

Comparing quality-of-life scores on patients with sacrospinal ligament fixation versus LeFort colpocleisis for pelvic organ prolapse

Caglar Helvacioğlu¹, Murat Ekin², Levent Yasar²

¹ISTANBUL TRAINING AND RESEARCH HOSPITAL, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY, ZUHURATBABA, BAKIRKOY 34100, ISTANBUL, TURKEY

²BAKIRKOY DR. SADI KONUK TRAINING AND RESEARCH HOSPITAL, DEPARTMENT OF OBSTETRICS AND GYNECOLOGY, BAKIRKOY, ISTANBUL, TURKEY

ABSTRACT



Aim. Pelvic organ prolapse negatively affects the women's quality of life and often require surgical treatment. There are several therapeutic options for pelvic organ prolapse. The aim of this study was to compare the quality of life in patients with pelvic organ prolapse treated by either sacrospinous ligament fixation or LeFort colpocleisis.

Materials and Methods. This prospective cohort study was conducted in our urogynecology clinic on 51 patients (29 sacrospinous ligament fixation, and 22 LeFort colpocleisis). The patients were evaluated 6 months postoperatively, using the The Prolapse Quality of Life Score.

Results. The study sample showed that there was no significant difference in quality of life between the two groups. There was no significant difference in PQOL scores for all components analyzed. There was only a significant positive correlation in role-limiting scores related to BMI in patients who had a sacrospinous fixation group ($p < 0.05$). In our sample, the sacrospinal ligament fixation group was younger than the LeFort colpocleisis group.

Conclusions. Recurrence rates in sacrospinous ligament fixation surgery are high. LeFort colpocleisis should be considered as the first option in patients with comorbidities and without sexual activity.

Category:

Original Research Article

Received: January 07, 2020

Accepted: April 10, 2020

Keywords:

Sacrospinous ligament fixation, LeFort colpocleisis, pelvic organ prolapse, urogynecology.

*Corresponding author:

Caglar Helvacioğlu, MD.

Istanbul Training and Research Hospital, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Tevfik Saglam Street, No. 11, Zuhuratbaba, Bakirkoy 34100, Istanbul, Turkey

ORCID 0000-0002-6247-2383

E-mail: caglarhel@hotmail.com

Introduction

Pelvic organ prolapse (POP), is a relatively common disorder, affecting up to 30% of the women during their life, when a decrease in the quality of the life can be registered [1]. The current surgical management for POP, out of mesh surgery, includes reconstructive procedures like sacrospinous colpopexy or sacral colpopexy and obliterative procedure LeFort colpocleisis. Most of these patients have chronic (cardiovascular, renal, endocrine or pulmonary) comorbidities, and the treatment options are chosen taking into account not only degree of the pelvic prolapse but also presence and severity of comorbidities [2].

In the sacrospinous ligament fixation (SSLF) procedure the vaginal apex is suspended to sacrospinous ligament. Amreich described the procedure in 1951, while Randall and Nichols popularized the right SSLF [3-5]. There are several techniques and devices that are suggested/

available for placing the suture through the sacrospinous ligament [4]. The objective cure rates ranged from 67 to 97 percent [6]. The recurrence rate of apical prolapse was reported in 2 to 19 percent of women, and of previous vaginal wall prolapse in 6 to 29 percent after SSLF [7, 8].

Colpocleisis is the obliteration procedure first described by LeFort in 1877 for patients with uterovaginal or vaginal prolapse who are unwilling to retain their vaginal function for intercourse, while SSLF is a reconstructive procedure performed vaginally [9]. The purpose of this study is to evaluate and compare the effect of these two procedures on the quality of life.

Prolapse Quality of Life Score (P-QOL) has been developed by Digesu et al in 2005 [10]. P-QOL questionnaire is specific for POP and thus reliable and valid, being an instrument able to characterize symptom severity, impact on quality of life, as well as to evaluate treatment.

Materials and Methods

Fifty-one women were enrolled in the study, treated surgically either by SSLF (n:29) or LeFort colpocleisis (n:22). This prospective cohort study was approved by the local ethic committee, and an informed consent was signed by all participants to the study. Patients were interviewed by an expert gynecologist in the sixth month postoperatively. The demographic information related to age, parity, BMI, marital status, educational status, were included in the interview. Then all the participants were asked to complete a verbal questionnaire P-QOL. The responses ranged from “none/not at all”, through “slightly/a little” and “moderately” to “a lot”. A four point scoring system for each item was used for the severity measurement of urogenital prolapse symptoms. Scores in each domain range between 0 and 100. A high total score indicates a greater impairment of quality of life, while a low total score indicates a good quality of life.

Statistical Analysis. NCSS (Number Cruncher Statistical System) 2007 Statistical Software (Utah, USA) was used for the data analysis. For univariate analyses continuous data were reported as mean sd. T test were used to compare groups within variations. Mann Whitney U test were used to compare groups with abnormal variation. Fisher-Freeman-Halton test was used to compare qualitative data. Statistical significance was accepted at a P value of <0.05.

Results

The mean age of the patients was 63.43±12.89 (37- 88) years. The mean age of the patients was significantly low in patients who underwent SSLF compared to mean age of the patients who benefited by LeFort colpocleisis (p<0.001). No significant difference was observed in parameters BMI and educational status, respectively (Table 1).

There was statistically no significant difference at PQOL scores in all of the components studied, including

general health perception, prolapse impact, role limitation, personal relationship, emotional status, sleep/ energy and severity measures, respectively (Table 2).

There was only a significant positive correlation in the role limitation scores with respect to BMI in the group of patients with sacrospinous fixation. (r:0.451; p=0.014; p<0.05) (Table 3).

Discussions

LeFort colpocleisis and SSLF are vaginal procedures used for uterine prolapse or prolapse of the vaginal vault. LeFort colpocleisis is an obliterative procedure that restricts the sexual intercourse, being thus different by SSLF [9]. There is no study comparing the quality of life after these two procedures. Such a comparison would be necessary to evaluate the different aspects of the two procedures, because LeFort colpocleisis is obliterative while SSLF is reconstructive.

To our opinion, the quality of life can be a comparable item for these two procedures; the obliterative surgery should be further considered as a logical option in some circumstances and with an expanded informed consent. In this study, the age of the patients was significantly higher in patients who underwent LeFort colpocleisis compared with patients who benefited by SSLF. Although the age comparison was an expected item, the quality of life scores was not significantly different in the two groups. This may be attributed to changes that have taken place in the sexual intercourse, disappearance of dyspareunia leading to better quality of the life scores, while alterations the axe of the vagina in SSLF may lead to dyspareunia in some of the patients.

Obesity is a risk factor for the new onset and recurrent POP [11, 12]. In this study there was only a significant positive correlation in the role limitation scores with respect to BMI in patients from SSLF group; it seems that obliterative or reconstructive vaginal surgery are not affected from high BMI.

Table 1. The comparison of demographic variables

	Surgery		Total (n=51)	P value	
	Sacrospinous Fixation (n=29)	LeFort Colpocleisis (n=22)			
Age(years)		37-69	66-88	37-88	^a 0.001**
	Mean (SD)	54.38	75.36	63.43	
BMI (kg/m ²)		19.5-35.2	21.1-35.8	19.5-35.8	^a 0.094
	Mean (SD)	26.92	28.99	27.82	
Education	Nonliteral	10 (34.5%)	10 (45.5%)	20 (39.2%)	^b 0.529
	Literal	15 (51.7%)	8 (36.4%)	23 (45.1%)	
	High School	3 (10.3%)	4 (18.2%)	7 (13.7%)	
	University	1 (3.4%)	0 (0)	1 (2.0%)	

^aStudent t Test

^bFisher-Freeman-Halton Test

**p<0.01

Table 2. Comparison of PQOL scale subgroups in patients with sacrospinous fixation and LeFort colpocleisis

P-QOL scale		Surgery		Total (n=51)	*P value
		Sacrospinous Fixation (n=29)	LeFort Colpocleisis (n=22)		
General Health Perceptions Score		38.2-54.5	36.4-54.5	36.4-54.5	0.190
	Mean (SD)	43.6	43.39	43.6	
Prolapse Impact Score		37.1-62.9	34.3-60	34.3-62.9	0.136
	Mean (SD)	44.04	42.47	43.36	
Role Limitation Score		20-40	20-40	20-40	0.884
	Mean (SD)	23.79	23.18	23.53	
Physical/Social Limitations Score		20-30	20-30	20-30	0.320
	Mean (SD)	22.76	21.59	22.25	
Personal Relationship Score		33.3-46.7	33.3-46.7	33.3-46.7	0.337
	Mean (SD)	40	41.21	40.52	
Emotional Score		20-26.7	20-26.7	20-26.7	0.544
	Mean (SD)	23.91	23.33	23.66	
Sleep /Energy Score		20-30	20-30	20-30	0.302
	Mean (SD)	23.10	21.82	22.55	
Severity Measures Score		20-30	20-25	20-30	0.781
	Mean (SD)	21.9	21.59	21.76	

*Mann Whitney U Test

Table 3. The correlation analysis between BMI and PQOL scale subgroups

P-QOL Scale		Surgery		Total (n=51)
		Sacrospinous Fixation (n=29)	LeFort Colpocleisis (n=22)	
General Health Perceptions Score-BMI	R	0.289	0.331	0.057
	p	0.128	0.132	0.691
Prolapse Impact Score- BMI	R	0.109	0.025	0.062
	p	0.573	0.911	0.668
Role Limitation Score – BMI	R	0.451	0.187	0.173
	p	0.014*	0.404	0.224
Physical/Social Limitations Score - BMI	R	0.131	0.176	-0.015
	p	0.498	0.432	0.918
Personal Relationship Score - BMI	R	0.297	0.054	0.168
	p	0.118	0.812	0.238
Emotional score - BMI	R	0.126	0.351	0.07
	p	0.516	0.109	0.627
Sleep /Energy - BMI	R	0.267	0.167	0.17
	p	0.161	0.457	0.234
Severity Measures Score – BMI	R	0.069	0.223	0.127
	p	0.723	0.318	0.373

r: Spearman's Correlation coefficient *p<0.05

Sacrospinous fixation has the higher recurrence rates, up to 26% [7, 8, 13]. Most of the recurrences are at the anterior vaginal wall and postoperative infection seems to be the most important factor for the recurrence. The advantages of obliterative procedures are represented by

short operative time, low risk of perioperative morbidity, and lower rate of prolapse recurrence. Colpocleisis is offered as an option in elderly patients who do not desire sexual intercourse. In a similar way, this procedure can be extended to middle aged menopausal women who do not

desire sexual intercourse any more, or in patients who cannot be considered candidates for more extensive surgery (such as the sacrospinous fixation, that has a higher recurrence rates). Although we have compared only these two techniques, there are changes described in the literature. Thus, Bildircin et al. described two new surgical techniques, such as transapical circular sacrospinous colpopexy and cervical sacrospinous uteropexy [14]. There is no study in the literature that compares all these techniques, so that we consider that such a study should be conducted in the near future.

Limitations

The limitation of the study was represented by age of the patients that were significantly lower in patients who underwent SSLF. In fact, our study sample was relatively low, and there were patients from the LeFort category that were not included. Consequently, this reduced the population of the study. According to current data, our results could be the first report in literature comparing the two techniques, and this is the strengths of our study.

Conclusions

There was no significant difference at PQOL scores in all of the components. SSLF has a high recurrence rate and it is more difficult than the LeFort colpocleisis. The advantages of the LeFort colpocleisis are represented by short operative time and low risk of perioperative morbidity. Colpocleisis is offered as a therapeutic option especially in elderly patients who no longer desire sexual intercourse.

References

- Samuelsson EC, Victor FT, Tibblin G, Svärdsudd KF. Signs of genital prolapse in a Swedish population of women 20 to 59 years of age and possible related factors. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1999;180(2 Pt 1):299–305. doi:10.1016/s0002-9378(99)70203-6.
- Kuncharapu I, Majeroni BA, Johnson DW. Pelvic organ prolapse. *Am Fam Physician*. 2010;81(9):1111–1117.
- Randall CL, Nichols DH. Surgical treatment of vaginal inversion. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1971;38(3):327–332.
- Nichols DH, Milley PS, Randall CL. Significance of restoration of normal vaginal depth and axis. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1970;36(2):251–256.
- Petri E, Ashok K. Sacrospinous vaginal fixation—current status. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2011;90(5):429–436. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0412.2011.01084.x
- Beer M, Kuhn A. Surgical techniques for vault prolapse: a review of the literature. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2005;119(2):144–155. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2004.06.042
- Larson KA, Smith T, Berger MB, et al. Long-term patient satisfaction with michigan four-wall sacrospinous ligament suspension for prolapse. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2013; 122(5): 967–975. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0b013e3182a7f0d5
- Aigmüller T, Riss P, Dungal A, Bauer H. Long-term follow-up after vaginal sacrospinous fixation: patient satisfaction, anatomical results and quality of life. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct*. 2008;19(7):965–969. doi:10.1007/s00192-008-0563-5
- Ng SC, Chen GD. Obliterative LeFort colpocleisis for pelvic organ prolapse in elderly women aged 70 years and over. *Taiwan J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;55(1):68–71. doi:10.1016/j.tjog.2015.07.002
- Digesu GA, Khullar V, Cardozo L, Robinson D, Salvatore S. P-QOL: a validated questionnaire to assess the symptoms and quality of life of women with urogenital prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct*. 2005;16(3):176–181. doi:10.1007/s00192-004-1225-x
- Diez-Itza I, Aizpitarte I, Becerro A. Risk factors for the recurrence of pelvic organ prolapse after vaginal surgery: a review at 5 years after surgery. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct*. 2007; 18(11): 1317–1324. doi: 10.1007/s00192-007-0321-0
- Nieminen K, Huhtala H, Heinonen PK. Anatomic and functional assessment and risk factors of recurrent prolapse after vaginal sacrospinous fixation. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2003; 82(5): 471–478. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-0412.2003.00137.x
- Weber AM, Walters MD, Piedmonte MR, Ballard LA. Anterior colporrhaphy: a randomized trial of three surgical techniques. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2001; 185(6):1299–1306. doi:10.1067/mob.2001.119081
- Bildircin FD, Özdemir AZ, Karlı P. The two new surgical techniques for vaginal cuff prolapse and uterine prolapse. *J Surg Med*. 2019;3(8):619–22.