Pelvic organ prolapse (POP) is common. Up to 50% of parous women have some degree of genital prolapse, although only 10–20% are symptomatic. The lifetime risk of surgery for prolapse is 11% and almost one-third require reoperation.

Anterior vaginal prolapse is present in up to 33% of post-menopausal women. Anterior colporrhaphy has been the standard surgical treatment for anterior vaginal prolapse. However, it is associated with a 40% recurrence rate, and up to 32% even after using concomitant paravaginal repair with anterior colporrhaphy. It can also result in additional vaginal shortening or constriction.

An attempt has been made to resolve the problem of recurrence by means of an artificial mesh. The rationale for graft use can be supported by data on incisional hernia repair. Studies have reported low recurrence rates with mesh as compared with traditional colporrhaphy (6.7% vs. 38.5%). Type I, macroporous, polypropylene soft mesh is the ideal choice. There are different techniques of mesh insertion using either a self-designed mesh or commercially available standard kits for mesh repair. Although sufficient studies of the techniques for mesh placement in anterior colporrhaphy are available, definite recommendations are lacking.

Mesh-related complications include infection, sinus tract formation, erosion, bleeding and discharge, pain and dyspareunia. The lack of comparative data and the anticipated high incidence of graft-related complications have led to a debate among surgeons regarding the appropriateness of graft use. Regulatory bodies such as the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have revised and updated the guidelines of mesh use.

The aim of the study was to compare the mesh with traditional anterior colporrhaphy in terms of efficacy, complications, satisfaction and acceptability.

**Methods**

Patients were randomised into two groups: traditional anterior colporrhaphy (group A) and mesh repair of anterior vaginal prolapse (group B). Randomisation was performed using a computer-generated random number table. The number of patients was calculated by power analysis. Type 1 error was assumed to be 5% and power as 80%, with the anticipated recurrence with the traditional method taken as 25% and that with mesh repair 4%. The total number of patients required was therefore calculated to be 106, taking into account patients who would be lost to follow-up.

Patients with symptomatic anterior vaginal prolapse to the hymen or beyond were included in the trial. The exclusion criteria included concomitant stress urinary incontinence, dominant symptomatic posterior vaginal prolapse, active vaginal infections and presence of any gynaecological malignancy. The study was approved by the institutional ethical committee.

The study protocol was explained to patients and informed consent was obtained from all. A detailed urogynaecological and medical history was taken from all patients including data on bowel, urinary and coital symptoms. All patients underwent a comprehensive physical and urogenital examination in the supine position, with and without straining. The prolapse was graded using the standard pelvic organ prolapse quantification (POPQ) system. Points Aa, Ba and tVL were noted in all patients in preoperative assessment.
Acriflavine-glycerine packing was used if required for 1 week prior to surgery. All patients received preoperative intravenous antibiotics (1 g cefotaxime, 500 mg metronidazole). Additional procedures, including vaginal hysterectomy, McCall’s culdoplasty, sacrospinous colpopexy and sacropinous cervicopexy, were carried out wherever appropriate. Regional anaesthesia was used for the procedure.

In group A, traditional anterior colporrhaphy was performed. A sagittal anterior vaginal wall incision was made extending from the urethrovaginal junction to the vaginal apex. The mucosa was separated from the underlying fibromuscular layer and dissected up to the lateral sulcus. Midline plication of the fibromuscular layer was done with buttressing 2-0 absorbable vicryl suture. The vaginal wall was closed with interrupted 2-0 vicryl mattress sutures.

In group B, anterior colporrhaphy was done using a tailored non-absorbable, low-weight, monofilament, macroporous, vicryl-polypropylene mesh (VYPRO mesh, Johnson & Johnson Inc.) (Fig. 1). Four arms were made from a 6 x 11 cm mesh patch. The anterior border of the mesh was slightly curved to avoid covering the urethrovaginal junction. After separating the fibromuscular layer from the mucosa of the anterior vaginal wall, four tunnels were made by sharp and blunt dissection so that the arms of the mesh could be fixed anteriorly and posteriorly. Mesh was attached to the underlying bladder fascia with interrupted 2-0 vicryl sutures. The vagina was closed as for group A.

All patients received intravenous antibiotics for 48 hours postoperatively (1 g cefotaxime, 500 mg metronidazole). The vaginal pack was removed after 24 hours and the catheter after 24 - 72 hours. All patients were discharged within 72 hours.

Objective measurements were used to rate the efficacy of the procedure. Cure was defined as optimal (when both points Aa and Ba were at stage 0 (-3 cm)) or satisfactory (when both points Aa and Ba were at stage 1 (-2 cm) and improved from preoperative staging). Outcome was unsatisfactory (failure) when either point Aa or Ba was at stage II or worse (-1 cm or lower) or unchanged or worse than preoperative staging. Intraoperative and postoperative complications were noted in the two groups.

The patients were followed up at 4 weeks, 6 months and 1 year. The primary endpoint was recurrence of anterior wall vaginal prolapse reaching stage II POPQ or more. Secondary endpoints noted were complications including bleeding, discharge, mesh erosion, infection, sinus formation, etc. Improvement in urinary and bowel symptoms was analysed. Patient satisfaction with and acceptance of the procedure were also assessed by means of a previously validated local questionnaire.

The data were analysed using SPSS version 16.0 (SPSS, USA). Univariate analysis was conducted with Fisher’s exact test for categorical variables and the Mann Whitney U-test for continuous variables. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare the POPQ measurements before and after the procedure. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**Results**

One hundred and six women were enrolled and followed up in the study between May 2009 and May 2012; 54 were in group A (traditional anterior colporrhaphy) and 52 in group B (repair with mesh) (Fig. 2). The baseline characteristics were comparable in the two groups (Table 1).

In group A, 52 (96%), 44 (81%) and 41 (76%) patients out of 54 came for follow-up at 4 weeks, 6 months and 1 year, respectively. One patient had vault prolapse at 3 months and was excluded while the rest were lost to follow-up. In group B, 51 (98%), 48 (92%) and 44 (84%) patients out of 52 were followed up at 4 weeks, 6 months

![Fig. 1. Self-tailored mesh, with a centre and four arms.](image1)

![Fig. 2. Flow diagram, including total sample size, randomisation, follow-up and analysis.](image2)
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was optimal in 65% and satisfactory in 35%. There was no significant difference in the outcomes between the two groups (p=0.4). There was no procedure failure in both the groups (excluding the vault prolapse). The mean (standard deviation (SD)) duration of surgery was significantly greater in the mesh group, 0.8 (0.27) hours v. 0.4 (0.1) hours (p=0.02). Mean (SD) blood loss was 398 (129) ml in the mesh group, which was significantly more than that in group A, 188 (97) ml (p=0.015). In group A, blood
transfusion was given to 12 patients, 4
had postoperative fever and 1 patient had
urinary tract infection. In the mesh group,
blood transfusion was given to 19 patients,
2 had an anterior wall haematoma and 1
had overflow incontinence. One patient
with vaginal haematoma had mesh erosion
through the vaginal wall after 3 weeks and
was excluded.
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Table 1. Baseline characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A (N=54)</th>
<th>Group B (N=52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years), mean (SD)</td>
<td>51.5 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity, median (range)</td>
<td>4 (2 – 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous LSCS, n</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmenopausal, n (%)</td>
<td>40 (74.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of prolapse (years), median (range)</td>
<td>4 (3 – 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical high risk, n (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>10 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior hysterectomy, n (%)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative measurements and staging, median (cm),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tVL</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPQ stage IIBa</td>
<td>IIBa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin (g/dl), mean (SD)</td>
<td>9.6 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concomitant vaginal hysterectomy, n (%)</td>
<td>53 (98.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrospinous fixation, n (%)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrohysteropexy, n (%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Follow-up in the two groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements (cm), median (cm)</th>
<th>4 weeks</th>
<th>6 months</th>
<th>1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>Group B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tVL</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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kits. Also, most of the studies available
showed reduced objective recurrence rates
of anterior vaginal prolapse with mesh,
but the rate of serious complications was
high. The available evidence was sparse
for definitive conclusions. This study
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used a combination of a vicryl polyprolene
mesh, with the hypothesis that the vicryl
absorption would enhance the pore size,
facilitating take-up and tissue in growth
and minimising complications. The use of
VYPRO mesh has been evaluated in surgery
other than prolapse and the reported
erosion rate is 5 - 15%. Also, most literature
is from developed nations, and very few
randomised controlled trials have been
reported from the developing world.
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times has concluded that mesh placement
using trocar-based mesh kits or self-
designed mesh placement is superior, in
terms of reduced recurrence. In contrast,
the present study did not show any
significant improvement in the anatomical
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although follow-up was limited to 1 year.
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Most of the available literature in recent
times has concluded that mesh placement
using trocar-based mesh kits or self-
designed mesh placement is superior, in
terms of reduced recurrence. In contrast,
the present study did not show any
significant improvement in the anatomical
cure rates or reduction in recurrence with
the use of mesh in anterior colporrhaphy
in comparison with traditional colporrhaphy,
although follow-up was limited to 1 year.
The use of mesh was associated with signifi-
cantly increased intraoperative haemorrh-
hage and operating time, which is similar to
reports in other studies. Reintervention
for mesh exposure was 5% in the current
study, which is similar to 3 - 5% as seen in other studies.\[8,10,12\] There was no new stress urinary incontinence in either of the groups, as is reported by others.\[10,12\]

Although standard questionnaires for urinary and sexual functions were not used, a questionnaire validated in the unit showed no significant difference in the satisfaction with and acceptability of the two procedures. Recently the FDA has issued instructions to healthcare providers that in most cases, POP can be treated successfully without mesh, thus avoiding the risk of mesh-related complications.\[13\] Also, mesh should be chosen only after weighing the costs and benefits of surgery. Newer complications in association with transvaginal POP repair with mesh, such as mesh contraction, causing vaginal shortening, tightening and/or vaginal pain, are being increasingly reported in the literature.\[13\]

**Study limitations**

The limitations of this study were the small number of patients and the large percentage lost to follow-up. Follow-up was limited to 1 year. The study did not compare the functional outcomes in the two groups, and the questionnaire used to assess satisfaction was validated within the unit. Many procedures were accompanied by other procedures, including McCall’s culdoplasty and others.

**Conclusion**

The effectiveness of use of mesh needs to be validated further, especially for developing countries where use of mesh increases the cost burden to patients and hospitals. More randomised controlled trials are needed to validate routine use of mesh.
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