

**Table 2. Categorical Outcomes for Comparative Studies on Graft Use in Transvaginal Pelvic Organ Prolapse Repair**

Outcome	Study, Year	Intervention Dates	Length of Follow-up (Mean Unless Specified)	Degree of Prolapse Included in Study	Graft Type/Type of Repair	Recurrent Prolapse, %	No. Followed-up/No. Recruited	No. Events	P-Value Primary/Secondary Outcome? Powered or Not	Quality (Study Design)
<b>Posterior compartment, biologic graft versus no graft</b>										
Anatomic outcomes										
Anatomic failure point Bp greater than -2 on POPQ at 12 months	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	26/31 (84%)	12/26 (46%)	.02 Primary outcome Powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/37	28/37 (76%)	4/28 (14%)		
					Site specific	5/37	27/37 (73%)	6/27 (22%)		
Anatomic failure, POPQ = Stage 2	Altman <sup>20</sup> 2004	NR	12 months (range 9.3-12.9 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Porcine dermis (Pelvicol)	0/17	17/17 (100%)	2/17 (12%)	Not powered	C (Prospective, historical controls)
					Traditional	NR	15	2/15 (13%)		
Symptom outcomes										
Defecatory dysfunction at 12 months (affirmative answer to PFDI questions 4,7,8)	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	26/31 (84%)	5/26 (19%)	.32 Secondary outcome Not Powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/37	28/37 (76%)	9/28 (32%)		
					Site specific	5/37	27/37 (73%)	10/27 (37%)		
Functional failure at 12 months (worsening of POPDI-6 and/or CRADI-8 scores)	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	26/31 (84%)	6/26 (23%)	.61 Secondary outcome Not powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/37	28/37 (76%)	5/28 (18%)		
					Site specific	5/37	27/37 (73%)	4/27 (15%)		

Online appendix to Sung VW, Rogers RG, Schaffer JI, Balk EM, Uhlig K, Lau J, et al. Graft use in transvaginal pelvic organ prolapsed repair: A systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;112:1131-42.

(Table 2 continued)

Dyspareunia outcomes										
Dyspareunia at 12 months (Response of “sometimes, usually or always” to PISQ-12 question #5)	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	16/31 (52%)	3/16 (19%)	.45 Secondary outcome Not powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/37	19/37 (51%)	9/19 (47%)		
					Site specific	5/37	21/37 (57%)	6/21 (29%)		
Dyspareunia, based on PISQ-12 specific items	Novi <sup>21</sup> 2007	NR	6 months	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Pelvicol	17/70 (Any Prior URPS)	70/70 (100%)	4/70 (6%)	.09 Secondary outcome Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Site specific	12/40	40/40 (100%)	5/40 (13%)		
Posterior compartment, absorbable synthetic graft versus no graft										
Anatomic outcomes										
Anatomic failure at or above grade 2 modified BW posterior vaginal prolapse	Sand <sup>22</sup> 2001	9/95-4/99	12 months	At or above grade 2 BW anterior vaginal prolapse	Vicryl	10/73 (Anterior recurrence)	65/73 (89%)	6/65 (9%)	.71 Secondary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Traditional	11/70	67/70 (96%)	7/67 (10%)		
Anterior compartment, biologic graft versus no graft										
Anatomic outcomes										
Anatomic failure: Ba ≥ -1	Meschia <sup>24</sup> 2007	3/03 – 6/04	1 year	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Pelvicol	0 (All primary)	98/100 (98%)	7/98 (7%)	.019 Primary outcome Powered	B (RCT)
					Traditional	0	103/106 (97%)	20/103 (19%)		
POP with BW or POPQ ≥ stage 2	Gandhi <sup>23</sup> 2005	7/99-11/02	Median 13 months	At or above grade 2 BW	Tutoplast	38/76 (Any prior URPS)	76/76 (100%)	16/76 (21%)	.229 Primary outcome Powered	B (RCT)
					Wide plication	42/78	78/78 (100%)	23/78 (30%)		
Failure: BW ≥ Grade 2	Handel <sup>26</sup> 2007	1999-2005	13.5 months (range 2-46)	Mean BW grade = 3	Pelvicol	NR	56	20/56 (36%)	NR Secondary outcome Not powered	C (Comparative w/historical controls)
					Polypropylene	NR	25	1/25 (4%)		
					Traditional	NR	18	1/18 (6%)		

(Table 2 continued)

Symptom outcomes										
Prolapse sensation	Meschia <sup>24</sup> 2007	3/03 – 6/04	1 year	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Pelvicol	0 (All primary)	98/100 (98%)	9/98 (9%)	.57 Secondary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Traditional	0	103/106 (97%)	13/103 (13%)		
Bulge Question	Gandhi <sup>23</sup> 2005	7/99-11/02	Median 13 months	At or above grade 2 BW	Tutoplast	38/76 (Any prior URPS)	67/76 (88%)	6/67 (9%)	>.2 Secondary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Wide plication	42/78	66/78 (85%)	6/66 (9%)		
Pain outcomes										
Dyspareunia	Meschia <sup>24</sup> 2007	3/03 – 6/04	1 year	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Pelvicol	0 (All primary)	47	7/47 (15%)	.12 Secondary outcome Not Powered	B (RCT)
					Traditional	0	48	5/48 (10%)		
Pelvic pain	Gandhi <sup>23</sup> 2005	7/99-11/02	Median 13 months	At or above grade 2 BW	Tutoplast	38/76 (Any prior URPS)	67/76 (88%)	5/67 (8%)	.074 Secondary outcome Not Powered	B (RCT)
					Wide plication	42/78	67/78 (86%)	13/67 (19%)		
Anterior compartment, synthetic, absorbable graft versus no graft										
Anatomic outcomes										
Anatomic failure ≥ Grade 2 modified BW anterior vaginal prolapse	Sand <sup>22</sup> 2001	9/95-4/99	12 months	At or above grade 2 BW	Vicryl mesh	10/73 (Anterior recurrence)	73/73 (100%)	18/73 (25%)	.02 Primary outcome Powered	B (RCT)
					Traditional	11/70	70/70 (100%)	30/70 (43%)		
Recurrence ≥ Stage 2	Weber <sup>27</sup> 2001	6/96 – 5/99	Median 23.3 months	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Vicryl mesh	3/26 (Any prior URPS)	26/35 (74%)	15/26 (58%)	NS Primary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Ultralateral plication	2/24	24/39 (62%)	13/24 (54%)		
					Traditional	4/33	33/35 (94%)	23/33 (70%)		

(Table 2 continued)

<b>Anterior compartment, synthetic, non-absorbable graft versus no graft</b>										
Anatomic outcomes										
Failure $\geq$ Stage 2 POPQ	Hiltunen <sup>28</sup> 2007	4/03-5/05	12 months	Anterior vaginal prolapse at or below hymen	Low weight polypropylene mesh	19/105 (Any prior URPS)	104/105 (99%)	7/104 (7%)	<.001 Primary outcome Powered	A- (RCT)
					Traditional	26/97	96/97 (99%)	37/96 (39%)		
Recurrent prolapse > Grade 0 on unique modification of BW	Julian <sup>29</sup> 1996	1/89-12/92	2 years	At or above grade 3 BW	Marlex	12/12 (Anterior recurrence)	12/12 (100%)	0/12	<.05 Primary outcome Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Traditional	12/12	12/12 (100%)	4/12 (33%)		
"Recurrence," undefined	Bai <sup>30</sup> 2007	3/99-5/05	12 months	At or above stage 3 POPQ	Anterior with Polypropylene	0/28 (All primary)	28/28 (100%)	0/28	.001 Primary outcome Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Traditional	0/72	72/72 (100%)	1/72 (1%)		
					Internal anterior repair (laparotomy)	0/38	38/38 (100%)	7/38 (18%)		
Symptom outcomes										
Persistent vaginal bulging	Hiltunen <sup>28</sup> 2007	4/03-5/05	12 months	Anterior vaginal prolapse at or below hymen	Low weight polypropylene mesh	19/105 (Any prior URPS)	102/105 (97%)	7/102 (7%)	.9 Secondary outcome Not powered	A- (RCT)
					Traditional	26/97	93/97 (96%)	5/93 (5%)		
<b>Anterior compartment, graft versus graft</b>										
Anatomic outcomes										
Failure: BW $\geq$ Grade 2	Leboeuf <sup>31</sup> 2004	10/98-10/02	15 months (range 6-48)	BW Grade 4	Four-defect anterior repair with Pelvicol	6 recurrent anterior wall total between 2 groups	19/19	3/19 (16%)	NR Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Four-defect anterior repair with Vicryl mesh		24/24	0/24		
Greater than stage 2 on POPQ	Deffieux <sup>32</sup> 2007	10/99-10/04	6 months	Grade 1-4 on BW, but mostly at or above grade 2	Anterior repair with Gynemesh	NR	89	3/89 (3%)	NR Secondary outcome Not powered	B (Retrospective cohort)
					Anterior repair with Gynemesh-soft	NR	49	4/49 (8%)		

Online appendix to Sung VW, Rogers RG, Schaffer JI, Balk EM, Uhlig K, Lau J, et al. Graft use in transvaginal pelvic organ prolapsed repair: A systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;112:1131-42.

(Table 2 continued)

Multiple compartments, multiple graft types										
Anatomic outcomes										
Recurrent prolapse greater than Grade 0 on BW	Vakili <sup>33</sup> 2005	2/97-1/04	Median= 9 months	All degrees, all compartments, multiple grafts	Graft (Multiple biologic and synthetic grafts included)	48/98 (Any prior URPS)	98	34/98 (35%)	.19 Primary outcome Not powered	C (Retrospective cohort)
					No graft	80/214	214	91/214 (43%)		
Recurrent Stage 3 prolapse	Vakili <sup>33</sup> 2005	2/97-1/04	Median= 9 months	All degrees, all compartments, multiple grafts	Graft (Multiple biologic and synthetic grafts included)	48/98 (Any prior URPS)	98	2/98 (2%)	>.99 Secondary outcome Not powered	C (Retrospective cohort)
					No graft	80/214	214	6/214 (3%)		
Further surgery for prolapse	Vakili <sup>33</sup> 2005	2/97-1/04	Median= 9 months	All degrees, all compartments, multiple grafts	Graft (Multiple biologic and synthetic grafts included)	48/98 (Any prior URPS)	98	8/98 (8%)	>.73 Secondary outcome Not powered	C (Retrospective cohort)
					No graft	80/214	214	20/214 (9%)		

References cited in the table are found at the end of the article.

POPQ, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification; URPS, urogynecologic reconstructive pelvic surgery; A, good; RCT, randomized controlled trial; NR, not reported; C, poor; PFDI, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory; POPDI-6, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory-6; CRADI-8, Colorectal–Anal Distress Inventory 8 ; PISQ-12, Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Urinary Incontinence Sexual Questionnaire-12; BW, Baden–Walker; B, fair.

**Table 3. Continuous Outcomes for Comparative Studies on Graft Use in Transvaginal Pelvic Organ Prolapse Repair**

Outcome	Study, Year	Intervention Years	Length of Follow-up (Mean Unless Specified)	Type (Degree) of Prolapse	Graft Type/Type of Repair	Recurrent Prolapse, %	No. Analyzed	Baseline Value, Mean (SD)	Baseline Value, Mean (SD)	Final Value (Between Group P-Value) (1 <sup>o</sup> ?, Powered?)	Quality
<b>Posterior compartment, biologic graft versus no graft</b>											
Symptom outcomes											
PFDI-20 overall score at 12 months	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	24	116.0 (55)	34.0 (37)	.28 Secondary outcome Not powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/27	28	114.0 (56)	39.0 (30)		
					Site specific	5/13	29	146.0 (66)	46.0 (53)		
PFIQ-7 at 12 months	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	24	63.0 (64)	10.0 (23)	.65 Secondary outcome Not powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/27	28	65.0 (69)	10.0 (18)		
					Site specific	5/13	29	87.0 (66)	22.0 (38)		
Sexual function outcomes											
PISQ-12 score at 12 months	Paraiso <sup>19</sup> 2006	6/02-12/04	17.5 months (range 4.4-33.7 mos)	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Fortagen	9/31 (Any Prior URPS)	16	33.0 (8)	37.0 (5)	.24 Secondary outcome Not powered	A (RCT)
					Traditional	10/27	19	29.0 (8)	36.0 (5)		
					Site specific	5/13	21	31.0 (8)	36.0 (7)		
PISQ-12 score at 6 months	Novi <sup>21</sup> 2007	NR	6 months	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Pelvicol	17/70 (Any Prior URPS)	70	81.4 (7.3)	101.3 (6.4)	.01 Primary, powered for WITHIN group differences	C (Prospective cohort)
					Site specific	12/40	40	83.6 (8.2)	89.7 (7.1)		
<b>Anterior compartment, biologic graft versus no graft</b>											
Anatomic outcomes											
Mean Ba at 24 months	Chaliha <sup>25</sup> 2006	2001-2003	24 months	NR (“No difference between groups,” per authors)	SIS	2/14 (Anterior recurrence)	14	1.64 (NR)	-1.07 (NR)	.83 No primary outcome described Not powered	C (Retrospective cohort)
					Traditional	2/14	14	2.25 (NR)	-.61 (NR)		

Online appendix to Sung VW, Rogers RG, Schaffer JI, Balk EM, Uhlig K, Lau J, et al. Graft use in transvaginal pelvic organ prolapsed repair: A systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;112:1131–42.

(Table 3 continued)

Symptom outcomes											
Prolapse impact mean score, P-QOL at 24 months	Chaliha <sup>25</sup> 2006	2001-2003	24 months	NR (“No difference between groups,” per authors)	SIS	2/14 (Anterior recurrence)	14	81.0 (NR)	14.0 (NR)	.13 No primary outcome described Not powered	C (Retrospective cohort)
					Traditional	2/14	14	62.0 (NR)	14.0 (NR)		
Anterior compartment, synthetic absorbable graft versus no graft											
Symptom outcomes											
Severity of POP symptoms, VAS	Weber <sup>27</sup> 2001	6/96 – 5/99	Median 23.3 months	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Vicryl mesh	3/26 (Any prior URPS)	26		Mean change 5.7 (2.8) points	Secondary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Ultralateral plication	2/24	24				
					Traditional	4/33	33				
Severity of sexual symptoms, VAS	Weber <sup>27</sup> 2001	6/96 – 5/99	Median 23.3 months	At or above stage 2 POPQ	Vicryl mesh	3/26 (Any prior URPS)	26		Mean change 2.4 (3.9) points	Secondary outcome Not powered	B (RCT)
					Ultralateral plication	2/24	24				
					Traditional	4/33	33				
Anterior compartment, synthetic non-absorbable graft versus no graft											
Anatomic outcomes											
Mean Ba on POPQ	Hiltunen <sup>28</sup> 2007	4/03-5/05	12 months	Anterior vaginal prolapse at or below hymen	Low weight polypropylene mesh	19/105 (Any prior URPS)	104	2.1(1.8)	-2.4 (0.8)	<.001 Postoperative between group Mean Ba No primary outcome described Not powered	A- (RCT)
					Traditional	26/97	96	2.3 (1.7)	-1.6 (1.5)		
Mean Ba on POPQ	Bai <sup>30</sup> 2007	3/99-5/05	12 months	At or above stage 3 POPQ	Anterior with polypropylene	0/28 (all primary)	28	3.8 (1.2)	-2.6 (.3)	NR Secondary outcome Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Traditional	0/72	72	3.3 (1.8)	-2.4 (0.4)		
					Internal anterior repair (laparotomy)	0/38	38	3.8 (2.0)	-2.0 (.5)		

(Table 3 continued)

Anterior compartment, graft versus graft											
Symptom outcomes											
Mean SEAPI score	Leboeuf <sup>31</sup> 2004	10/98-10/02	15 months (range 6-48)	BW Grade 4	Four-defect anterior repair with Pelvicol	6 recurrent anterior wall total between 2 groups	14	9.0 (NR)	1.2 (NR)	NR No primary outcome Not powered	C (Prospective cohort)
					Four-defect anterior repair with Vicryl mesh		10	6.7 (NR)	1.5 (NR)		

References cited in the table are found at the end of the article.

SD, standard deviation; PFDI-20, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20; POPQ, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification; URPS, urogynecologic reconstructive pelvic surgery; A, good; RCT, randomized controlled trial; PFIQ-7, Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire-7; PISQ-12, Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Urinary Incontinence Sexual Questionnaire-12; NR, not reported; C, poor; SIS, small intestine submucosa; QOL, quality of life; POP, pelvic organ prolapse; VAS, visual analogue score; B, fair; SEAPI, Stress, Emptying, Anatomic, Protection, and Instability Questionnaire; BW, Baden-Walker.



**Table 4: Adverse Events Tables for Graft Use in Transvaginal Pelvic Organ Prolapse Repair\***

Graft type	Anterior compartment	Posterior compartment	Apical	Multiple
<b>Visceral injury</b>				
<b>Ureteric injury</b>				
Biologic	3% (2) <sup>52, 70</sup>	3% (1) <sup>19</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable			2% (1) <sup>48</sup>	
Trocar-placed grafts				0% (1) <sup>60</sup>
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>67</sup>	
<b>Bladder injury</b>				
Biologic	0% (1) <sup>31</sup>	0% (1) <sup>19</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable	0% (1) <sup>69</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	1-5% (2) <sup>28, 68</sup>			0-2% (4) <sup>39, 51, 56, 73</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts	2% (1) <sup>34</sup>	0% (1) <sup>34</sup>		1-4% (2) <sup>34, 60</sup>
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>38</sup>	
<b>Urethral injury</b>				
Biologic				
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable				
Trocar-placed grafts	1% (1) <sup>34</sup>	0% (1) <sup>34</sup>		0% (1) <sup>34</sup>
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>67</sup>	
<b>Rectal injury</b>				
Biologic				
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable			1-3% (3) <sup>40, 46, 64</sup>	0-2% (4) <sup>39, 49, 51, 56</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts	0% (1) <sup>34</sup>	4% (1) <sup>34</sup>		0% (2) <sup>34, 60</sup>
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>38</sup>	
<b>Bleeding/Hematoma/Blood transfusion</b>				
Biologic	3% (2) <sup>24, 52</sup>	3-15% (2) <sup>19, 20</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable	0% (2) <sup>27, 69</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	0-8% (5) <sup>35, 42, 45, 47, 68</sup>	2% (1) <sup>72</sup>	2-3% (2) <sup>43, 46</sup>	0.4-2% (5) <sup>39, 49, 51, 59, 73</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts	4% (1) <sup>34</sup>	1% (1) <sup>34</sup>		2-6% (2) <sup>34, 60</sup>
Mixed			2-5% (2) <sup>38, 67</sup>	

Online appendix to Sung VW, Rogers RG, Schaffer JI, Balk EM, Uhlig K, Lau J, et al. Graft use in transvaginal pelvic organ prolapsed repair: A systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;112:1131-42.

(Table 4 continued)

<b>Infection</b>				
<b>Urinary tract infection</b>				
Biologic	3-17% (2) <sup>52, 65</sup>	9-19% (2) <sup>19, 20</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable	5-26% (7) <sup>28, 30, 35, 44, 61, 68, 71</sup>		5-9% (2) <sup>40, 46</sup>	1-3% (1) <sup>51</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts	6% (1) <sup>34</sup>	4% (1) <sup>34</sup>		12-14% (2) <sup>34, 60</sup>
Mixed				
<b>Wound</b>				
Biologic	0% (1) <sup>23</sup>	10% (1) <sup>19</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable	1-4% (4) <sup>28, 30, 61, 68</sup>	3% (1) <sup>44</sup>	1% (2) <sup>43, 46</sup>	
Trocar-placed grafts	0% (1) <sup>34</sup>	1% (1) <sup>34</sup>		0% (1) <sup>34</sup>
Mixed				2-18% (2) <sup>33, 49</sup>
<b>Erosion</b>				
Biologic	0-14% (5) <sup>23, 24, 31, 52, 70</sup>	0-4% (2) <sup>19, 66</sup>		11-21% (2) <sup>26, 58</sup>
Synthetic absorbable	0-4% (2) <sup>27, 69</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	0-25% (12) <sup>28-30, 32, 35, 42, 44, 45, 53, 61, 68, 71</sup>	7-29% (2) <sup>44, 72</sup>	2-21% (7) <sup>36, 37, 40, 43, 46, 48, 62</sup>	0-17% (9) <sup>39, 49-51, 54-56, 59, 73</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				3-5% (2) <sup>60, 63</sup>
Mixed				26% (1) <sup>33</sup>
<b>Fistula (vesicovaginal, urethrovaginal, rectovaginal)</b>				
Biologic	0% (1) <sup>31</sup>			
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable				0.4-1% (3) <sup>31, 54, 56</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>38</sup>	
<b>Wound healing (granulation tissue)</b>				
Biologic	3-9% (2) <sup>41, 52</sup>	3-11% (2) <sup>20, 66</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable				
Trocar-placed grafts				3-8% (2) <sup>60, 63</sup>
Mixed				39% (1) <sup>33</sup>
<b>Dyspareunia</b>				
Biologic	1-3% (2) <sup>41, 65</sup>	4-10% (2) <sup>20, 66</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable	2-36% (8) <sup>29, 32, 42, 44, 45, 53, 61, 71</sup>	27-61% (2) <sup>44, 72</sup>	0-5% (2) <sup>36, 64</sup>	0-13% (4) <sup>39, 49, 59, 73</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				13% (1) <sup>60</sup>
Mixed			1% (1) <sup>38</sup>	

Online appendix to Sung VW, Rogers RG, Schaffer JI, Balk EM, Uhlig K, Lau J, et al. Graft use in transvaginal pelvic organ prolapsed repair: A systematic review. *Obstet Gynecol* 2008;112:1131-42.

(Table 4 continued)

<b>Urinary functional events</b>				
<b>Voiding dysfunction</b>				
Biologic	1% (2) <sup>41, 65</sup>			
Synthetic absorbable	0% (1) <sup>69</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	0-12% (5) <sup>28, 30, 45, 53, 61</sup>		12% (1) <sup>64</sup>	1% (1) <sup>55</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				7% (1) <sup>60</sup>
Mixed			2% (1) <sup>38</sup>	
<b>OAB/Urge incontinence</b>				
Biologic	6-28% (6) <sup>24, 25, 31, 41, 65, 70</sup>			
Synthetic absorbable	7%-75% (3) <sup>27, 31, 69</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	3-18% (4) <sup>30, 35, 45, 47</sup>		2-9% (1) <sup>36</sup>	3-16% (3) <sup>51, 55, 59</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				
Mixed				
<b>Stress incontinence</b>				
Biologic	8-11% (4) <sup>24, 25, 31, 70</sup>			
Synthetic absorbable	1-8% (2) <sup>27, 31</sup>			
Synthetic non-absorbable	0-22% (5) <sup>28, 42, 47, 61, 68</sup>			
Trocar-placed grafts				9% (1) <sup>60</sup>
Mixed			9% (1) <sup>38</sup>	
<b>Bowel functional events</b>				
<b>Defecatory dysfunction</b>				
Biologic				
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable		10% (1) <sup>72</sup>		1% (1) <sup>59</sup>
Trocar-placed grafts				
Mixed				
<b>Anal incontinence</b>				
Biologic		1% (1) <sup>66</sup>		
Synthetic absorbable				
Synthetic non-absorbable				
Trocar-placed grafts				
Mixed				

References cited in the table are found at the end of the article.

\*Number of studies providing data for adverse events is given in parentheses.

OAB, overactive bladder.