JIMGS
Journal for International Medical Graduates
Volume 2 (02) September 21st, 2023
Editorial

The Role of Artificial Urinary Sphincter in Female Incontinence in 2023: A Literature Update

Yonas Tamene, MSN, MD, Lydia Tesfaye, MD, Suraj Subedi, MBBS, Jeffrey Jacob, MD, Viven Edi, MSc, MD
Journal for International Medical Graduates

Abstract:

This in-depth analysis of the literature provides a 2023 update on the crucial function of artificial urinary sphincters (AUS) in the treatment of female incontinence. This review illustrates the tremendous advancements in AUS technology, particularly the introduction of flexible cuff pressure and occlusive cuff techniques, which have considerably improved treatment outcomes and patient satisfaction. It draws on the most recent research from the last ten years.

The AMS 800 AUS has established itself as the gold standard for treating male incontinence, but research into how to adapt it for female patients is still ongoing. Robotic assisted insertion and other minimally invasive procedures have the potential to improve safety and effectiveness. This review emphasizes the growing significance of AUS in the management of female incontinence and provides solid justification for its effectiveness, patient advantages, and economic viability. Further improving patient outcomes and quality of life, it also points to interesting directions for future study, including novel materials, device designs, minimally invasive surgeries, and bioengineered substitutes.

Keywords: Artificial urinary sphincter, Female, Urinary incontinence, Urinary tract reconstruction, Refractory urinary incontinence, Urinary Stress Incontinence, Female Incontinence

Objective: The purpose of this review is to evaluate the effectiveness, rates of success, long-term survival, comparative benefits, contraindications, and potential risks associated with the use of artificial urinary sphincters (AUS).

Methods: A thorough examination of scholarly literature was conducted utilizing the resources of PubMed, Embase, and Google Scholar. The search queries entered through the search engine encompassed topics such as "female incontinence," "artificial urinary sphincter," "surgical therapy," and "2023." This review primarily focuses on the studies published within the period from January 2018 to June 2023. Several publications were selected based on their potential to provide insights into the role of the artificial urinary sphincter (AUS) in the management of female urine incontinence.

Results:

This comprehensive literature review on artificial urinary sphincters (AUS) for female incontinence shows significant technical advances, particularly in the past decade, with developments like adaptable cuff pressure and occlusive cuff processes improving the results of treatment and patient satisfaction. While AUS is the gold standard for male stress urine incontinence, its efficacy in treating women depends on patient characteristics and surgical techniques, requiring careful patient selection. Despite good results, revision procedures are needed due to patient age, past surgeries, perioperative problems, and pelvic irradiation. Modern surgery like laparoscopic surgery reduces erosion, infection, and mechanical failure. AUS implantation may have greater initial expenditures, but it may save money in the long run by reducing incontinence-related healthcare use. Despite declining long-term continence, patient satisfaction remains high. Developing new materials, device designs, less invasive methods, bioengineered alternatives, and patient selection criteria are AUS research goals. Female incontinence treatment innovation and results depend on collaboration between researchers, doctors, and industry partners. AUS is a promising and successful treatment for female incontinence, with continuous research and technology advances positioned to improve its usability and life quality for afflicted women.

Conclusion: In summary, artificial urinary sphincter implantation is a viable treatment for female incontinence, with continuous research and technology advances predicted to improve its efficacy and patient advantages. Women with urinary incontinence might benefit greatly from AUS.

Introduction:

Worldwide, a sizable percentage of women deal with urinary incontinence. A woman's social confidence, sense of self-worth, and ability to participate in daily activities can all take a serious hit as a result [1]. Artificial urinary sphincters (AUS) have recently gained attention as a possible method of treating female incontinence. Focusing on developments and studies in the previous decade, this article tries to offer a literature update on the part AUS plays in female incontinence. [2]

There are a number of therapy options available to help women who struggle with incontinence, but artificial urinary sphincters (AUS) stand out as a particularly effective one. Implantable artificial urinary sphincters help restore urinary continence by stabilizing the urethra mechanically and regulating urination. This cutting-edge innovation has changed the way women with incontinence are treated, giving them new reasons to live. [3]

This article aims to give a thorough literature analysis on the use of artificial urinary sphincters for the treatment of female incontinence, drawing from research published over the past decade. Through a review of the available data, we hope to learn more about AUS's efficacy, statistical success rate, and long-term survival rate, comparative advantages over other treatment methods, contraindications, and potential failure causes. Clinical decision-making and the improvement of patient outcomes and quality of life will both benefit from the knowledge provided by this review.

Literature Review:

Advancements in Artificial Urinary Sphincter Technology
Over the past decade, significant advancements have been made in artificial urinary sphincter technology, enhancing its effectiveness and safety. Improved designs, such as the adjustable cuff pressure and occlusive cuff mechanisms, have provided better outcomes in the management of female incontinence. Studies by Smith et al. (2018) demonstrated the positive impact of these advancements in reducing incontinence episodes and improving patient satisfaction rates. [4]

According to the research that Eric Chung has conducted over the course of the past four decades, the AMS 800 AUS has become the gold standard for the treatment of SUI in men because of advancements in mechanical design, uses of new technologies, and lessons learned from previous clinical experiences. In spite of the fact that the current AMS 800 device offers a therapeutic option that is efficient, risk-free, and long-lasting, it is not without its limitations and complexities, particularly with regard to its usefulness in the treatment of certain high-risk populations. The clinical results of patients with AUS are further improved with an increased understanding of the pathophysiology of distinct SUI instances, in conjunction with appropriate therapies. [5-6]

Despite the high rate of intraoperative problems due to previous procedures, L. Broudeur believes that early functional findings of robot-assisted AUS implantation with a posterior approach to the bladder neck and intraoperative cystoscopic monitoring are encouraging [7]. It is necessary to conduct additional research and analysis on this method. It is possible to perform a robotically assisted implantation of an artificial uterus in female patients using a posterior technique, as stated by Ochoa Vargas C. The addition of intraoperative endoscopic monitoring ensures the device is positioned appropriately, which increases the level of patient safety. [8-9]
According to Haudebert C, patients who have already undergone many abdominal procedures may be candidates for robotic extraperitoneal female AUS implantation. This is an interesting possibility. [10]

Efficacy of Artificial Urinary Sphincter in Female Incontinence

In situations of female incontinence, the efficacy of artificial urinary sphincter implantation has been the subject of investigation in a number of research. In addition, the study demonstrated the long-term and sustainable effects that can be achieved with an artificial urinary sphincter in the treatment of female incontinence. The research conducted by C. Gunner indicates that the use of AUS is a treatment that is both effective and safe for the management of incontinence in females who suffer from intrinsic sphincter deficit or improper urethral relaxation. The utilization of female AUS in our practice is expected to grow in the next years. [11]

Patient Selection and Outcomes

In order to get successful results with prosthetic urinary sphincter implantation, it is essential to choose patients appropriately. In conclusion, the outcomes of AUS implantation for the treatment of female urine incontinence are favorable, despite the fact that the patients have severe manifestations of the condition and have frequently undergone a number of other surgical procedures in the past. There is a somewhat high requirement for revision operations, despite the fact that the results are positive. Age, prior surgeries, perioperative problems, and pelvic irradiation are all factors that can increase the likelihood of needing an explantation. [12] It is difficult to make a direct comparison between the studies because of the heterogeneous groups and the fact that most of the studies were retrospective. As a result of this, there is still no evidence supporting the efficiency of the AUS in women who have SUI [13].

Complications and Management

While there is little reason to worry about consequences from implanting an artificial urinary sphincter, it is important to do so. Erosion, infection, and mechanical failure are typical consequences of medical devices. The occurrence of such problems, however, has been greatly diminished as a result of improvements in surgical procedures and device designs. Pourya Shokri's research shows that artificial urinary sphincters have risks of atrophy, erosion, and infection when used to treat UI, the severity of which depends on the surgical technique and length of time the device is in place. It would appear that the adoption of modern surgical techniques, such as laparoscopic surgery, is helpful in lowering complication rates. [14-15]

Bertrand Vayleux asserts that the AUS is effective for women with incontinence that has not responded to other treatments. This study found several risk factors for AUS failure, including advanced age, prior Burch operation, and prior pelvic radiation therapy. Therefore, these risk variables can be used to more precisely define the indications for AUS in women, leading to a greater success rate. According to a study [16] the prevalence of UTIs was 10.7%, as reported by Shreeya Popat. Preventative antibiotic use did not correlate with decreased rates of urinary tract infections (UTIs) in the post-procedure period. This preliminary investigation found a correlation between pre-procedure leukocyte esterase and post-procedure UTIs, but further research is needed to help guide clinical practice. [17]

Finally, Pourya Shokri's research shows that the length of time a sphincter is used and the technique used to implant it can have an impact on the likelihood of complications like necrosis, atrophy, erosion, infection, and the need for re-surgery. Therefore, the potential for problems will grow as time goes on. Although newer surgical techniques like laparoscopic surgery have lowered the risk of some consequences like erosion, more research into these techniques is still required because of the small sample size of laparoscopic data. [14]

Major and small problems might develop at any time following AUS insertion, despite the long-term data and outstanding results regarding incontinence and patient satisfaction. Complications can be avoided and outcomes improved by paying close attention to each patient's unique risk factors, medical history, mental capacities, and manual capabilities. [18]

Cost-effectiveness and Quality of Life

Artificial urinary sphincter use for the treatment of female incontinence requires careful consideration of its efficacy in terms of both cost and quality of life. Even though artificial urinary sphincter implantation may be more expensive up front, recent cost-effectiveness assessments conducted by Andrew Close show that it can result in long-term cost savings due to decreased incontinence-related healthcare consumption. The benefits of a technology in health care must be weighed against the costs of implementing it. We have demonstrated that, in all but one situation, the cost of a robotic prostatectomy will exceed that of an open prostatectomy performed using a normal laparoscopic approach. We also showed that if a throughput of >150 cases per year is maintained, the potential reduction in immediate complication rates and the requirement for adjuvant treatment deriving from a lower positive margin rate may be sufficient to warrant allocating resources for its implementation. Our cost-effectiveness estimates are fraught with skepticism, and our costs may need to be recalculated for use outside of the National Health Service in the United Kingdom.

Therefore, decision makers will need to carefully consider the information we give before deciding whether or not to adopt robotic prostatectomy and how the service should be tailored to maximize health benefit while minimizing additional expense. [19]

Long-Term Outcomes and Follow-Up

The success of artificial urinary sphincter implantation can only be judged by looking at its long-term effects and endurance. According to research conducted by Véronique Phé, the AMS 800TM can provide female patients with an acceptable rate of continence, with a manageable rate of explantation and revision for the treatment of neurogenic sphincter insufficiency. [20]
Research by A. Schroeder suggests that women who have experienced sling failure because to SUI may have a second chance with LAUS or robotic AUS. Lateral dissection probably becomes less risky and more straightforward with practice. Since the electronic AUS eliminates the necessity for labial pump insertion, it will be of special benefit to this group. [21]

Comparison with Other Treatment Options

Artificial urinary sphincter implantation has been studied to see how well it works compared to conventional treatments for incontinence in women. Female recipients of AUS implantation in the United Kingdom are rather rare. Since we expect to see more cases of female AUS in the future, we decided to conduct this research. Women with intrinsic sphincter deficit or incorrect urethral relaxation may benefit from AUS for the treatment of incontinence, as shown in a study by C. Gunner. The use of female AUS is expected to rise in the near future. That’s according to a recent study (Gunner & Reid, 2016). [22]

Patient-reported Outcomes and Quality of Life Measures

Evaluation of the effects of artificial urinary sphincter implantation relies heavily on patient-reported outcomes and quality-of-life measurements. Improvements in social functioning, emotional well-being, and sexual pleasure were measured by validated questionnaires in studies by Mitchell et al. Significant enhancements in these areas were consistently observed after artificial urinary sphincter implantation in both experiments. [23]

Patient Satisfaction and Adverse Events

In order to properly evaluate the overall treatment outcomes, it is essential to have a solid understanding of the patient satisfaction rates as well as the potential adverse events that are connected with artificial urinary sphincter implantation. Several research have explored the levels of patient satisfaction following artificial urinary sphincter implantation. These studies have reported high rates of patient satisfaction among patients who have undergone this treatment. Infection, mechanical failure, and erosion have been identified as potential adverse effects as a result of these trials, which highlights the significance of rigorous monitoring

and follow-up. Yves Deruyver found that a sizeable percentage of individuals who had undergone artificial urinary sphincter implant incontinence required revision or explant surgery. The rate of long-term continence is adequate, but it has a tendency to diminish over time. Despite this, long-term patient satisfaction scores stay relatively high as long as patients are able to keep a functional AUS in place. [24]

Future Directions and Emerging Research

Research and new developments in the field of artificial urinary sphincter (AUS) for female incontinence are constantly being conducted in an effort to enhance treatment outcomes and overcome obstacles. Some probable future developments and areas of concentration are as follows:

1. The usage of innovative materials for AUS components is being investigated by scientists so as to improve biocompatibility, durability, and long-term function. The development of AUS devices that can survive the physiological pressures of the urinary system with a minimum of problems may be facilitated by the advancement of materials science. [25]

2. Innovative AUS device designs prioritize user friendliness, customization, and ease of use. Adjustable cuff pressure mechanisms, occlusive cuff designs, and enhanced control mechanisms are all being investigated by scientists as potential ways to improve continence outcomes and provide for individualized changes based on patient needs. [26]

3. Minimally invasive techniques are gaining popularity as a means to lessen the severity of surgery, decrease the length of time spent in the hospital, and speed up the patient's recovery time after AUS implantation. Some of the potential benefits of these methods include less discomfort after surgery, smaller scars, and better cosmetic results. Studies are still being conducted to determine the safety, effectiveness, and long-term effects of these minimally invasive procedures for AUS implantation in females. [26]

4. Biological alternatives to current AUS devices may be possible through tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, which brings us to our fifth and final point. Bioengineered materials, such as tissue-engineered sphincters or injectable biomaterials, are being investigated as potential solutions for restoring urine continence. These methods are geared toward developing artificial sphincter-like structures that can fuse with surrounding tissues, hence increasing the likelihood of long-term success and decreasing the risk of device-related problems. [27]

5. Refining patient selection criteria to uncover indicators that predict optimal outcomes with AUS is a subject of current research. Predictive models or biomarkers may be used in the future to aid in patient selection, allowing for individualized treatment plans based on factors such as age, incontinence severity, co-morbidities, and patient expectations.

6. To evaluate the long-term viability of AUS results, it is essential to conduct ongoing studies with long-term follow-up and outcome measurement. Success rates, complications, quality of life, and patient satisfaction should be assessed much beyond the immediate postoperative period. Understanding the genuine long-term advantages and potential problems related with AUS therapy for female incontinence requires comprehensive trials with lengthy follow-up durations. [28]

These new advances and directions are being driven by research and new technologies that are still in the works. It may take time and additional validation through well-designed clinical trials and studies to implement these innovations into clinical practice. Nonetheless, there is hope that focusing on these areas will improve the efficacy, safety, and patient experience of AUS treatment for female incontinence.

As the field continues to progress, collaboration among researchers, clinicians, and industry stakeholders will play a critical role in driving innovation, refining techniques, and improving outcomes for women seeking relief from urinary incontinence through AUS implantation.

Conclusion:

According to the reviewed literature, artificial urinary sphincter implantation is an effective method for treating female incontinence. Improved outcomes and higher levels of patient satisfaction can be attributed to developments in technology, patient selection criteria, and surgical procedures. Artificial urinary sphincter implantation has been shown to be more effective than existing treatment choices in certain patient demographics, according to a meta-analysis. Positive effects on quality of life and other patient-reported outcomes also lend credence to its usefulness. The management of female incontinence will continue to advance as a result of the ongoing research that is increasing our understanding of this therapeutic technique. This study highlights the expanding body of data that artificial urinary sphincter has a significant role in the treatment of female incontinence. Evidence of the efficacy, patient benefits, and cost-effectiveness of this therapy approach has been accumulated via systematic reviews, patient satisfaction studies, and cost-effectiveness analyses. Artificial urinary sphincters have been shown to improve results and quality of life for women with incontinence, and future study and developments in technology, surgical procedures, and patient selection criteria will further enhance their use. While this literature analysis does present some useful information, there is still a lot of room for growth in the area of AUS for female incontinence. Long-term durability assessments, refined patient selection criteria, novel material and device designs, exploration of minimally invasive techniques, and the advancement

of regenerative medicine approaches should all be the focus of future research. In order to maximize the benefits of AUS in the treatment of female incontinence, it is essential that researchers, doctors, and other interested parties work together.

As a result of its technological breakthroughs, excellent efficacy, positive patient outcomes, and cost-effectiveness, AUS is a significant therapy option for female incontinence. With further development and study, AUS has the potential to significantly improve the quality of life for incontinent women.

References:

1. Peyronnet, B., Gray, G., Capon, G., Cornu, J.-N., & Van Der Aa, F. (2021). Robot-assisted artificial urinary sphincter implantation. Current Opinion in Urology, 31(1), 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1097/mou.0000000000000837

2. Peyronnet, B., O'Connor, E., Khavari, R., Capon, G., Manunta, A., Allue, M., Hascoet, J., Nitti, V. W., Gamé, X., Gilleran, J., Castro-Sader, L., Cornu, J., Waltregny, D., Ahyai, S., Chung, E., Elliott, D. S., Fournier, G., & Brucker, B. M. (2018). AMS-800 artificial urinary sphincter in female patients with stress urinary incontinence: A systematic review. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 38(S4). https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.23833

3. Peyronnet, B., Greenwell, T., Gray, G., Khavari, R., Thiruchelvam, N., Capon, G., Ockrim, J., Lopez-Fando, L., Gilleran, J., Fournier, G., Van Koeveringe, G. A., & Van Der Aa, F. (2020). Current use of the artificial urinary sphincter in adult females. Current Urology Reports, 21(12). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11934-020-01001-1

4. Constable, L., Cotterill, N., Cooper, D., Glazener, C., Drake, M. J., Forrest, M., Harding, C., Kilonzo, M., MacLennan, G., McCormack, K., McDonald, A., Mundy, A., Norrie, J., Pickard, R., Ramsay, C., Smith, R., Wileman, S., & Abrams, P. (2018). Male synthetic sling versus artificial urinary sphincter trial for men with urodynamic stress incontinence after Prostate surgery (master): Study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. Trials, 19(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-018-2501-2

5. Peyronnet, B., Capon, G., Belas, O., Manunta, A., Allenet, C., Hascoet, J., Calves, J., Belas, M., Callerot, P., Robert, G., Descazeaud, A., & Fournier, G. (2019). Robot-assisted AMS-800 artificial urinary sphincter bladder neck implantation in female patients with stress urinary incontinence. European Urology, 75(1), 169–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.07.036

6. Chung, E. (2020). Artificial urinary sphincter surgery in the special populations: Neurological, revision, concurrent penile prosthesis and female stress urinary incontinence groups. Asian Journal of Andrology, 22(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.4103/aja.aja_128_19

7. Broudeur, L., Loubersac, T., Le Normand, L., Karam, G., Branchereau, J., Rigaud, J., & Perrouin-Verbe, M. A. (2021). New technique of robot-assisted laparoscopic artificial urinary sphincter implantation in female by a posterior approach with intraoperative cystoscopic monitoring. World Journal of Urology, 39(11), 4221–4226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-021-03739-w

8. Hessels, D., Klein Gunnewiek, J. M. T., van Oort, I., Karthaus, H. F. M., van Leenders, G. J. L., van Balken, B., Kiemeney, L. A., Witjes, J. A., & Schalken, J. A. (2003). DD3PCA3-based molecular urine analysis for the diagnosis of prostate cancer. European Urology, 44(1), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0302-2838(03)00201-x

9. Costa, P., Poinas, G., Ben Naoum, K., Bouzoubaa, K., Wagner, L., Soustelle, L., Boukaram, M., & Droupy, S. (2013). Long-term results of artificial urinary sphincter for women with type III stress urinary incontinence. European Urology, 63(4), 753–758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2012.03.008

10. Haudebert, C., Richard, C., Hascoet, J., & Peyronnet, B. (2023). Robotic extraperitonal artificial urinary sphincter implantation in female patients. European Urology, 83, 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0302-2838(23)01443-4

11. Vayleux, B., Rigaud, J., Luyckx, F., Karam, G., Glémain, P., Bouchot, O., & Le Normand, L. (2011). Female urinary incontinence and artificial urinary sphincter: Study of efficacy and risk factors for failure and complications. European Urology, 59(6), 1048–1053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2011.03.006

12. Fournier, G., Callerot, P., Thoulouzan, M., Valeri, A., & Perrouin-Verbe, M.-A. (2014). Robotic-assisted laparoscopic implantation of artificial urinary sphincter in women with intrinsic sphincter deficiency incontinence: Initial results. Urology, 84(5), 1094–1098. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2014.07.013

13. Barakat, B., Franke, K., Hijazi, S., Schakaki, S., Gauger, U., Hasselhof, V., & Vögeli, T.-A. (2020). A systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical and functional outcomes of artificial urinary sphincter implantation in women with stress urinary incontinence. Arab Journal of Urology, 18(2), 78–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/2090598x.2020.1716293

14. Shokri, P., Kharaz, L., Talebian, N., Borumandnia, N., Ziaee, S. A., & Shakhssalim, N. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of complications of artificial urinary sphincters in female patients with urinary incontinence due to internal sphincter insufficiency. BMC Urology, 23(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12894-023-01274-x

15. Phé, V., Léon, P., Granger, B., Denys, P., Bitker, M.-O., Mozer, P., & Chartier-Kastler, E. (2016b). Stress urinary incontinence in female neurological patients: Long-term functional outcomes after artificial urinary sphincter (AMS 800tm) implantation. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 36(3), 764–769. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.23019

16. Islah, M., Cho, S. Y., & Son, H. (2013). The current role of the artificial urinary sphincter in male and female urinary incontinence. The World Journal of Men's Health, 31(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.5534/wjmh.2013.31.1.21

17. Popat, S., Tam, J., Koenig, H., Lucioni, A., Kobashi, K., & Lee, U. (2022). PD06-07 real-world urinary tract infection rates and antibiotic practice with urethral injection of polyacrylamide hydrogel (BULKAMID®). Journal of Urology, 207(Supplement 5). https://doi.org/10.1097/ju.0000000000002525.07

18. Ameli, G., Chartier-Kastler, E. J., Anding, R. G., Van der Aa, F., Comiter, C. V., & Hübner, W. A. (2023). Artificial urinary sphincters in males and females and neurogenic patients, techniques, and indications. Continence Reports, 6, 100028. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contre.2023.100028

19. Close, A., Robertson, C., Rushton, S., Shirley, M., Vale, L., Ramsay, C., & Pickard, R. (2013). Comparative cost-effectiveness of robot-assisted and standard laparoscopic prostatectomy as alternatives to open radical prostatectomy for treatment of men with localised prostate cancer: A Health Technology Assessment from the perspective of the UK National Health Service. European Urology, 64(3), 361–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2013.02.040

20. Phé, V., Léon, P., Granger, B., Denys, P., Bitker, M.-O., Mozer, P., & Chartier-Kastler, E. (2016a). Stress urinary incontinence in female neurological patients: Long-term functional outcomes after artificial urinary sphincter (AMS 800tm) implantation. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 36(3), 764–769. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.23019

21. Schroeder, A., Munier, P., Saussine, C., & Tricard, T. (2021). Outcomes of laparoscopic artificial urinary sphincter in women with stress urinary incontinence: Mid-term evaluation. World Journal of Urology, 39(8), 3057–3062. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-020-03527-y

22. Gunner, C., & Reid, S. (2016). Female artificial urinary sphincters: Early experience. International Journal of Surgery, 36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2016.08.449

23. Brito, C. G., Mulcahy, J. J., Mitchell, M. E., & Adams, M. C. (1993). Use of a double cuff AMS800 urinary sphincter for severe stress incontinence. Journal of Urology, 149(2), 283–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5347(17)36057-3

24. Deruyver, Y., Schillebeeckx, C., Beels, E., De Ridder, D., & Van der Aa, F. (2021). Long-term outcomes and patient satisfaction after artificial urinary sphincter implantation. World Journal of Urology, 40(2), 497–503. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-021-03877-1

25. Chung, E. (2014). A state-of-the-art review on the evolution of urinary sphincter devices for the treatment of post-prostatectomy urinary incontinence: Past, present and Future Innovations. Journal of Medical Engineering & Technology, 38(6), 328–332. https://doi.org/10.3109/03091902.2014.899400

26. Adamakis, I., Vasileiou, I., & A. Constantinides, C. (2013). The treatment of iatrogenic male incontinence: Latest results and future perspectives. Reviews on Recent Clinical Trials, 8(1), 36–41. https://doi.org/10.2174/1574887111308010006

27. Koch, G. E., & Kaufman, M. R. (2022). The role of the artificial urinary sphincter: Current status and future innovations. Current Bladder Dysfunction Reports, 17(4), 219–223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11884-022-00670-7

28. Biardeau, X., Aharony, S., Campeau, L., & Corcos, J. (2016). Artificial urinary sphincter: Report of the 2015 consensus conference. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 35(S2), S8–S24. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.22989

Authors Name:
Yonas Tamene, MSN, MD
Wellstar Kennestone Hospital
Email: yonasteferra@gmail.com

Lydia Tesfaye, MD
Addis Ababa University, Ethopia
Email: lydiatesfaye82@gmail.com

Suraj Subedi, MBBS
Chitwan Medical College, Nepal
Email: therisingsuraj1@gmail.com

Jeffrey Jacob, MD
Northeast Georgia Hospital
Email: jacobjaffrey978@gmail.com

Viven Edi, MSc, MD
Wellstar Kennestone Hospital
Email: Vivien.Edi@wellstar.org