## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MID-URETHRAL SLING OUTCOMES IN DIABETIC AND NON-DIABETIC WOMEN: DO DIFFERENCES EXIST?





for the Collaborative Research in Pelvic Surgery Consortium 1 Columbia University Medical Center; 2 Houston Methodist Hospital

# INTRODUCTION

- Diabetic cystopathy has been described as increased bladder capacity, impaired detrusor contractility, and incomplete bladder emptying (Ellenberg, 1980).
- Results from more contemporary studies have been conflicting as to whether or not this phenomenon actually exists.
- Few studies have looked at outcomes of diabetes on voiding function following surgery.

### OBJECTIVE

• The objective was to compare post-void residual and outcomes following mid-urethral slings.

### METHODS

- A multi-center retrospective study was done.
- Patients were identified who underwent mid-urethral sling (MUS)  $\bullet$ placement (January 2012- September 2016).
- For analysis T-test, Mann-Whitney, Fisher's Exact, and chi-square tests were done (p<0.05 significant).
- Baseline demographics, pre-operative voiding parameters, post-void residual volume (PVR), and complications were recorded.
- DM was characterized by treatment type, duration, and HbA1C.

## RESULTS

- 551 patients were identified (all type 2)
  - 60 (10.9%) had DM
  - 491 (89.1%) did not have DM



Doreen E. Chung<sup>1</sup>, Denise Umpierrez-Morley<sup>1</sup>, Danielle D. Antosh<sup>2</sup>, Zonia Barbosa<sup>2</sup>, Marguerite Susich<sup>1</sup>, Cara L. Grimes<sup>1</sup>

		RESULTS				
		Table 2. Postoperative Empyting				
			DM	Non DM	P-value	
1.6%)		Passed TOV within 24h (%)	48 (80%)	386 (70%)	0.788	
		PVR at discharge (mL)	146.9 ± 220.9	147.4 ± 218.7	0.989	
race (p=0.314), sling type (p=0.274), or 3 mL, p =0.185)		Mean change in PVR Postop (mL)	63.63 ± 197	62.6 ± 183.7	0.396	
%, p=0.230) and sling revision (1.6% vs. women with and without DM.		DISCUSSION				
cs and Urodynamic Parameters		<ul> <li>Study</li> <li>Limitations are retrospective nature of study, limited data on diabetes such as duration, fact that disease was well-controlled in subjects (HbA1C 6.83%)</li> </ul>				
	P-value	CON				
55.6 ± 13.1	<0.005		GLUSION	5		
27.9 ± 6.0	0.001	<ul> <li>In this population no differences in baseline or postoperative PVR were seen in patients with and without DM following MUS placement.</li> <li>Although we did not find objective evidence for the influence of DM on surgical outcomes of MUS, further studies are needed to investigate the effect of the disease on subjective outcomes</li> </ul>				
274 (49.7)	0.752					
310 (56.30	0.258					
86 (15.6)	0.228					
47.7 ± 70.9	0.099	investigate the enect of the u	iscuse on subjec	the outcomes	•	
445.8 ± 163.3	0.096					
23.34 ± 25.0	0.427	R	REFERENCES			
21.8 ± 11.9	0.634					
120 (24.0)	0.039	2. Ellenberg, M., Development of urinary bladder dysfunction in	diabetes mellitus. Ann Intern Med, 1980	);92: p. 321.	2):2066-76.	
	.185) and sling revisio th and without DN dynamic Parameter Non DM (n = 551) 55.6 $\pm$ 13.1 27.9 $\pm$ 6.0 274 (49.7) 310 (56.30 86 (15.6) 47.7 $\pm$ 70.9 445.8 $\pm$ 163.3 23.34 $\pm$ 25.0 21.8 $\pm$ 11.9	.185)D) and sling revision (1.6% vs. th and without DM.Aynamic ParametersNon DM (n = 551)P-value (n = 551) $55.6 \pm 13.1$ <0.005	Table 2. Po Table 2. Po Passed TOV within 24h (%) PVR at discharge (mL) Mean change in PVR Postop (mL) Mean change in PVR Postop (mL) DIS S S S S S S S S	Table 2. Postoperative EmployedImage: Section 1.16% vs.1.314), sling type (p=0.274), or1.85)DV within 24h (%)445.8 ± 10.5ONO DM (n = 551)P-value (n = 551)S5.6 ± 13.1 <0.005 27.9 ± 6.0 0.001 274 (49.7) 0.752 310 (56.30 0.228Arr.7 ± 70.9 0.099 445.8 ± 163.3 0.096 23.34 ± 25.0 0.427 21.8 ± 11.9 0.634Arr.7 ± 70.9 0.099 445.8 ± 163.3 0.096 23.34 ± 25.0 0.427 21.8 ± 11.9 0.634Arr.7 ± 70.9 0.099 445.8 ± 163.3 0.096 23.34 ± 25.0 0.427 21.8 ± 11.9 0.634Colspan="2">Colspan="2"Colspan="2" <td col<="" td=""><td>Table 2. Postoperative EmpytingTable 2. Postoperative EmpytingDMNon DMPassed TOV within 24h (%)48 (80%)386 (70%)PVR at discharge (mL)146.9 ±147.4 ± 218.7220.9Mean change in PVR Postop (mL)63.63 ± 19762.6 ± 183.7Discussion (1.6% vs.Discussion (1.6% vs.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyand without DM.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyStrength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyAtynamic ParametersStrength of this study include large number of study, limited data on such as duration, fact that disease was well-controlled in subj (HbA1C 6.83%)Non DM (n = 551)P-value (n = 551)55.6 ± 13.1&lt;0.005</td>27.9 ± 6.00.001274 (49.7)0.752310 (56.300.25886 (15.6)0.22847.7 ± 70.90.099445.8 ± 163.30.09623.34 ± 25.00.42721.8 ± 11.90.634</td>	<td>Table 2. Postoperative EmpytingTable 2. Postoperative EmpytingDMNon DMPassed TOV within 24h (%)48 (80%)386 (70%)PVR at discharge (mL)146.9 ±147.4 ± 218.7220.9Mean change in PVR Postop (mL)63.63 ± 19762.6 ± 183.7Discussion (1.6% vs.Discussion (1.6% vs.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyand without DM.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyStrength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyAtynamic ParametersStrength of this study include large number of study, limited data on such as duration, fact that disease was well-controlled in subj (HbA1C 6.83%)Non DM (n = 551)P-value (n = 551)55.6 ± 13.1&lt;0.005</td> 27.9 ± 6.00.001274 (49.7)0.752310 (56.300.25886 (15.6)0.22847.7 ± 70.90.099445.8 ± 163.30.09623.34 ± 25.00.42721.8 ± 11.90.634	Table 2. Postoperative EmpytingTable 2. Postoperative EmpytingDMNon DMPassed TOV within 24h (%)48 (80%)386 (70%)PVR at discharge (mL)146.9 ±147.4 ± 218.7220.9Mean change in PVR Postop (mL)63.63 ± 19762.6 ± 183.7Discussion (1.6% vs.Discussion (1.6% vs.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyand without DM.Strength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyStrength of this study include large number of subjects, multi- studyAtynamic ParametersStrength of this study include large number of study, limited data on such as duration, fact that disease was well-controlled in subj (HbA1C 6.83%)Non DM (n = 551)P-value (n = 551)55.6 ± 13.1<0.005

