

- Title** Transvaginal mesh in pelvic organ prolapse repair.
- Agency** Avalia-t. Galician Health Technology Assessment Agency. Axencia de Avaliación de Tecnoloxías Sanitarias de Galicia Edificio Administrativo San Lázaro 15781 Santiago de Compostela  
Telf.: 881 541 831 Fax: 881 542 854 e-mail: [avalia-t@sergas.es](mailto:avalia-t@sergas.es) ·  
<http://avalia-t.sergas.es>
- Reference** avalia-t2012-12, [http://www.sergas.es/docs/Avalia-t/avalia\\_t201212Mallastransvaginales.pdf](http://www.sergas.es/docs/Avalia-t/avalia_t201212Mallastransvaginales.pdf)

### Aim

To assess the safety, effectiveness and cost of using transvaginal mesh in the surgical repair of POP.

### Conclusions and results

The scientific evidence published following the release of the 2011 FDA safety communication affords no data to refute the recommendations made by this body in relation to the higher risk posed by the use of transvaginal mesh as compared to other surgical options in the treatment of POP.

The quality of the studies that assessed POP surgery in women was rated as good to fair. These studies correspond to RCTs with a good methodological design but have certain limitations, such as a short-term follow-up time.

The objective and subjective outcomes of vaginal prolapse repair improve, both with surgical treatment using transvaginal mesh and with conventional surgery without mesh, regardless of the prolapse site.

The anatomical outcomes of prolapse, measured objectively after POP repair, were better with the use of transvaginal mesh. Yet, in terms of symptomatology or quality of life reported by patients post-treatment, no differences were observed between surgery with and surgery without transvaginal mesh.

"Outcome", defined as the anatomical success of the intervention, does not necessarily coincide with the clinical success of treatment of prolapse.

Compared to conventional surgery without mesh, the use of transvaginal mesh in POP surgery has severe adverse effects, such as transvaginal mesh erosion, which often requires a new intervention (itself not free of complications) to extract the mesh.

The prolapse recurrence rate is lower after transvaginal mesh repair but seems to increase the probability of appearance of de novo prolapse in the initially unaffected and, by extension, untreated compartments.

The economic evaluation studies indicated that the use of transvaginal mesh in the treatment of pelvic organ prolapse in the anterior compartment is not cost-effective vis-à-vis repair without mesh. This is mainly due to the adverse

effects associated with the use of these types of mesh in urogynaecological surgery and the use of marketed kits which increase the cost of the procedure. There are no economic evaluation studies addressing the use of mesh in other vaginal compartments.

Currently, scientific evidence does not support the generalised use of permanent transvaginal mesh in the surgical treatment of POP.

### Recommendations

Health professionals should assess the potential risks and benefits of the different treatment options on an individualised basis until an algorithm has been defined for the management of patients with pelvic organ prolapse.

The use of permanent transvaginal mesh is not generally recommended in the treatment of pelvic organ prolapse, and its use as a preventive method in unaffected compartments is not advisable due to the fact that not enough is known about long-term effects and complications.

Vaginal prolapse repair with transvaginal mesh should only be used in patients in whom the benefit-risk balance is justified when weighed against the other alternatives.

In line with FDA guidelines, patients should be advised, not only about the risks and benefits of all treatment options, including non-surgical options, surgery without mesh, abdominal surgery with mesh, but also of the probabilities of benefit from these alternatives versus transvaginal surgery with mesh.

Prior to the intervention, patients should be informed in detail about the adverse effects associated with surgical repair using transvaginal mesh, such as vaginal mesh erosion, pain or dyspareunia, and about the elevated probability of reintervention, with the possibility of sequelae persisting even after the mesh has been extracted.

A comprehensive record should be kept of all patients treated with transvaginal mesh, on which a note is made of the outcomes of the surgical intervention -with the concept of "successful treatment" being clearly defined- complications, recurrences and total reintervention rate.

Currently, the use of transvaginal mesh as the first choice should only be implemented in the context of RCTs, since it

requires rigorous information which compares the use of synthetic transvaginal mesh to other types of tissue, with a long-term postoperative follow-up (at least 2-5 years) to assess the real results of these techniques in terms of their safety and effectiveness as a treatment for prolapse.

In view of the dearth of quality information on the results of conservative treatment, including pelvic floor exercise, change of lifestyle and mechanical/prosthetic devices (pessaries), RCTs or studies of good methodological quality should be conducted to evaluate these alternatives of POP repair as compared to the use of mesh or conventional surgery, and to the use of mesh as a first-line option.

The use of mesh for transvaginal POP repair should be considered as a second-line therapeutic alternative for those cases in which conventional surgery fails.

### **Methods**

We conducted a systematic review with a search of the scientific literature from April 2013, stipulating no time limit and covering all leading biomedical databases specialised in systematic reviews (Health Technology Assessment, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness, NHS Economic Evaluation Database, Cochrane Library Plus), as well as general databases such as Medline and Embase. The search strategy included the terms, "pelvic organ prolapse" and "transvaginal mesh", among others. Insofar as the type of study was concerned, we only selected systematic reviews, meta-analyses, clinical practice guidelines and randomised controlled trials (RCTs).

### **Written by**

Lucinda Paz-Valiñas. Galician Health Technology Assessment Agency (avalia-t). Spain.