

# Infracoccygeal sacropexy using mesh for vaginal vault prolapse repair

This document replaces previous guidance on posterior infracoccygeal sacropexy for vaginal vault prolapse (Interventional Procedure Guidance 125).

## 1 Guidance

- 1.1 Current evidence on the efficacy and safety of infracoccygeal sacropexy using mesh for vaginal vault prolapse repair is inadequate in quantity and quality. Therefore this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent and audit or research.
- 1.2 Clinicians wishing to undertake infracoccygeal sacropexy using mesh for vaginal vault prolapse repair should take the following actions:
  - Inform the clinical governance leads in their Trusts.
  - Ensure that patients understand the uncertainty about the procedure's safety, including mesh erosion (for example, into the vagina) and the risk of recurrence, and provide them with clear written information. In addition, use of NICE's information for patients ('Understanding NICE guidance') is recommended (available from [www.nice.org.uk/IPG281publicinfo](http://www.nice.org.uk/IPG281publicinfo)).
- 1.3 The procedure should only be carried out by surgeons specialising in the management of pelvic organ prolapse and female urinary incontinence.
- 1.4 The British Society for Urogynaecology runs a database on urogynaecological procedures, and clinicians should enter details about all patients undergoing this procedure onto this database ([www.bsug.net](http://www.bsug.net)).
- 1.5 NICE encourages further research into infracoccygeal sacropexy using mesh for vaginal vault prolapse repair, and may review the procedure on publication of further evidence on

different types of mesh. Clinicians are encouraged to collect long-term data on clinical outcomes and patient-reported quality-of-life outcomes using validated scales.

## 2 The procedure

### 2.1 Indications and current treatments

- 2.1.1 Vaginal vault prolapse can occur in women who have had a hysterectomy. The uppermost part of the vagina descends from its normal position, sometimes out through the vaginal opening. It can affect quality of life by causing symptoms of pressure and discomfort, and by its effect on urinary, bowel and sexual function.
- 2.1.2 Current treatment options include pelvic floor muscle training, use of pessaries and surgery. Several surgical procedures can be used, including hysterectomy, mesh sacrocolpopexy, uterine suspension sling (including sacrohysteropexy) and uterine/vault suspension (without sling). Some of these procedures involve the use of mesh, with the aim of providing additional support.

### 2.2 Outline of the procedure

- 2.2.1 The procedure is performed with the patient under general anaesthesia. An incision is made in the posterior wall of the vagina and a small puncture incision is made in each buttock. A tape (mesh) is introduced through one buttock and, using a tunnelling device (guided by a finger through the vaginal incision), the tape is passed around the rectum. The tape is then passed up the side of the vagina, across the top, and down

## Interventional procedure guidance 281

Interventional procedures guidance makes recommendations on the safety and efficacy of a procedure. The guidance does not cover whether or not the NHS should fund a procedure. Decisions about funding are taken by local NHS bodies (primary care trusts and hospital trusts) after considering the clinical effectiveness of the procedure and whether it represents value for money for the NHS.

Interventional procedures guidance is for healthcare professionals and people using the NHS in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. This guidance is endorsed by NHS QIS for implementation by NHSScotland.

the other side, and out through the incision in the other buttock. The tape is sutured to the top of the vagina to act as a tension-free sling that aims to suspend the vaginal vault.

- 2.2.2 This procedure can be combined with a hysterectomy or surgery for stress urinary incontinence, such as a suburethral sling placement.
- 2.2.3 Several different types of synthetic and biological mesh are available, which vary in structure and in their physical properties such as absorbability.

Sections 2.3 and 2.4 describe efficacy and safety outcomes from the published literature that the Committee considered as part of the evidence about this procedure. For more detailed information on the evidence, see the systematic review, available at [www.nice.org.uk/ip268review](http://www.nice.org.uk/ip268review)

### 2.3 Efficacy

- 2.3.1 A case series of 93 women treated by infracoccygeal sacropexy reported subjective failure in 9% (8/91) of women (mean follow-up 12 months, 2 women lost to follow-up).
- 2.3.2 A case series of 75 women reported objective failure within 24 months in 10% (4/40) of women (35 patients lost to follow-up). A case series of 20 women reported no objective failure (0/20) at a mean follow-up of 16 months.
- 2.3.3 Case series of 93 and 75 women reported that 2% (2/91) and 30% (12/40) of women, respectively, had further surgery for vault prolapse with a mean follow-up of 12 months, and between 1 and 4.5 years, respectively.
- 2.3.4 The Specialist Advisers considered key efficacy outcomes to include success rates, as measured by the pelvic organ prolapse quantification system (POPQ), and outcomes including resolution of prolapse symptoms and urinary, bowel and sexual function. Three Advisers noted a need for long-term efficacy outcomes.

### 2.4 Safety

- 2.4.1 Rectal perforation was reported in 1% (1/93) and 3% (2/75) of patients in the case series of 93 and 75 women, respectively (subsequent management and follow-up not stated).
- 2.4.2 Mesh erosion was reported in 7% (2/30) of women treated by infracoccygeal sacropexy in a randomised controlled trial of 60 women (conference abstract only) at a mean follow-up of 24 months. Four case series of 93, 75, 52 and 15 women reported mesh erosion in 6% (6/93), 5% (4/75), 21% (11/52) and 7% (1/15) of women, respectively, at mean follow-up periods of between 20 weeks and 12 months.
- 2.4.3 Infection was reported in 5% (5/93) and 1% (1/75) of women (urinary tract infection and unspecified infection, respectively) within 1 week of surgery in the case series of 93 and 75 women, respectively.
- 2.4.4 The Specialist Advisers considered theoretical adverse events to include rectal injury, infection/sepsis, mesh erosion or rejection, dyspareunia and functional disturbance of the bowel or bladder. One Adviser commented that the development of new types of mesh means that current mesh-related complication rates may be lower than those available in the evidence.

## 3 Further information

- 3.1 NICE has published interventional procedures guidance on a number of procedures for uterine prolapse repair and vaginal vault prolapse repair. For more information go to [www.nice.org.uk](http://www.nice.org.uk)

### Information for patients

NICE has produced information on this procedure for patients and carers ('Understanding NICE guidance'). It explains the nature of the procedure and the guidance issued by NICE, and has been written with patient consent in mind. See [www.nice.org.uk/IPG281publicinfo](http://www.nice.org.uk/IPG281publicinfo)

### Ordering printed copies

Contact NICE publications (phone 0845 003 7783 or email [publications@nice.org.uk](mailto:publications@nice.org.uk)) and quote reference number N1771 for this guidance or N1772 for the 'Understanding NICE guidance'.

This guidance represents the view of NICE, which was arrived at after careful consideration of the available evidence. Healthcare professionals are expected to take it fully into account when exercising their clinical judgement. This guidance does not, however, override the individual responsibility of healthcare professionals to make appropriate decisions in the circumstances of the individual patient, in consultation with the patient and/or guardian or carer.

Implementation of this guidance is the responsibility of local commissioners and/or providers. Commissioners and providers are reminded that it is their responsibility to implement the guidance, in their local context, in light of their duties to avoid unlawful discrimination and to have regard to promoting equality of opportunity. Nothing in this guidance should be interpreted in a way which would be inconsistent with compliance with those duties.

© National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2009. All rights reserved. This material may be freely reproduced for educational and not-for-profit purposes. No reproduction by or for commercial organisations, or for commercial purposes, is allowed without the express written permission of NICE.