Pelvic Floor Disorders Following Hysterectomy for Benign Conditions of Uterus and Endometrial Carcinoma - A Long-term Follow-up Study

Pendekanti Padmaja

Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

Background: Vaginal vault prolapse occurs usually as a consequence of prior hysterectomy. Other causes are inborn or age dependent insufficiency of soft tissue, damage to the pelvic floor during and after childbirth and obesity (>BMI) and other conditions that increase intra-abdominal pressure.

Aim of the Study: To study measured symptoms of pelvic floor disorders (PFD) and their effect on quality of life in post Hysterectomy women for Benign and Malignant lesions of Endometrium.

Materials and Methods: 134 women with post Hysterectomy history were included. Demographic data, height, weight, BMI, time since surgery, Staging of endometrial carcinoma, type of hysterectomy, menopausal status, hormone replacement status, smoking status, parity, and number of vaginal deliveries were elicited. Severity of the symptoms of (PFD) Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory (PFDI-20) was used. This consisted of 3 subscales: Urinary Distress Inventory (UDI-6), Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory (POPDI-6), and Colorectal-Anal Distress Inventory (CRADI-8).

Observations and Results: 134 women were divided into 2 groups. Group A patients who have undergone Hysterectomy for benign conditions of endometrium and group B for malignant conditions of endometrium. Age groups were 30 -60; mean age of 44.72±4.60 years. In group A, PFD symptoms of POPDI-6 were 46/84 (54.76%), CRADI-8 were 57/84 (67.85%) and UDI-6 were 61/84 (72.61%) patients. In group B, PFD symptoms of POPDI-6 were reported by 33/50 (66%), CRADI-8 by 32/50 (64%) and UDI-6 by 30/50 (60%) patients.

Conclusions: Prevalence of Pelvic Floor Disease is higher in our study of Post Hysterectomy women undergoing for both benign and malignant indications. The degree of symptoms most commonly was mild but the patients should be enquired about these symptoms that are possible. There was more than one organ system of pelvic floor that was involved.

Key words: Benign, Hysterectomy, Malignant and endometrium, Pelvic floor, Quality of life

INTRODUCTION

Hysterectomy is one of the most common surgeries performed worldwide for various benign and malignant conditions of the uterus apart from its endometrial diseases. Posthysterectomy patients are likely to develop pelvic floor disorders (PFDs) during their post-operative



period. The common symptoms of these PFDs are urinary incontinence, pelvic organ prolapse, and fecal incontinence. There are many reports in the literature giving the prevalence of PFD in general population to be 23.7%; 15.7% of women experiencing urinary incontinence, 2.9% pelvic organ prolapse, and 9.0% experiencing fecal incompetence.^[1] A woman reporting at least one complaint of PFD increases proportionately with age, gravidity, increased parity, and body mass index (BMI).^[2] This leads to increased surgeries to correct pelvic floor and in the USA more than 338,000 such procedures undertaken annually.^[3,4]

In an Indian study based at Ahmadabad, it was found that 9.8% of rural women and 5.3% of urban insured

Corresponding Author: Dr. Pendekanti Padmaja, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, India. E-mail: drpadmaja43@gamil.com

women had had a hysterectomy, compared to 7.2% and 4.0%, respectively, of uninsured women; one-third of the hysterectomy patients were below 35 years of age.^[5] It was reported that among the risk factors, prolapse of uterus was the main factor resulting in PFD.^[6,7] Among the malignant conditions, carcinoma of the endometrium is the most common indication for hysterectomy. As more than 75% of the cases of endometrial carcinoma are diagnosed in Stage-I, for which the indicated surgery is hysterectomy.^[8,9] Several immediate and long-term complications are described in literature following hysterectomy such as mild-to-severe morbidity, ureteral injuries, bowel injuries, bladder injuries, and hemorrhage.^[10] There are not many studies about the prevalence of PFD in posthysterectomy patients published in the literature.^[11] The present study was conducted in this context to identify the prevalence of symptoms of PFD in posthysterectomy patients the indications being both benign and malignant diseases of the endometrium; in addition to assess the impact of PFD on patient quality of life.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was cross-sectional study of 134 women who had undergone hysterectomy and presenting with symptoms of PFD. An ethical committee clearance was obtained; consent form approved by the committee was used. The 134 patients included were divided into two groups. Group A consisted of 84 women who underwent hysterectomy for benign conditions of endometrium. Group B consisted of 50 women who underwent hysterectomy for malignant conditions of the endometrium.

Inclusion Criteria

- 1. Patients aged between 30 and 60 years were included.
- 2. Patients who have undergone hysterectomy more than 1 year ago were included.
- 3. Patients who have undergone hysterectomy for both benign and malignant conditions of the endometrium are included.
- 4. Posthysterectomy patients with at least one symptom of PFD were included.

Exclusion Criteria

- 1. Patients aged below 30 and above 60 years were excluded.
- 2. Patients who are nulliparous were excluded.
- 3. Patients with BMI below 25 were excluded.
- 4. Patients who have undergone radiotherapy following hysterectomy were excluded.
- 5. Patients who have undergone surgeries for PFD were excluded.

Demographic data were collected in a printed pro forma approved by the ethical committee which included age, height and weight, time since surgery, staging of endometrial carcinoma, type of hysterectomy, menopausal status, hormone replacement status, parity, and number of vaginal deliveries. To assess the severity of the symptoms of PFD inventory (PFDI-20)^[12] was used. This consisted of three subscales: Urinary distress inventory (UDI-6), pelvic organ prolapse distress inventory (POPDI-6), and colorectal-anal distress inventory (CRADI-8).^[12] Each inventory consisted of 6, 6, and 8 questions, respectively. They were answered with a 4-point Likert scale: 1- not at all to 4- quite a bit. Only the mean values of all answered items are multiplied by 25 to determine the scale score (range 0–100). Higher scores denote a greater symptom or impact score.^[13] All the data were analyzed with standard statistical methods.

OBSERVATIONS AND RESULTS

A total of 134 women were divided into two groups. Group A patients who have undergone hysterectomy for benign conditions of endometrium and Group B for malignant conditions of endometrium. The demographic data of the Group A women included showed that they belonged to ages between 30 and 60 years with a mean age of 44.72 \pm 4.60 years. The mean values of weight and height are shown in Table 1. 26 women had attained menopause (30.95%) and 62 had not (73.80%). 55 patients had undergone abdominal hysterectomy and 29 (65.47%) had undergone vaginal hysterectomy (34.52%). Of a total follow-up of 5 years of in the present study, the time lapse between the hysterectomy and appearance of PFD symptoms was observed in 47/84 patients (55.95%) within 3 years and 37/84 patients (44.04%) complained of symptoms after 3 years. The relation of posthysterectomy patients and their parity is shown in Table 1. 23 (27.83%) patients required hormonal replacement as they had undergone total hysterosalpingo-oophorectomy [Table 1].

The demographic data of the Group B women (50 patients) included showed that they also belonged to ages between 30 and 60 years with a mean age of 54.24 ± 3.10 years. The mean values of weight and height are shown in Table 2. 8 women had attained menopause (16%) and 62 had not (84%). All the patients had undergone abdominal hysterectomy. Of a total follow-up of 5 years of in the present study, the time lapse between the hysterectomy and appearance of PFD symptoms was observed in 28/50 patients (56%) within 3 years and 22/50 patients (44%) complained of symptoms after 3 years. The relation of posthysterectomy patients and their parity is shown in Table 2. All the (100%) patients required hormonal replacement as they had undergone total hystero-salpingo-oophorectomy [Table 2].

| Observation | Group A- 84 | | | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------|------------|
| | Mean weight | Mean height | Mean BMI | |
| Age | | | | |
| 30–40 years - 38 | 64.25±0.30 | 5.30±1.10 | 30 | 45.23 |
| 40–50 years - 27 | 68.30±0.50 | 5.42±1.30 | 34 | 32.14 |
| 50–60 years - 19 | 67.40±0.40 | 5.55±1.50 | 35 | 22.61 |
| Menopausal state | | | | |
| Yes | 26 | | | 30.95 |
| No | 62 | | | 73.80 |
| Type of hysterectomy | | | | |
| Abdominal | 55 | | | 65.47 |
| Vaginal | 29 | | | 34.52 |
| Time lapse after surgery (year) | | | | |
| 1–2 | 23 | - | - | 27.38 |
| 2–3 | 24 | | | 28.57 |
| 3–4 | 22 | | | 26.19 |
| 4–5 | 15 | | | 17.85 |
| Parity | | | | |
| 1 | 17 | - | - | 28.56 |
| 2 | 23 | | | 27.38 |
| 3 | 15 | | | 17.85 |
| 4 | 14 | | | 19.04 |
| 5 | 15 | | | 17.85 |
| Number of vaginal deliveries | | | | |
| 1 | 16 | - | - | 19.04 |
| 2 | 36 | | | 42.85 |
| 3 | 21 | | | 25 |
| 4 | 11 | | | 13.09 |
| Hormonal replacement | | | | |
| Yes | 23 | - | - | 27.83 |
| No | 61 | | | 72.61 |

| Table 1: The demographic data and gynecological and obstetric risk factors of Group | A (<i>n</i> = | :84) |
|---|----------------|------|
| | | |

In Group A pelvic symptoms of POPDI-6 were reported by 46/84 (%), CRADI-8 by 57/84 (%), and UDI-6 by 61/84 (%) patients. These findings demonstrate that Group A patients had more than one PFD symptoms [Table 3].

In Group B pelvic symptoms of POPDI-6 were reported by 33/50 (%), CRADI-8 by 32/50 (%), and UDI-6 by 30/50 (%) patients. These findings demonstrate that Group A patients had more than one PFD symptoms [Table 4].

DISCUSSION

Vaginal vault prolapse occurs usually as a consequence of prior hysterectomy. Other causes are inborn or age dependent insufficiency of soft tissue, damage to the pelvic floor during and after childbirth and obesity (>BMI) and other conditions that increase intra-abdominal pressure.^[14,15] Post Hysterectomy women are prone to Pelvic Floor Diseases could be due to excision of the parametrium which is typically the elasto- fibromuscular support tissue for the vaginal cuff. In Urogynaecologic researches the PFDI-20 can be used to measure the extent of lower urinary tract, colorectal-anal, and pelvic organ prolapse symptoms and how they affect the quality of life of these women. They are found to be validated, reliable, and responsive to change.^[16,17] These patient-oriented subjective evaluation methods are recommended for improving the quality of clinical research projects and play an important role in fixing the goals for Healthcare Research and Quality.^[12] In the present study of follow up of 5 years post Hysterectomy women the prevalence of PFD among benign conditions of the endometrium were ranging from 51.85% to 56.61%. In Post Hysterectomy for endometrial carcinoma the prevalence was ranging from 66 to 60%. This is higher than the prevalence reported in the literature among the general population as 23.7%.^[1] This can be explained by the fact that in group B women the procedure involved the wide dissection of uterus, fallopian tubes and ovaries with lymphadenectomy than seen hysterectomy for benign conditions. In the present study this difference was similar in regards with parity, BMI and age of the women. Review of literature has shown that hysterectomy increases the risk of PFDs.^[18-20] The cumulative risk of developing PFDs rises from 1% at 3 years to 5% at 15 years.^[21] In the present study women with symptoms, most were in the mild range in group A (Table 3) and severe in Group B (Table4). In similar studies the authors have observed that although symptomatic pelvic floor distress has been

| Observation | Group B - 50 | | | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------|------------|
| | Mean weight | Mean height | Mean BMI | _ |
| Age (year) | | | | |
| 30–40-03 | 64.25±0.30 | 5.30±1.10 | 30 | 6 |
| 40–50-12 | 68.30±0.50 | 5.42±1.30 | 34 | 24 |
| 50–60-35 | 67.40±0.40 | 5.55±1.50 | 35 | 70 |
| Menopausal state | | | | |
| Yes | 08 | - | - | 16 |
| No | 42 | | | 84 |
| Type of hysterectomy | | | | |
| Abdominal | 50 | - | - | 100 |
| Vaginal | - | | | - |
| Time lapse after surgery (year) | | | | |
| 1–2 | 9 | - | - | 18 |
| 2–3 | 13 | | | 26 |
| 3–4 | 18 | | | 36 |
| 4–5 | 10 | | | 20 |
| Parity | | | | |
| 1 | 00 | - | - | 00 |
| 2 | 2 | | | 4 |
| 3 | 18 | | | 36 |
| 4 | 12 | | | 24 |
| 5 | 18 | | | 36 |
| Number of vaginal deliveries | | | | |
| 1 | 8 | - | - | 16 |
| 2 | 14 | | | 28 |
| 3 | 11 | | | 22 |
| 4 | 17 | | | 34 |
| Stage of endometrial carcinoma | | | | 01 |
| Stage-I | 58 | _ | _ | 69.04 |
| Stage-II | 15 | | | 17.85 |
| Stage-III | 11 | | | 13.09 |
| Hormonal replacement | | | | 10.00 |
| Yes | 43 | _ | _ | 51.19 |
| No | 43 | - | - | 48.80 |

Table 2: The demographic data and gynecological and obstetric risk factors of Group B (n=50)

Table 3: The pelvic floor distress inventoryresponses in Group A (n=84)

| Patient response | POPDI-6 | CRADI-8 | UDI-6 |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------|-------|
| Mild (1–33) | 17 | 34 | 30 |
| Moderate (34-66) | 15 | 12 | 16 |
| Severe (67–100) | 14 | 11 | 15 |
| Absent | 38 | 27 | 23 |
| Percentage of positive response | 54.76 | 51.85 | 56.61 |

Table 4: The pelvic floor distress inventory responses in Group B (*n*=50)

| Patient response | POPDI-6 | CRADI-8 | UDI-6 |
|------------------|---------|---------|-------|
| Mild (1–33) | 10 | 08 | 11 |
| Moderate (34-66) | 09 | 12 | 11 |
| Severe (67–100) | 14 | 12 | 08 |
| Absent | 17 | 18 | 20 |
| Mean score | 66 | 64 | 60 |

correlated with quality of life measures, the association is typically observed in women with more severe symptoms.^[22] In this study there was no correlation between prevalence

of PFDs and a higher endometrial cancer stage (Table 1). The present study though an attempt to identify the risk factors and prevalence of pelvic floor diseases in post Hysterectomy women compared to the prevalence in general population obtained from the literature has some limitations. Firstly the sample size is small. The pre-operative data was lacking which was because of the practice patterns at our tertiary referral institution. Patients with stage-I endometrial carcinoma were sent back to their family physicians for follow up hence a larger could not be undertaken. A larger population could undergo multivariate analysis to determine major risk factors for PFDs in postoperative women who have undergone hysterectomy for endometrial cancer. Similarly advanced stages of carcinoma patients were more likely to end up with follow up at the radiotherapist or oncologist.

CONCLUSIONS

Prevalence of PFD is higher in our study of post hysterectomy women undergoing for both benign and malignant indications. The degree of symptoms most commonly was mild but the patients should be enquired about these symptoms that are possible. There was more than one organ system of pelvic floor that was involved. Early screening of this high-risk population in the postoperative period may increase identification and improve patient quality of life.

REFERENCES

- Nygaard I, Barber MD, Burgio KL, Kenton K, Meikle S, Schaffer J, et al. Prevalence of symptomatic pelvic floor disorders in US women. JAMA 2008;300:1311-6.
- Ellerkmann RM, Cundiff GW, Melick CF, Nihira MA, Leffler K, Bent AE, et al. Correlation of symptoms with location and severity of pelvic organ prolapse. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2001;185:1332-7.
- Rortveit G, Brown J, Thom D, Van Den Eeden SK, Creasman JM, Subak LL. Symptomatic pelvic organ prolapse. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2007;109:1396-403.
- Popovic JR, Kozak LJ. National hospital discharge survey: Annual summary, 1998. Vital Health Stat 13 2000;148:1-94.
- Desai S, Sinha T, Mahal A. Prevalence of hysterectomy among rural and urban women with and without health insurance in Gujarat, India. Reprod Health Matters 2011;19:42-51.
- Swift SE. The distribution of pelvic organ support in a population of female subjects seen for routine gynecologic health care. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2000;183:277-85.
- Olsen AL, Smith VJ, Bergstrom JO, Colling JC, Clark AL. Epidemiology of surgically managed pelvic organ prolapse and urinary incontinence. Obstet Gynecol 1997;89:501-6.
- Mant J, Painter R, Vessey M. Epidemiology of genital prolapse: Observations from the oxford family planning association study. Br J Obstet Gynaecol 1997;104:579-85.
- DiSaia PJ, Creasman WT, editors. Adenocarcinoma of the uterus. Clinical Gynecologic Oncology. 7th ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby; 2007. p. 134-67.
- 10. Jemal A, Siegel R, Ward E, Hao Y, Xu J, Murray T, et al. Cancer statistics,

2008. CA Cancer J Clin 2008;58:71-96.

- 11. Maresh MJ, Metcalfe MA, McPherson K, Overton C, Hall V, Hargreaves J, *et al.* The value national hysterectomy study: Description of the patients and their surgery. BJOG 2002;109:302-12.
- Nosti PA, McDermott CD, Schilder JM, Stehman FB, Woodman PJ. Symptoms of pelvic floor disorders and quality of life measures in postoperative patients with endometrial cancer. Clin Ovarian Other Gynecol Cancer 2015;5:27-30.
- Barber M, Walters M, Cundiff G. Responsiveness of the pelvic floor distress inventory (PFDI) and pelvic floor impact questionnaire (PFIQ) in women undergoing vaginal surgery and pessary treatment for pelvic organ prolapse. Obstet Gynecol 2006;194:1492-8.
- Nichols DH. Massive eversion of the vagina. Technique of transvaginal sacrospinous fixation. Gynecologic and Obstetric Surgery. St Luis: Mosby, 1993.
- Symmonds RE, Pratt JH. Vaginal prolapse following hysterectomy. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1960;79:899-9.
- Barber MD, Kuchibhatla MN, Pieper CF, Bump RC. Psychometric evaluation of 2 comprehensive condition-specific quality of life instruments for women with pelvic floor disorders. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2001;185:1388-95.
- Barber M, Walters M, Cundiff G. Responsiveness of the pelvic floor distress inventory (PFDI) and pelvic floor impact questionnaire (PFIQ) in women undergoing vaginal surgery and pessary treatment for pelvic organ prolapse. Obstet Gynecol 2006;194:1492-8.
- Outcomes Research. Fact Sheet. AHRQ Publication No. 00-P011. Rockville, MD: March: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Available at: http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/outfact.htm. [Last accessed on 2012 Apr 17].
- 19. Jelovsek JE, Maher C, Barber MD. Pelvic organ prolapse. Lancet 2007;369:1027-38.
- Dällenbach P, Kaelin-Gambirasio I, Dubuisson JB, Boulvain M. Risk factors for pelvic organ prolapse repair after hysterectomy. Obstet Gynecol 2007;110:625-32.
- Digesu AG, Chaliha C, Salvatore S, Hutchings A, Khullar V. The relationship of vaginal prolapse severity to symptoms and quality of life. BJOG 2005;112:971-6.
- Jackson KS, Naik R. Pelvic floor dysfunction and radical hysterectomy. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2006;16:354-63.

How to cite this article: Padmaja P. Pelvic Floor Disorders Following Hysterectomy for Benign Conditions of Uterus and Endometrial Carcinoma - A Long-Term Follow-Up Study. Int J Sci Stud 2017;5(8):81-85.

Source of Support: Nil, Conflict of Interest: None declared.