



Reply to Wael Agur letter to the editor re: Gamal Ghoniem and Daa Rizk, “Renaissance of the autologous pubovaginal sling” *International Urogynecology Journal*, 29 (2) 177–178

Gamal Ghoniem¹

Received: 15 February 2018 / Accepted: 19 February 2018 / Published online: 12 March 2018
© The International Urogynecological Association 2018

I appreciate the comments made by Wael Agur regarding colposuspension compared with slings. His argument against Fusco et al.’s conclusion that synthetic slings were superior to colposuspension is strong. However, Fusco and Novara [1] corrected their meta-analysis and placed the Valpas study in the laparoscopic colposuspension group. The corrected Forest plot did not change the odds ratio and *p* value compared with the original plot. The other problem with meta-analysis studies is the inclusion of nonhomogenous groups and different surgical techniques. Autologous slings from different body sites (e.g., fascia lata or vaginal wall) can show great variation in their viscoelastic properties and remodeling after grafting.

The largest, well-designed study [2], the Stress Incontinence Surgical Treatment Efficacy Trial (SISTER) compared traditional pubovaginal sling (PVS) using autologous rectus fascia with colposuspension (modified Tanagho) using permanent sutures. At 24 months, Albo et al. [3] reported the results of this first randomized multicenter clinical trial (RCT) conducted by the National Institutes of Health’s Urinary Incontinence Treatment Network (UITN) in which women (*n* = 655) underwent either colposuspension (*n* = 329) or pubovaginal sling (*n* = 326) procedures. Overall and specific stress urinary incontinence success rates were higher in the PVS group than in colposuspension group. The superiority of PVS over colposuspension [4] was maintained at 5 years in the extended study (E-SISTER).

A recent Cochrane review [5] that analyzed 22 studies comparing colposuspension with slings (traditional and synthetic) found no significant difference in success rates.

However, subgroup analysis of studies comparing traditional slings and open colposuspension showed better effectiveness with traditional slings in the medium and long term [relative risk (RR) 1.35; 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.11–1.64 from 1–5 years of follow-up; RR 1.19; 95% CI 1.03–1.37].

Training young pelvic floor reconstructive surgeons in traditional PVS is important and should be part of their curriculum. An open colposuspension should still be considered an option, especially in patients undergoing open surgery.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of Interest Gamal Ghoniem received research grants from Astellas, Cogentix, Aquinox and Allergen

References

1. Fusco F, Novara G. Reply to Wael Agur and Jawad Freites’ Letter to the Editor re: Ferdinando Fusco, Mohamed Abdel-Fattah, Christopher R. Chapple, et al. Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Comparative Data on Colposuspensions, Pubovaginal Slings, and Midurethral Tapes in the Surgical Treatment of Female Stress Urinary Incontinence. *Eur Urol*. 2017;72:567–91.
2. Tennstedt S. Urinary Incontinence Treatment N. Design of the Stress Incontinence Surgical Treatment Efficacy Trial (SISTER). *Urol*. 2005;66:1213–7.
3. Albo ME, Richter H, Brubaker L, et al. Burch colposuspension versus fascial sling to reduce urinary stress incontinence. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;356:2143–55.
4. Brubaker L, Richter HE, Norton PA, Albo M, Zyczynski HM, Chai TC, et al. Five Year Continence Rates, Satisfaction and Adverse Events of Burch Urethropexy and Fascial Sling Surgery for Urinary Incontinence. *J Urol*. 2012;187(4):1324–30. Published online 2012 Feb 15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2011.11.087>.
5. Lapitan MCM, Cody JD, Mashayekhi A. Open retropubic colposuspension for urinary incontinence in women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;7:CD002912. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002912.pub7>.

This reply refers to the comment available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00192-018-3591-9>.

✉ Gamal Ghoniem
gghoniem@uci.edu

¹ University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, USA