication with absorbable mesh – 42%
  - Ultralateral plication – 46%
- Many of these did not require further repair
- But - What will happen at 5 or even 10 years?

Why such a high failure rate?
- Tissue Factors
  - Multiple studies show differences in tissue between women with prolapse and those without – vaginal tissue, skin and other sites

Why such a high failure rate
- Tissue Factors
  - Multiple studies show differences in tissue between women with prolapse and those without – vaginal tissue, skin and other sites
- Thus – are we really helping by suturing weakened, possibly defective tissue back
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Cadaveric fascia failure

Our Experience with SIS

NICE Review

Summary

Conclusion

Capsule Thickness

Cell Number

Stiffness of mesh increased with incorporation of surrounding tissue

Bladder and implants were extracted and fixed for histological analysis

Histologically examined at 6 and 12 weeks

Total DNA concentrations ranged from 0.3

Risk of transmission unknown

Scrapie
HIV DNA by PCR
HTLV 1/11 Ab
Hepatitis C Ab
Orthopedic uses

Cadaveric fascia has been in clinical use for 3 decades

Types of biomaterials

Types of Synthetic Mesh

Absorbable mesh was significantly lower

39 years

$4.2 billion for Home Health Care associated with incontinence

De novo urge incontinence in 10%

15

50% of women over 60 years age

35% of women

6.5 million women in US has SUI

- Failed

- Re do

- First time

- 11.1%

- 21.4 million

- 5%

- 2004

Paradigm of General Surgery:
Hernia Repairs

For decades inguinal and abdominal wall hernias were repaired by suturing native tissue
to native tissue

More recently many have
started to use synthetic
mesh with improved results
Can we follow this paradigm?

Mesh Repair - Kits

Outcomes

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) report
– Provides national clinical guidelines in the United Kingdom
– Examined surgical repair of vaginal prolapse using mesh
– 199 page document
– Evaluated 446 reports - 49 studies selected
– 4569 patients in total

Poor Surgical Outcome with Allograft

Failure of Allograft

Variable host response
Method of tissue processing
Site of harvest
Quality of harvested graft

Small intestinal submucosa (SIS)

Prepared from submucosa of small intestine of pigs and is replaced by host tissue in 90-
120 days
SIS contains
– Collagen
– Growth factors
  Transforming growth factor- alpha
  Fibroblast growth factor-2
  Glucosaminoglycans
  Glycoprotein

Minimal tissue reaction
Biocompatible
High tensile strength

SIS in Pubovaginal Sling

Literature Review
Our Experience with SIS

- Total patients: 22
- PVS (4-PLY): 15
- PVT (8-PLY): 6
- Male Sling (4-PLY): 1

Our Experience with SIS

- PVS
  - Cured: 12
  - Improved: 2
  - Failed: 1
- PVT
  - Cured: 3
  - Improved: 1
  - Failed: 2
- Male Sling
  - Cured/Improved: 1

What Do I Use

- Hypermobility
  - Polypropylene mesh (TOT)
  - ISD
    - First time – SIS pubovaginal sling
    - Re do - Autologous fascia
  - POP
    - Vaginal – allograft
    - Sacrocolpopexy – polypropylene mesh

FDA Regulation

- FDA classify all implantable devices into 3 regulatory classes based on the degree of regulation necessary to provide device safety and effectiveness. (1976 amendment)
- Sling materials are included in class II devices and are subject to general controls and special controls. It requires data from human clinical trials, post-market surveillance, patient registries. (1990 amendment)

Biomaterial – Any natural or synthetic substance that incorporates or integrates into patients tissues.

Biocompatibility – Ability of a material to perform with an appropriate host response in a specific situation.

- It needs to be integrated properly into the tissues
- Generate an appropriate inflammatory response
- Maintain mechanical integrity (hold shape)
Criteria for Ideal Synthetic Sling

1. The material should be chemically inert.
2. Not to be modified by tissue fluids.
3. Not induce inflammatory response or antibodies.
4. Not be carcinogenic.
5. Not induce allergy or hypersensitivity.
6. Be able to resist mechanical stress.
7. Be manufactured in the required shape.
8. Be able to be sterilized.
9. Resistant to infection.
10. Be resistant to adhesions.
11. Have a better in vivo response than autologous tissue.
12. Cost effective
Clinical results of biological and synthetic graft use in pelvic organ prolapse surgery

Rahmi Onur, MD. Department of Urology, Firat University, Faculty of Medicine, Elazig-Turkey.

Pelvic floor dysfunction associated with prolapse is a common disorder affecting a substantial number of women in almost every population. It may occur in up to 50% of paraous women (1,2). Seven to 11% of women will undergo surgery for prolapse during their lifetime and 29 to 30% of those may require repeat operation for recurrent prolapse (3,4). Surgical cure rates vary depending on the technique used. Originally described traditional repair techniques, the anterior and posterior repairs, rely on adequate tissue for successful repair. Thus, use of attenuated or weak tissue for primary repair may provide poor results (5). In an attempt to improve prolapse surgery outcomes, several biological and synthetic materials have been used during pelvic reconstructive surgeries.

Any natural or synthetic substance that incorporates or integrates into a patient’s own is defined as a “biomaterial” (6). The biomaterials or grafts used in pelvic reconstructive surgeries are classified into two basic types: biologic and synthetic. Further types and characteristics of these materials are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of materials or grafts used in pelvic organ prolapse repair (5,7,8).

A. Biologics:
   1- Autologous fascia: Rectus fascia, fascia lata, vaginal mucosa, skin graft
   2- Heterologous:
      i) Allogenic: Cadavaeric- Dura matter, Rectus sheath, Fascia lata, Dermis,
      ii) Xenogenic: Porcine dermis, small intestine submucosa, bovine pericardium, fetal bovine dermis.

B. Synthetics:
   1- Absorbable: Polyglycolic acid, polyglactin, polyglactin/polypropylene
   2- Non-absorbable: Polyester, polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), polypropylene,
                  Polyethylene, and nylon
The aim of using either biological or synthetic grafts is to provide adequate support to pelvic floor by reinforcing existing tissue. This is one of the main indications for graft use in pelvic reconstructive surgery. Other common indications: nonexistent or suboptimal autologous tissue, connective tissue disorder, unavoidable stresses on the repair, the need to bridge a space, concern about vaginal length or caliber, and pelvic floor denervation, patients who failed previous surgery (4). On the contrary, pelvic radiation, poorly controlled diabetes, severe vaginal atrophy, and predisposition to infection such as systemic steroid use, active vaginal infection and heavy tobacco use are termed to be contraindications for use of graft materials in pelvic organ prolapse repair (4,9).

Development, processing and characteristics of prosthesis are beyond the scope of this review and will be discussed elsewhere in this course. In this review, it was aimed to provide available data about the efficacy and clinical use of biological or synthetic grafts in pelvic organ prolapse treatment.

**Clinical Results:**

Recently, it was reported that nearly half of the surgeons used minimally invasive transobturator devices for cystocele repair and nearly all use synthetic mesh in procedures either for stress incontinence and/or POP treatment (10). Dissatisfaction with traditional repairs has led to more frequent use of grafts. Long-term success rates with biologic or synthetic mesh were reported to be between 68-100% for abdominal sacrocolpopexies (ASC), ranged from 84 to 100% for posterior repairs. Success rates are not consistent for anterior repairs (2,11). Since there are only few prospective, randomized controlled studies evaluating the success rates and complications of graft use in pelvic reconstructive surgery, it’s not possible to make definitive conclusions. Recently published studies involving different types of grafts used in vault apical, anterior and posterior prolapse surgery will be addressed in this review.
Apical prolapse

Abdominal sacrocolpopexy using synthetic mesh is defined as the “gold” standard treatment for apical vaginal prolapse (8,12). Success rates for this procedure range from 78 to 100% over a follow-up period of 6 months to 3 years (13). Longer term follow-up data is also available in another study and for up-to 13 years after ASC, 74% success rate was maintained (14). Laparoscopic sacrocolpopexy was also shown to have similar short-term outcomes comparable with the abdominal approach (7). Operative outcomes with follow-up periods with use of different mesh types are consistently high in ASC and are listed in Table 2. However, allogenic graft material use in ASC showed a high short-term failure rate (15). In two prospective trials comparing treatment successes of synthetic and biological meshes for ASC, Culligan et al reported significantly higher failure rates in women receiving solvent dehydrated fascial grafts at 6th months postoperatively compared to women receiving synthetic mesh (16). Similarly, use of synthetic mesh was also found to be superior to use of freeze-dried cadaveric fascia for ASC surgery in a retrospective cohort study. Higher success rates were obtained when mesh was used (89%) compared to allograft use (61%) (17). On the contrary, Fitzgerald et al, reported on a series of 67 women who underwent ASC with cadaveric fascia lata and determined failure of the procedure in 8% at a follow-up period of 6-11 months (15).

Table 2. Operative outcomes with use of different mesh types in abdominal sacrocolpopexy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mesh type</th>
<th>Follow-up (mo)</th>
<th>Success (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory et al (17)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marlex/Mersilene</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culligan et al (16)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altman et al (18)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prolene</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rust et al (19)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mersilene</td>
<td>9-42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison et al (20)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mersilene</td>
<td>6-126</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker et al. (21)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Prolene</td>
<td>1-45</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate et al. (22)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granese et al. (23)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>43 mo</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox and Stanton (24)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Teflon</td>
<td>6-32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder, Krantz (25)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Gore-Tex</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valaitis, Stanton (26)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Teflon</td>
<td>3-91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Treatment of apical and vault prolapse may also be carried out by transvaginal route. Benson et al., treated 88 women by randomizing to a vaginal (bilateral sacrospinous vault suspension and paravaginal repair) or abdominal (sacrocolpopexy and paravaginal repair) surgical technique. The treatment outcome was considered as unsatisfactory in 33% of the vaginal group and 16% of the abdominal group (27). In another study comparing two techniques optimal results were obtained in 80.3% of women in the vaginal group and 94.2% in the abdominal group (28). However, Maher et al, after 2 years of follow-up, reported equal treatment successes as 91% and 94% in vaginal and abdominal sacrocolpopexy groups, respectively (29). Considering these three trials which were considered to be similar enough to allow comparison of these two techniques revealed that ASC was better than vaginal treatment in terms of: a lower rate of recurrent vault prolapse, less postoperative dyspareunia, less postoperative stress incontinence, lower reoperation rate for prolapse (27-29).

Posterior intravaginal sling (PIVS) or intravaginal slingplasties using synthetic mesh are other alternatives for the treatment of apical vault prolapse (8). Petros first described this technique as a less invasive method and reported a success rate of 94% in 71 patients with 5.6% complication rate (30). Literature consists of several studies with intravaginal slingoplasties that have used nylon, polypropylene, polyglactin/prolene and prolene meshes and success ranged between 71%-100% (8). In another study, 118 consecutive women underwent PIVS operation for Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification stage 3 or 4 vaginal cuff prolapse. At a mean follow-up of 58.6 months, the success rate of PIVS was 96.6% (31).

For sacral colpopexy using polypropylene graft, mesh erosion or extrusion rates were reported to be around 2% as suggested by IUGA/ICS (5,32). These rates were found to be higher with microporous, multifilament meshes such as Gore-Tex and Mersilene (33). Nygaard et al., reviewed 2178 women who underwent ASC and reported 3.4% erosion. Erosion rate was highest for Teflon, Marlex and Gore-Tex (appr. 5%) whereas, it was less...
than 1% for prolene (13). Gastrointestinal complications such as ileus and small bowel obstruction may also be detected after ASC operation. Women were reported to experience 5.9% ileus or small bowel obstruction with 1.2% of patients requiring operation (34). However, there’s enough support in literature for the use of polypropylene mesh. Thus, as National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence recommends, polypropylene mesh use in ASC surgery may be termed as a safe and efficacious method of vaginal vault prolapse repair (35).

**Anterior compartment**

Traditional treatment of anterior vaginal prolapse with patient’s native tissue (anterior colporraphy) has been reported to have a high failure rate both for primary and secondary cases (35). The risk for failure after classic anterior repair was found to be 30% within 4 years of the original surgery (36) and several other prospective studies have demonstrated that anterior colporraphy alone has a success rate of 37% to 57% (37,38). Synthetic and biological materials at the time of anterior repair are used in order to improve outcomes of this surgery.

Although synthetic grafts are widely used in the treatment of anterior repair, the majority of the reported studies are retrospective case series and success rates are highly different (8). These differences occur since authors use distinct definitions for outcomes, success and use different materials. Moreover, classification of anterior prolapse and treatment are not standardized in every study. Nevertheless, anatomic cure rates using polypropylene meshes and new prosthetic kits ranges from 75.7% to 100% (35). Sand et al, in their prospective randomized study, compared use of polyglactin 910 mesh placed during anterior repair to classic treatment. They concluded that mesh reinforced treatment had significantly lower recurrence rate compared to controls (25% vs 43%, P= 0.02) (37). Most studies use “tension-free” technique for transvaginal mesh placement. De Tayrac et al., had a success rate of 89.1% in 55 women with graft placed anterior repair. Mesh related
complications occurred in 14.6% of patients with 9.1% mesh extrusion (39). Similarly, Hoenil et al., and Deffieux et al, used commercially available tension free kits and reported 94.5% and 94.3% success rates, respectively (40,41). However, mesh extrusion rates in the latter study was found to be 20% (41). Considering the efficacy of recurrent cystocele, 24 women allocated to anterior colporraphy alone or reinforcement with mesh. Authors anchored the prosthesis proximally to the vaginal apex and laterally to the levator fascia after standard colporraphy and at 24 months’ follow-up, prolapse treatment was 100% in the mesh group whereas, it was 66% in women who received anterior colporraphy alone (42). In a prospective observational study, Milani et al found 94% success rate with Prolene mesh at a 17-month follow-up, but there was an erosion rate of 13% (43). Salvatore et al, reported a similar complication rate with 13% erosion and a significant increase in overactive bladder symptoms (56%), dyspareunia (78%) after mesh placement (44). In ten randomized controlled studies (1148 women), it was shown that mesh/graft use for anterior repair was better than no mesh for preventing recurrence (45). Thus, nonabsorbable mesh use for anterior prolapse repair is accepted to have high success rates but seems to have unacceptably high complication rates in some series (5).

In an attempt to decrease the complication rates and particularly erosions, biological grafts were introduced for anterior repairs. In terms of biological materials, Salomon et al., reported anterior prolapse repair using porcine dermal implant through the transobturator route. Anatomical cure was present in 81% of women whereas 19% had recurrence or persistence (46). In a retrospective review, Gomelsky et al, 70 women underwent surgical repair of high grade cystocele with porcine dermis interposition grafts. The graft was secured to arcus tendinous fascia pelvis (ATFP). More than 90% of patients had no failure at a mean follow-up of 24 months (47). Using same graft for the correction of advanced anterior vaginal prolapse, a 4 x 12 cm segment was secured bilaterally to the ATFP. At 2 years followup, an
overall cure rate of 78% was reported (48). Systematic review and meta-analysis for using mesh or grafts in the treatment of anterior compartment prolapse revealed the evidence that there was a trend in the crude objective failure rates with procedures not using mesh/graft having the highest failure rate, followed by procedures with absorbable synthetic mesh, biological graft, and non-absorbable synthetic mesh with decreasing order (45). However, Cervigni et al., compared Prolene Soft with Porcine Dermis with a mean follow-up of 8 months in anterior repair. The objective failure rates were found to be similar between groups (49).

The primary aim of using absorbable mesh was to achieve equivalent success rates with fewer complications. Polyglactin 910 has been examined in several studies and concluded that it led to significantly decreased recurrence rate compared to traditional colporraphy (5). Similarly, Maher et al., supported this finding and observed that use of Polyglactin 910 had higher cure rates when compared to fascial repair only (75% vs 57%) (50). Considering the efficacy of cadaveric tissues in anterior prolapse repair, Ghandi et al, found decreased recurrence rates with the use of cadaveric fascia lata versus standard repair (51). Kobashi et al., used cadaveric fascia lata secured by anchors attached to the pubic bone vaginally, and sutured laterally and posteriorly to the vault for treatment of primary cystocele. No failures or complications were observed at a short follow-up (52). In another study, Frederick et al., examined 251 patients and at a short follow-up (6 months), cadaveric sling use for anterior prolapse showed 93% cure (53). However, Clemons et al, had only 59% success rate by using AlloDerm graft for anterior compartment treatment (54). Considering the comparative studies on the use of biological graft use in the anterior compartment and anterior colporraphy, a total of 4 RCT were available and two of these studies favored use of biological grafts for better results whereas, other 2 retrospective studies demonstrated no difference in outcomes (55). Thus, there’s no sufficient data to conclude whether biological
grafts offer advantages or disadvantages in anterior prolapse repair compared with traditional repair without graft. Results of various trials are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mesh type</th>
<th>Follow-up (yrs)</th>
<th>Success (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaikin et al (56)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cadaveric fascia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groutz et al (57)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cadaveric fascia lata</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandhi et al (51)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cadaveric fascia</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al (58)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cadaveric dermis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber et al (38)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Polyglactin 910</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tayrac et al. (59)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migliari et al. (60)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Polypropylene</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There’s currently mixed evidence to support graft use in every case with anterior compartment prolapse. Although graft reinforced anterior prolapse repair in recurrent cases were shown to have higher success rates in women whom no graft was used, there’s still controversy in literature and further large prospective studies are required. Major concern after prolapse surgery is development of complications such as; mesh extrusion, dyspareunia, de novo urgency. Several retrospective or case studies showed excellent results whereas, serious complications were reported in other series (8).

**Posterior compartment**

The success rates with traditional posterior repairs range between 76% to 96% (5,35). Thus, it’s questionable for further search for a new technique or graft use for posterior prolapse repair. There are no large series and randomized studies comparing graft versus no graft (61). Moreover, synthetic meshes are used less frequently, whereas absorbable meshes were not shown to have better results than traditional repair (35).

In a retrospective study, Lim et al., used polyglactin/polypropylene mesh and after 6 months of follow-up, there was a cure rate of 83.9%. The erosion rate was 12.9% in this group. Postoperative constipation was present in 18%, difficulty with defecation occurred in
20.5% and de novo dyspareunia was detected in 3.4% (62). Sand et al., randomly assigned women to receive mesh or no mesh for posterior prolapse repair. No significant improvement was detected between two groups (mesh: 91.2% vs no mesh: 90%) (37). Milani used prolene mesh both for anterior and posterior repairs and reported 6.5% erosion rate and 63% increase in dyspareunia (63).

Recently, biological materials have been introduced for posterior repairs to avoid synthetic mesh complications. In a review by Kohli and Miklos, 30 women underwent posterior repair with placement of cadaveric dermal graft and for an average of 12.9 months, 7% of patients showed failure (64). However, Altman et al., using collagen mesh had less satisfactory results. At 12 months of follow-up, 38% of patients had recurrent rectoceles (65). In a comparative study between posterior colporraphy, site-specific rectocele repair, or site-specific repair reinforced by porcine small intestinal submucosa graft, Paraiso et al, reported 86% of patients in first group and 78% of patients in site-specific repair group had anatomic cure. However, women who received graft for repair had 54% success rate (66). In another trial which compared posterior repair with or without polyglactin mesh (Vicryl), posterior compartment prolapse recurrence was equal in both groups (37).

In conclusion, currently it’s not possible to make a definitive recommendation for routine use of meshes or biological grafts in posterior compartment and native tissue even remains appropriate or same efficacy in posterior vaginal wall repair when compared to absorbable grafts (55). Moreover, there's still reluctance among many surgeons to put prosthetic material in posterior compartment because of the risk of erosion and coital dysfunction (7).

**Vaginal Procedural Kits:**

Although there’s no evidence based suggestion for routine use of grafts or prosthesis in pelvic floor reconstructive surgeries, many different procedural kits have been developed
for vaginal placement of mesh or graft, recently. These kits include needles, mesh/graft and/or several attachment devices. Most use blind passage of needles through safe foramens or attach mesh or fix them to different anatomic locations, such as major ligaments as landmarks. These kits are developed for correction of all compartments’ prolapses. Intravaginal slingplasty, anterior and posterior repairs may be carried with these kits. Prolift (Ethicon, Somerville, NJ) aims to correct anterior, posterior, or total vaginal prolapse with type I polypropylene mesh, whereas Perigee and Apogee (American Medical Systems, Minnetonka, MN) employ either type I polypropylene mesh or porcine dermal graft for anterior and posterior restoration. Intravaginal slingplasty or infracocecygeal sacrocolpopexy corrects urinary incontinence and/or posterior component for apical prolapse (4). Current data related to these procedural kits are limited. Prospective randomized controlled studies are few and in limited series it was reported that Prolift™ had an overall cure rate of 95.3% at 3 months (67). Gauruder-Burmester et al, applied both Perigee and Apogee and reported 93% rate of success at 1 year (68). In several studies, success rate for IVS was reported to range from 74% to 96% (69-71). Nguyen and Burchette reported the results of their comparative study between anterior colporraphy and Perigee with polypropylene mesh. After 1 year, success and satisfaction was obtained in 55% of patients in colporraphy group and 87% in patients who received mesh (72). In a prospective study involving 70 women, Elevate™ kit was used for prolapse repair. Twenty Anterior, 16 Posterior, and 34 Anterior and Posterior repair systems were placed. Recurrences were recorded in 21 patients (31.3%) at the 1-year follow-up. Of the 21 failures (stage ≥2), 13 were stage 2 with the leading edge above the hymen (73). Various early complications were also reported for commercially available kits. In a series of 277 women who received Prolift (Johnson&Johnson, New Jersey, USA), a high rate of mesh exposure (12%) was reported (74). However, De Tayrac et al, reported 6.3% of vaginal erosions using Pelvitex (Sofradim, Trevoux, France) for anterior prolapse repair (75).
Similarly, Nguyen and Burchette also found low erosion rates for mesh use (5%). They also reported that de-novo dyspareunia occurred in 16% of patients receiving the kit whereas it was 9% in classic repair (72). In a recent study, evaluating the risk factors for mesh complications after trocar guided transvaginal mesh kit repair of anterior vaginal wall prolapse, mesh erosion rate was found to be 8.6%. Smoking, multiple childbirth, and somatic inflammatory disease were reported to be possible risk factors (76). Nguyen et al., evaluated perioperative complication and reoperation rates associated with slings and prolapse repairs using mesh and biologic grafts. During the 21-month period, 1508 women had prolapse repair procedures using implanted prostheses. Mesh-related reoperations after prolapse procedures were reported to be performed more often for vaginal mesh erosion (3%) than for biologic graft infection (0.3%) and were performed more commonly after anterior (6%) compared with apical (2%) or posterior vaginal mesh repairs (2%) (77).

**Conclusions**

Although there seems to be an increasing tendency to use of grafts in pelvic floor reconstructive surgeries, currently few studies show sufficient level of evidence. Improvement in mesh characteristics, better commercial kits may further increase their use, however long-term, randomized controlled studies are still lacking. Currently, there’s mixed data to support the routine use of graft in pelvic organ prolapse treatment.

Synthetic grafts have been used for a long time for abdominal sacrocolpopexy and shown to have better results compared to biological grafts (5). The procedure is accepted as gold standard but may be associated with short term morbidity and potential foreign body problems (8).

Graft reinforcement in women with recurrent cystocele was reported to improve short term outcomes (7). Overall, insufficient data exist to conclude the superiority of anterior wall.
grafts to repairs without graft use. However, nonabsorbable synthetic meshes may reveal better results at the cost of several adverse events (55).

There’s limited data evaluating the role of mesh augmentation for posterior compartment prolapse repair. In many of the studies, the use of biological grafts in posterior wall repairs did not reveal better results than native tissue repair. Similarly, use of synthetic meshes did not receive enough attention because of fear of infection/erosion. There’s also limited long-term data for use of biological or synthetic grafts for posterior prolapse repair.
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Pericervical Ring

Childbirth & Prolapses

Anatomical basis
Anatomical basis

Level I Defect

Anterior Defects

Anterior Defects

Anterior Defects

Anterior Defects
**Anterior Defects**

- Central site specific correction
- Transverse apical defect

**Transverse Anterior Defect**

- Site specific apical transverse correction

**Mesh for POP repair**

- High failure rates after conventional techniques
- Reinforce the native tissues ("neoligaments")
- Achieve improved functional and anatomical outcomes
- Anterior vaginal mesh: reduces the prolapse recurrence
- Posterior and apical vaginal mesh: no level I evidence to support the use
Complications (2008-2011)

- Erosion
- Infection
- Pain
- Urinary problems
- Recurrence of prolapse and/or incontinence
- Shrinkage of polypropylene meshes¹²

2. Gauruder-Brunsater A et al. Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct 2007

SIS: abscess

SIS: Asseptic abscess

Urethrovaginal vaginal fistula

Partial removal of mesh

Posterior Gynemesh exposure
What are the clinical concerns?

**Mesh contraction**

**Major Symptoms**
- Severe vaginal pain (worsened by movements)
- Dyspareunia

**Minor Symptoms**
- Vaginal discharge/spotting
- Awareness of prolapse
- Male partner discomfort

**Vaginal examination**
- Prominent tense focal areas of mesh
  - arm / body
- Painful prominent mesh areas
- Prominent tender band
- Vaginal tightness
- Foreshortened vagina
- Mesh erosion
**Vaginal examination**

- Palpation of each side and arms of the mesh
- Ask if she experienced pain like during sexual intercourse or movements
- Localize trigger points

**Perforations**

- 3.5%

---

**Obstruction (BOO)**

- BOO under diagnosed
- Incidence 2.7 – 23%
- Anatomical or functional
- Detrusor overactivity

---

**Etiology**

- Anti-incontinence procedures 20%
- Genital prolapses 16%
- Primary obstruction of the bladder neck 6%

---

**Diagnosis**

- Residuals
- Urodynamics + VUCG
- Videourodynamic

---

**Nomograma**

Blaivas & Grootz, 2001
BOO
1. Funcional
2. Anatômica

Obstruction

Tape incision

Partial removal

Urethrolisys:
Results

AutoLOGous: 18 / 210 (8.5%)
Synthetic: 2 / 226 (0.6%)

Diagnosis: from 3 m to 8 yrs. (mean: 9 m)
Qmax: 9.9 ml/s PdetQmax: 48 cmH2O (mean)

Palma et al; Eur. Urol, 2004
**TUIBN**

**Healing abnormalities**

- Geralmente exposições sem granulação
- Ocorre em 6-14% casos
- Maioria assintomática
- Tratada conservadoramente consultório ou CC
- Influencia resultado?

**Classification of healing abnormalities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Comple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tempo pós-op</td>
<td>&lt; 12 weeks</td>
<td>&gt; 12 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Granulatio
inflammation | Absent | Present |
| Localization     | incision | Other |
| organ             | Vagina | viscus |

IUGA grafts symposium, 2005

**Sling : healing abnormalities**

**Partial removal**

**Inside- out?**
Complications - TOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ob Tape</th>
<th>Monarc</th>
<th>TVT-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erosão</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infecção</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropatia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangramento</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Bexiga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Uretra</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Leg pain

• **40% TVT-O**


2008 neuourology and urodymanics 27:572-3

Persistant pain

Conclusions

• Mesh exposure 6-14%
• Conservative management first
• Patial removal
• Impact on the outcome?
• Severe complications - experience
• Prevention is the best treatment!
Notes
Record your notes from the workshop here