

# Guidelines for the Evaluation and Treatment of Recurrent Urinary Incontinence Following Pelvic Floor Surgery

This clinical practice guideline has been prepared by the Urogynaecology Committee and approved by the Executive and Council of the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada.

## PRINCIPAL AUTHORS

Danny Lovatsis, MD, Toronto ON  
William Easton, MD, Scarborough ON  
David Wilkie, MD, Vancouver BC

## UROGYNAECOLOGY COMMITTEE

Danny Lovatsis, MD, (Chair), Toronto ON  
Jens-Erik Walter, MD (Co-Chair), Montreal QC  
William Easton, MD, Scarborough ON  
Annette Epp, MD, Saskatoon SK  
Scott Farrell, MD, Halifax NS  
Lise Girouard, RN, Winnipeg MB  
Chander Gupta, MD, Winnipeg MB  
Marie-Andrée Harvey, MD, Kingston ON  
Annick Laroche, MD, St-Lambert QC  
Magali Robert, MD, Calgary AB  
Sue Ross, PhD, Calgary AB  
Joyce Schachter, MD, Ottawa ON  
Jane Schulz, MD, Edmonton AB  
David Wilkie, MD, Vancouver BC

Disclosure statements have been received from all members of the committee.

The literature searches and bibliographic support for this guideline were undertaken by Becky Skidmore, Medical Research Analyst, Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada.

**Key Words:** Urinary incontinence, recurrent, surgery

## Abstract

**Objective:** To provide general gynaecologists and urogynaecologists with clinical guidelines for the management of recurrent urinary incontinence after pelvic floor surgery.

**Options:** Evaluation includes history and physical examination, multichannel urodynamics, and possibly cystourethroscopy. Management includes conservative, pharmacological, and surgical interventions.

**Outcomes:** These guidelines provide a comprehensive approach to the complicated issue of recurrent incontinence that is based on the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms.

**Evidence:** Published opinions of experts, and evidence from clinical trials where available.

**Values:** The quality of the evidence is rated using the criteria described by the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care (Table).

## Recommendations

1. Thorough evaluation of each patient should be performed to determine the underlying etiology of recurrent urinary incontinence and to guide management. (II-3B)
2. Conservative management options should be used as the first line of therapy. (III-C)
3. Patients with a hypermobile urethra, without evidence of intrinsic sphincter deficiency, may be managed with a retropubic urethropexy (e.g., Burch procedure) or a sling procedure (e.g., mid-urethral sling, pubovaginal sling). (II-2B)
4. Patients with evidence of intrinsic sphincter deficiency may be managed with a sling procedure (e.g., mid-urethral sling, pubovaginal sling). (II-3B)
5. In cases of surgical treatment of intrinsic sphincter deficiency, retropubic tension-free vaginal tape should be considered rather than transobturator tape. (I-B)
6. Patients with significantly decreased urethral mobility may be managed with periurethral bulking injections, a retropubic sling procedure, use of an artificial sphincter, urinary diversion, or chronic catheterization. (III-C)
7. Overactive bladder should be treated using medical and/or behavioural therapy. (II-2B)
8. Urinary frequency with moderate elevation of post-void residual volume may be managed with conservative measures such as drugs

This document reflects emerging clinical and scientific advances on the date issued, and is subject to change. The information should not be construed as dictating an exclusive course of treatment or procedure to be followed. Local institutions can dictate amendments to these opinions. They should be well documented if modified at the local level. None of these contents may be reproduced in any form without prior written permission of the SOGC.

**Key to evidence statements and grading of recommendations, using the ranking of the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care**

Quality of evidence assessment*	Classification of recommendations†
I: Evidence obtained from at least one properly randomized controlled trial	A. There is good evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action
II-1: Evidence from well-designed controlled trials without randomization	B. There is fair evidence to recommend the clinical preventive action
II-2: Evidence from well-designed cohort (prospective or retrospective) or case-control studies, preferably from more than one centre or research group	C. The existing evidence is conflicting and does not allow to make a recommendation for or against use of the clinical preventive action; however, other factors may influence decision-making
II-3: Evidence obtained from comparisons between times or places with or without the intervention. Dramatic results in uncontrolled experiments (such as the results of treatment with penicillin in the 1940s) could also be included in this category	D. There is fair evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action
III: Opinions of respected authorities, based on clinical experience, descriptive studies, or reports of expert committees	E. There is good evidence to recommend against the clinical preventive action
	L. There is insufficient evidence (in quantity or quality) to make a recommendation; however, other factors may influence decision-making

\*The quality of evidence reported in these guidelines has been adapted from The Evaluation of Evidence criteria described in the Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.<sup>20</sup>

†Recommendations included in these guidelines have been adapted from the Classification of Recommendations criteria described in the The Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care.<sup>20</sup>

to relax the urethral sphincter, timed toileting, and double voiding. Intermittent self-catheterization may also be used. (III-C)

9. Complete inability to void with or without overflow incontinence may be managed by intermittent self-catheterization or urethrolysis. (III-C)

10. Fistulae should be managed by an experienced physician. (III-C)

J Obstet Gynaecol Can 2010;32(9):893-898