



ABDOMINAL SACROHYSTEROPEXY IN YOUNG WOMEN WITH UTEROVAGINAL PROLAPSE

Dr. Kusum Kumari*

M.B.B.S., DNB. (Obs. & Gynae.), Senior Resident, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar.*Corresponding Author

Dr. (Prof.) Lata Shukla Dwedi

M.S. (Obs. & Gynae.), Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College and Hospital, Gaya, Bihar.

ABSTRACT **Objective:** To study the results of sacrohysteropexy with Prolene Mesh for treatment of uterovaginal prolapse in women who desire to preserve their uterus. **Material and Methods:** This Prospective observational study was carried out in Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, ANMMCH, Gaya, Bihar over a period of 1½ years from June 2018 to December 2019. 12 women with uterovaginal prolapsed wishing to retain their uterus underwent Sacrohysteropexy with Prolene Mesh attached to uterine isthmus and to the anterior longitudinal ligament of the first or second sacral vertebra in a tension free fashion. Subjective and objective cure of uterine prolapse and operative and postoperative complications were noted. **Results:** 12 patient underwent Sacrohysteropexy for uterovaginal prolapse during this study period. The mean age of patient was 30 years (range 16-40 years). Ten (83.3%) were multipara while two (16.7%) were nullipara. All women had second degree uterovaginal prolapse. The mean follow up period was 12 months. No women developed intra and postoperative complications. No single case of mesh erosion was detected success rate was 83.3%. Recurrent prolapse was recorded in 2 (16.7%) women which was symptomatic and required repeat surgical treatment. **Conclusion:** Sacrohysteropexy is effective and safe procedure in women with uterovaginal prolapse who want to preserve their uteri.

KEYWORDS : Uterovaginal Prolapse, Conservative surgical management success.

INTRODUCTION

The first case of genital prolapse is mentioned in the Ebers papyrus date 1500 BC. The treatment consisted of smearing the prolapse with a mixture of honey and then replacing it. In 400 BC. Hippocrates described treatment of uterine prolapse by tying the patient upside-down and shaking her violently, or the reduction of the uterine prolapse by introducing a half pomegranate soaked in wine into the vagina. Donald of Manchester and his assistant Fothergill described the first surgical methods of treatment in 1880. This was later called the Manchester operation¹. Pelvic organ prolapse (POP) is estimated to affect nearly half of all females over 50 years of age² and has a negative impact on the patient's quality of life. Women have an 11% lifetime risk of undergoing pelvic reconstructive surgery for POP or urinary incontinence^{3,4} and the costs of prolapse surgery, as recorded in the North American population, might be in excess of 1 billion dollars⁵. The etiology of POP is complex and multifactorial, current treatment options include pelvic floor muscle training, use of pessaries and surgery.

Treatment depends on factors such as the severity or grade of POP, symptoms, the patients general condition and expectations and the surgeon experience.

Diverse surgical approaches are now available for POP repair, the goal of which are to restore normal pelvic anatomy, to restore or maintain normal urinary, bowel or sexual function, to reduce the impact of symptoms and to improve quality of life. The decision to remove a healthy organ, such as the uterus in POP repair, must take the patient preference, need and values into consideration. Hence interest in uterus sparing surgery is growing. In the last two decades, several studies have described successful anatomical and functional outcomes after uterus preserving POP repair in both young and elderly women⁶. The advantages of uterus preservation include the maintenance of pelvic anatomy integrity, reduction of intraoperative blood loss, shortened operating time and hospital stay.

Finally uterus preservation appears to contribute positively to the patient's self esteem, body image, confidence and sexuality⁷. Procedures are Manchester operation⁸, uterosacral suspension and plication^{9,10,11,12,13}, sacrospinous hysteropexy^{14,15}, tension free vaginal mesh. These are performed vaginally^{16,17,18}. Open abdominal uterus sparing procedures for POP repair include combined procedures, such as vaginal abdominal retropubic uterine suspension¹⁹, pectineal ligament uterine

suspension²⁰ and sacrohysteropexy^{21,22,23}. Arthur and Savage were the first to describe attachment of the prolapsed uterus to the

sacrum using an abdominal approach²⁴. However while the earliest report described the procedure using a combination of autologous grafts and retropubic suspensions, more contemporary literature focuses on sacrohysteropexy using synthetic mesh²⁵.

Abdominal sacrohysteropexy procedure is performed using mesh fixed to uterine isthmus anteriorly & anterior longitudinal ligament over sacral promontory posteriorly.^{26,27,28}. An important point for discussion concerning abdominal surgery with or without hysterectomy is increased risk of infection or mesh erosion, some authors report significantly higher percentages of mesh erosion in patients after hysterectomy (upto 27%) compared with uterus sparing surgery or sacrocolpopexy without hysterectomy (0-4%), while others found no difference^{29,30,31,32}. It restores normal anatomy, enhances sexual function and preserves child bearing capacity. It also allows restoration of the length of the vagina without compromising its caliber, and is therefore likely to have a favourable functional outcome^{33,34}.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

This Prospective observational study was carried out in Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, ANMMCH, Gaya, Bihar over a period of 1½ years from June 2018 to December 2019. All 12 women were selected by convenient sampling. All women who had major uterine prolapse grade-II or more and who did not want to undergo hysterectomy or were desirous of further childbearing were included in this study. The patients were evaluated by general physical examinations & pelvic examination to grade the type of prolapse. In grade-I prolapse, the leading edge of the prolapse did not descend below 1cm above the hymenal ring. Grade-II when the leading edge of prolapse extended from 1cm above to 1cm below hymenal ring. Grade-III, 1cm beyond the hymenal ring but without complete vaginal eversion and Grade-IV where vagina is completely everted¹¹. Patients were admitted after thorough preoperative assessment. All the patients were counseled regarding mesh erosion, infection, fever, damage to bladder or bowel, pain during sexual intercourse, vaginal discharge bleeding and failure of procedure. An informed consent was obtained from the patient for the procedure. In the sacrohysteropexy procedure after entering the abdominal cavity the peritoneum over the anterior surface of sacral vertebra 1 or 2 was incised and this was continued down to create peritoneal flaps. Using prolene 1 suture and taking care not to injure the vessels and nerves, prolene mesh was fixed to back of uterine isthmus anteriorly & anterior longitudinal ligament over sacral promontory posteriorly in a tension free manner. The peritoneal flaps were re approximated over the mesh & abdomen closed. All operations were performed by the same surgeon.

RESULTS

12 patients underwent Sacrohysteropexy for uterovaginal prolapse during this study period. The mean age of patient was 30 years (range 16-40 years).

Ten (83.3%) were multipara while two (16.6%) were nullipara & out of these patients one (8.3%) being unmarried. All women had grade-II uterovaginal prolapse. In four (33.3%) patients concomitant bilateral tubal ligation was performed. No women developed intra operative and postoperative complications. No single case of mesh erosion was recorded in our study. Recurrent prolapse was recorded in 2(16.7%) women. Success rate was 83.3%.

Pregnancy was reported in one (8.3%) woman who delivered by lower segment caesarean section.

Table 1 : Age distribution of patients

Age in years	No. of patients (n=12)	Percentage
16-20	3	25%
30-40	9	75%

Table 2 : Parity of patients

Parity	No. of patients (n=12)	Percentage
Multipara	10	83.3%
Nullipara	2	16.6%

Table 3 : Degree of Prolapse

Degree of Prolapse	No. of patients (n=12)	Percentage
1st Grade – I	0	0
2nd Grade – II	12	100%

Table 4 : Complication of Procedure

Complications	No. of patients (n=12)	Percentage
Mesh erosions	0	0
Intra & Post operative complications	0	0

Table 5 : Success of Procedure

Successful Repair	No. of patients (n=12)	Percentage
1st Procedure	10	83.3%
Repeat Surgery	2	16.6%

DISCUSSION

It has been estimated that half of parous women lose pelvic floor support resulting in some degree of prolapse and out of these women 10-20% seek medical care. A minor prolapse may be treated with pelvic floor exercise and vaginally inserted pessaries without the need for surgery. More serious prolapse may need surgery. Consensus is growing that the uterus can be preserved at the time of pelvic reconstructive surgery in appropriately selected women who desire it. The result of comparison trials and prospective studies have confirmed that uterus sparing surgery is feasible with shorter operating time and hospital stay having similar outcomes compared to hysterectomy³⁰. Several approaches have been advocated for the management of uterine prolapse in young women or those who desire to retain their uteri. In Manchester's operation vaginal shortening of the uterosacral and cardinal ligaments is done with cervical amputation³¹.

Manchester procedure is associated with several major problems such as recurring prolapse in 20% of patients, a decrease in fertility and a pregnancy wastage of up to 50%. Furthermore, cervical stenosis is frequent and makes it difficult to obtain tissue from the cervix and endometrium for cytology and histology respectively³².

Synthetic material such as Dacron tape or Strips of external oblique aponeurosis, were employed to suspend the uterus to anterior abdominal wall with disappointing results, the significant change in the normal vaginal axis causes abdominal pressure to be transmitted to the cul-de-sac, thereby increasing the possibility of subsequent enterocele formation. New generation meshes including Prolift, Seraton and Avaulta have been used successfully via the vaginal route for total prolapse preserving the uterus. The occasional disadvantage is the erosion rate³⁵. Several authors have recommended the abdominal approach³⁶. Insertion of mesh uterine suspension sling is done with the women under a general anaesthetic and can be carried out either as

open abdominal surgery or by Laparoscopy. O'Brien and Ibrahim were the first to report laparoscopic anterior suspension of the uterus or vagina with uterus preservation. Rosenblatt et al, have published the largest case series of 40 women who underwent laparoscopic sacrocervicopexy, pelvic organ prolapse quantification system measurement was used and showed good result³⁷.

The present study was carried out to evaluate effectiveness of sacrohysteropexy using prolene mesh for treatment of uterovaginal prolapse.

In a study carried out by Barranger et al³⁸, the mean age of the women undergoing sacrohysteropexy was 35.7 years (range 29-43). The mean age of the women was 30 years (range 16-40 years) in our study. In the largest review of 30 cases by Barranger et al, all women were parous. Young and nullipara women with prolapse have been demonstrated to be more likely to have some identifiable risk factors (congenital anomalies, neurological disease, connective tissue disease than older or parous women where no obvious clinical risk factor is identified³⁹. These findings are consistent with our study where 10 (83.3%) patients of prolapse were multipara with history of prolonged labour and delivery by unskilled person. Only two (16.6%) women in our study were nullipara, one being unmarried. This may be due to congenital weakness of pelvic supporting structures. Several different types of synthetic and biological mesh are available, which vary in structure and their physical properties such as absorbability. In study performed by Elad Leron and Stuart L & Slanton⁴⁰ Sacrohysteropexy was performed by using Teflon mesh while in Farhat Karims⁴¹ study

sacrohysteropexy was performed using prolene-1. The short term outcome was successful with zero complications. In addition it was more cost effective as the need for synthetic mesh is avoided and hospital stay is also reduced. However, it leads to erosion and bowel adhesion and obstruction. In a study performed by Demirci and Leron E et al⁴², there were no intraoperative and postoperative complications.

However in the largest review of 30 cases by Barranger et al³⁸ intraoperative and postoperative complications occurred in two patients (6.6%) and four patients (13.3%) respectively. Vaginal mesh erosion occurred in one woman. The mean objective and subjective follow up period was 44.5 months. Two cases of recurrent uterovaginal prolapse (6.6%) were described. In our study performed on 12 cases, there

were no intraoperative and postoperative complications. During one and half years follow up period no single case of mesh erosion was recorded. However two patients (16.6%) had recurrent uterovaginal prolapse. Both of these were nullipara and young.

Their prolapse may be due to congenital weakness of pelvic supporting structures. The success rate was 83.3%. Pregnancy after uterus sparing POP surgery is a controversial issue. Caution should be exerted in fertile women who have undergone any form of prolapse repair because the effect of pregnancy and delivery on any reconstructive procedure are still poorly understood. In 257 women who underwent uterus sparing surgery, 24 pregnancies (9.7%) and 16 deliveries, (6 caesarean section, 10 vaginal deliveries and 6 abortions) have been reported to date. (Barranger et al 2003). One patient (8.3%) in our study got pregnant, who later delivered by caesarean section³⁸.

CONCLUSION

Abdominal sacrohysteropexy is effective and safe treatment of uterovaginal prolapse in women who wish to retain their uteri. It maintains a durable anatomic restoration of normal vaginal axis (hence eliminating the prolapse symptoms) and sexual function without painful or rigid vaginal scarring. The success rate is excellent for correcting prolapse with minimal complications.

REFERENCES

1. Loret de Mola JR, Carpenter S.E Management of genital prolapse in neonates and young women. *Obstet Gynecol Surv* 1996; 51:253-260.
2. Samuelsson EC, Victor FT, Tibblin G and Svardsudd, 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; 180:299-305.
3. Olsen AL, Smith VJ et al. Epidemiology of surgically managed pelvic organ prolapse and urinary incontinence. *Obstet Gynecol* 1997; 89:501-506.
4. Smith FJ, Holman CD, Mooring RE, Tsokos N. Lifetime risk of undergoing surgery for pelvic organ prolapse. *Obstet Gynecol* 2010; 116:1096-1100.
5. Subak LL, Brown JS, Lee KA et al. Cost of Pelvic Organ prolapse surgery in the United States *Obstet Gynecol* 2001; 98:646-651.

6. Kovac SR and Shank HC. Successful pregnancies and vaginal deliveries after sacrospinous uterosacral fixation in five of nineteen patients. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1993; 168:1778-1783.
7. Neuman M and Lavy Y. Conservation of the prolapsed uterus is a valid option medium term results of a prospective comparative study with the posterior intravaginal Slingplasty Operation. *Inturogynecol J Pelvic floor Dysfunction* 2007; 18:889-893.
8. Ayhan A, Esin S, Guvens et al. The Manchester operation for uterine prolapse. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2006; 92:228-233.
9. Ridgeway B, Frick A.C, Walter M.D et al. Hysteropexy. A review *Minerva Ginecol* 2008;60:509-528.
10. Margulies RU, Rogers MA, Morgan DM Outcomes of transvaginal uterosacral ligament suspension: systematic review and metaanalysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2010; 202:124-134.
11. Dwyer PL, Fattou B Bilateral extraperitoneal uterosacral suspension: a review approach to correct posthysterectomy vaginal vault prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2008; 19:283-292.
12. Fattou B, Dwyer PL, Achdari C, Tan PK Bilateral extra-peritoneal uterosacral vaginal vault suspension: a 2-year follow-up longitudinal case series of 123 patients. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2009; 20:427-434.
13. Lowenstein L, Fitz A, Kenton K, FitzGerald MP, Mueller ER, Brubaker L Transabdominal uterosacral suspension: outcomes and complications. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2009; 200:6561-6565.
14. Dietz V, Huisman M, de Jong J.M et al. Functional outcome after sacrospinous hysteropexy for uterine de scensus. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2008; 19:747-752.
15. Dietz V, van der Vaart CH, van der Graaf Y, Heintz P, Schraffordt Koops SE One-year followup after sacrospinous hysteropexy and vaginal hysterectomy for uterine descent: a randomized study. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2010; 21:209-216.
16. Takahashi S, Tazawa H, Tashiro H et al. Tension free vaginal mesh procedure for pelvic organ prolapse: a single-center experience of 310 cases with 1 year follow up- *Int J Urol* 2010; 17:353-358.
17. Kato K, Calvin E, Mari Y et al. Clinical pathway for tension free vaginal mesh procedure evaluation in 300 patients with pelvic organ prolapse. *Int J Urol* 2009; 16:314-317.
18. Caquant F, Collinet P, Garbin O et al. Safrey of transvaginal mesh procedure retrospective study of 684 patients *J Obstet Gynaecol Res* 2008;34:449-456.
19. Joshi VM. A new technique of uterine suspension to pectineal ligaments in the management of uterovaginal prolapse. *Obstet Gynecol* 81, 790-793.
20. Nesbitt RE Jr. uterine preservation in the surgical management of genuine stress urinary incontinence associated with uterovaginal prolapse. *Surg. Gynecol Obstet* 1989; 168:143-147.
21. Walters Md. Uterovaginal prolapse in a woman desiring uterine preservation. *Int Urogynecol J. Pelvic floor Dynsfunct* 2008; 19:1465-1470.
22. Costantini E, Lazzeri M, Bini V et al. Uterus preservation in Surgical Correction of uterovaginal prolapse *Eur. Urol* 2005; 48, 642-649.
23. Roovers JP et al. A randomized controlled trial comparing abdominal and vaginal prolapsed surgery effect on urogenital function *BJG* 2004; 111:50-56.
24. Costantini E, Lazzeri M, Porena M. Hysterectomy and stress incontinence. *Lancet* 2008; 371:383-384.
25. Imperato E, Aspesi G, Rovetta E, Presti M. Surgical management and prevention of vaginal vault prolapse. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*.1992; 175:233-237.
26. Thompson PK, Pugmire JE, Sangi-Haghpeykar H. Abdominal colposacropexy utilizing gore-tex in genital prolapse. *J Pelvic Med Surg* 2004; 10:311-317.
27. Mattox TF, Stanford EJ, Varner E. Infected abdominal sacrocolpoxies: diagnosis and treatment. *Int Urogynecol J pelvic floor Dysfunct* 2004; 15:319-323.
28. Brizzolara S, Pillai-Allen A. Risk of mesh erosion with sacral colpexy and concurrent hysterectomy *Obstet Gynecol* 2003; 102:306-310.
29. Price N, Slack A, Jackson SR. Laparoscopic hysteropexy; the initial result of a uterine suspension procedure for uterovaginal prolapsed *BJOG* 2010; 117:62-68.
30. Dietz V, Vander Vaart Ch, Vander Graafy et al. One year follow up after sacrospinous hysteropexy and vaginal hysterectomy for uterine descent: a randomized study *Int Urogynecol J. Pelvic floor Dysfunct* 2010; 21:209-216.
31. Skiadas CC, Goldstein DP, and Laufer MR. The Manchester. Fothergill procedure as a fertility sparing alternative for pelvic organ prolapse in young women. *J Pediatr. Adolesc Gynecol* 2006; 19:89-93.
32. De Boer TA, Milani AL, et al. The effectiveness of surgical correction of uterine prolapse: cervical amputation with uterosacral ligament placcation (modified Manchester) versus vaginal hysterectomy with high utersacral ligament placcation. *Int Urogynecol J. Pelvic floor Dysfunct* 2009; 20:1313-1319.
33. Faraj R and Broome J. Laparoscopic sacrohysteropexy for uterine prolapse: a case report and review of literature, Department of OBGY and Urogynaecology, Royal Hospital, UK. *Journal of Medical case reports*, 2009.
34. Delarue E, Collinet P. Sacrohysteropexy for treatment of genital prolapse, Department Of Obstetrics & Gynaecology , Hospital Jeanne de Flandre, France, *Journal of Gynaecological surgery*, Oct 2008.
35. Altman D, Vayryen T, Engh ME, et al, Nordic Transvaginal Mesh Group: short term outcome after transvaginal mesh repair of pelvic organ prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2008, 19:789-793.
36. Costantini E, Lombi R et al. Colposacropexy with Gore-Tex mesh in marked vaginal and uterovaginal prolapse. *Eur Urol* 1998; 34:111-117.
37. Rosenblatt PL, Chelmov D, Ferzandi TR: Laparoscopic sacrocervicopexy for the treatment of uterine prolapse: a retrospective case series report. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol* 2008; 15: 268-272.
38. Barranger E, Fritel X, Pigne A. Abdominal sacrohysteropex in young women with uterovaginal prolapse; long term follow up. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2003; 189:1245-1250.
39. Harris RL, Drach LL, Morris D et al. Urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse in nulliparous women. *Obstet Gynecol* 1998; 92:951-4.
40. Leron E, Stuart L, Stanton. Sacrohysteropexy with synthetic mesh for the management of uterovaginal prolapse. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 2001; 108:629-633.
41. Farhat Karim, Mamoon Mushtaq, Samina Azaz. Sacrohysteropexy with Prolene-1 for the management of uterovaginal prolapse. *Pakistan Armed Forces Medical Journal* 2005; 003-9648.
42. Demirci F, Ozdemir et al. Abdomianl Sacrohysteropexy in young women with utervaginal prolapse: result of 20 cases. *J Reprod Med*. 2006; 51:539-543.