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Background What is the impact of co-existent faecal and urinary incontinence?

Objectives Urinary incontinence (UI) can occur concurrently with chronic constipation (CC) with or without faecal incontinence (FI) in children. The understanding of the pathophysiology of these patients and the impact of their wellbeing remains scarce.

Methods Prospective data of 283 children attending to our service were analysed, including demographics, bowel assessments: St Mark’s Incontinence Score (SMIS) and Cleveland Constipation Score (CCS), risk of distress (PI-ED), QoL (PedsQL 4.0). The use of the Wong Baker Smile faces (scale of 0–10 [10 most severe] assessed patient perspective on symptom severity. High resolution anorectal manometry (HRAM) and transit marker studies (TMS) were performed to assess pathophysiology. Data of all children were both analysed with χ2 test and Pearson’s r, both at significance levels of 0.05. Percentages not included (n = 97).

Results In total, 97 (34.0%) patients with symptoms of CC/FI and UI were identified (46 boys; median: 8 years; range, 2–17 years). Patients presented with organic pathologies (16): Hirschsprung disease (7); anorectal malformations (8) and spinal injury (1) and 81 (83.5%) with functional CC/FI. HRAM demonstrated abnormal physiology in 44/95 (46.3%). TMS was abnormal in 39/90 (43.3%): slow transit in 14 (14.4%), rectal evacuatory disorder in 25 (26%). Symptom severity was a median of 6; (range 0–10). Abnormal SMIS scores in 78/95 (82.1%) and 91/95 (95.8%) CCS scores were found. Poor QoL was demonstrated in 51 patients (52.6%) and patients were at risk of distress in 32 (33.0%). There were no significant differences found between patients with and without UI regarding assessments, physiology and symptom severity (table 1). However, patients with both demonstrated significantly higher means on the SMIC (p<0.05) compared to patients with GI only.

Conclusions

- The addition of urological symptoms does not appear to adversely affect HRAM, TMS, PI-ED
- Either the consequences of GI symptoms are so severe that the addition of UI symptoms does not resolve in worse outcomes, or we have underestimated the urological symptoms.

We look forward to adding questionnaires and including urologist in the multi-disciplinary team.
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