U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

Public Access Author manuscript

Womens Health Issues. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 February 04.

Published in final edited form as:

Womens Health Issues. 2016 ; 26(4): 476–477. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2016.03.008.

Women's Urological Health as a Priority to the Woman Well Visit

Elizabeth R. Mueller, MD, MSME

Departments of Urology & Obstetrics/Gynecology Loyola University Chicago, Stritch School of Medicine/Loyola University Medical Center, Maywood, IL

Margot S. Damaser, PhD

Biomedical Engineering Department and Glickman Urological and Kidney Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH

Research Service, Louis Stokes Cleveland Dept of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cleveland, OH

Monica P. Mallampalli, PhD, MSc [Vice President],

Scientific Affairs, Society for Women's Health Research, Washington, DC

Liliana Losada, PhD [Associate Director]

Scientific Affairs, Society for Women's Health Research, Washington, DC

To the Editors:

We would like to add urological health as a priority to the woman well visit described by Alisa Pascale and her colleagues (Pascale, Beal, & Fitzgerald, 2016), which was your most recent Editor's Choice.

Women are disproportionately affected by urological conditions compared with men. Epidemiological data shows that over 35% of adult women in the United States struggle with urinary incontinence versus less than 7% of men, and women have a greater than 50% lifetime risk of urinary tract infections (Carls, 2007; Fultz et al., 2005; Jacome, Oliveira, Marques, & Sa-Couto, 2011; Qaseem et al., 2014; Urologic Diseases in America, 2012). The prevalence of bladder pain syndrome among women is 3.8%, which was as high as other chronically painful conditions, such as migraine (2.1%), asthma (3.7%), and back pain (4.1%; Zondervan et al., 1999), and approximates the prevalence of other disabling conditions cited in Pascale et al. Urological conditions pose serious negative consequences to concentration, physical activity levels, self-confidence, and ability to complete work without requiring interruption (Carls, 2007; Jacome et al., 2011), and for many women these are highly debilitating (Kinsey, Pretorius, Glover, & Alexander, 2016; Litwin et al., 2005; Miller, Saigal, & Litwin, 2009; Sinclair & Ramsay, 2011). Last, women with incontinence are 80% more likely to have depression compared with continent women in the same age group (Nygaard, Turvey, Burns, Crischilles, & Wallace, 2003). Despite the high prevalence and incidence of urinary incontinence, as many as 90% of women never discuss their urologic symptoms with their health care providers (Carls, 2007; Jacome et al., 2011). Similarly, conditions such as overactive or underactive bladder and bladder pain syndrome are rarely discussed with providers, leading to extended and unnecessary delays in diagnosis

or treatment. It is clear that women's urological health rises to the level of a public health issue.

A number of effective and simple screening tools to assess urinary incontinence have been developed in the United States and Australia (Bradley et al., 2005; Brown et al., 2006; Gunthorpe, Brown, & Redman, 2000; Sandvik, Seim, Vanvik, & Hunskaar, 2000; Suskind et al., 2014, 2015). Further, clinical evidence demonstrates that implementation of early interventions to address urological conditions has a significant and lasting positive effect on women's health (Dumoulin, Hay-Smith, Habee-Seguin, & Mercier, 2015; Dumoulin et al., 2016). These interventions include simple behavioral modifications like fluid modification, pelvic floor exercises, pharmacologic treatment, or even surgical options. Therefore, the tools to screen, treat, and prevent future complications are in place, and have been demonstrated to be effective in clinical settings.

Pascale et al. properly highlight the need to "solidify the value of this preventive health visit, to help clinicians prioritize among the many potential highest value [woman well visit] elements, and to educate and empower women to fully utilize their preventive health and screening benefits." However, we argue that the scoping review methodology that was used by Pascale et al. (2016), and the methods used to develop well-visit guidelines in general, have consistently ignored urological health. For example, neither the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force nor the 2011 Institute of Medicine (2011) committee to evaluate Clinical Preventative Services for Women included an urologist or urogynecologist among the subspecialists. Furthermore, the data sources used to determine morbidity and mortality in Pascale or before (e.g. *Healthy People 2020*) do not include measures with respect to urological health. Because the guidelines developed by these different bodies were determined by consensus (even if only evidence-based services were considered), then the lack of specialists and exclusion of relevant epidemiological data regarding urological health would almost certainly result in the omission of this important topic in the woman well visit.

The Society for Women's Health Research Interdisciplinary Network on Women's Urological Health strongly urges health care providers to actively engage in conversations with women during the Woman Well Visit as an opportunity to determine the need and proper treatment course for better urological health in all women.

References

- Bradley C, Rovner E, Morgan M, Berlin M, Novi J, Shea J, & Arya L (2005). A new questionnaire for urinary incontinence diagnosis in women: Development and testing. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 192(1), 66–73. [PubMed: 15672005]
- Brown J, Bradley C, Subak L, Richter H, Kraus S, Brubaker L, Grady D (2006). The sensitivity and specificity of a simple test to distinguish between urge and stress urinary incontinence. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 144(10), 715–723. [PubMed: 16702587]
- Carls C (2007). The prevalence of stress urinary incontinence in high school and college-age female athletes in the Midwest: Implications for education and prevention. *Urologic Nursing*, 27(1), 21–24, 39. [PubMed: 17390923]
- Dumoulin C, Hay-Smith J, Habee-Seguin G, & Mercier J (2015). Pelvic floor muscle training versus no treatment, or inactive control treatments, for urinary incontinence in women: A short version Cochrane systematic review with meta-analysis. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 34(4), 300–308. [PubMed: 25408383]

- Dumoulin C, Hunter K, Moore K, Bradley C, Burgio K, Hagen S, & Chambers T (2016). Conservative management for female urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse review 2013: Summary of the 5th International Consultation on Incontinence. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 35, 15–20. [PubMed: 25400065]
- Fultz N, Girts T, Kinchen K, Nygaard I, Pohl G, & Sternfeld B (2005). Prevalence, management and impact of urinary incontinence in the workplace. *Occupational Medicine*, 55(7), 552–557. [PubMed: 16251372]
- Gunthorpe W, Brown W, & Redman S (2000). The development and evaluation of an incontinence screening questionnaire for female primary care. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 19(5), 595–607. [PubMed: 11002302]
- Institute of Medicine (IOM). (2011). *Clinical preventive services for women: Closing the gaps*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Jacome C, Oliveira D, Marques A, & Sá- Couto P (2011). Prevalence and impact of urinary incontinence among female athletes. *International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics*, 114(1), 60–63. [PubMed: 21571270]
- Kinsey D, Pretorius S, Glover L, & Alexander T (2016). The psychological impact of overactive bladder: A systematic review. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 21(1), 69–81. [PubMed: 24591118]
- Litwin M, Saigal C, Yano E, Avila C, Geschwind S, Hanley J, & Wang M (2005). Urologic Diseases In America Project: Analytical methods and principal findings. *Journal of Urology*, 173(3), 933–937. [PubMed: 15711342]
- Miller D, Saigal C, & Litwin M (2009). The demographic burden of urologic diseases in America. *Urologic Clinics of North America*, 36(1), 11–27, v. [PubMed: 19038632]
- Nygaard I, Turvey C, Burns T, Crischilles E, & Wallace R (2003). Urinary incontinence and depression in middle-aged United States women. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 101(1), 149–156. [PubMed: 12517660]
- Pascale A, Beal M, & Fitzgerald T (2016). Rethinking the well woman visit: A scoping review to identify eight priority areas for well woman care in the era of the Affordable Care Act. *Women's Health Issues*, 26(2), 135–146. [PubMed: 26817659]
- Qaseem A, Dallas P, Forciea M, Starkey M, Denberg T, Shekelle P, & Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians (2014). Nonsurgical management of urinary incontinence in women: A clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 161(6), 429–440. [PubMed: 25222388]
- Sandvik H, Seim A, Vanvik A, & Hunskaar S (2000). A severity index for epidemiological surveys of female urinary incontinence: Comparison with 48-hour padweighing tests. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 19(2), 137–145. [PubMed: 10679830]
- Sinclair A, & Ramsay I (2011). The psychosocial impact of urinary incontinence in women. *Obstetrician & Gynaecologist*, 13(3), 143–148.
- Suskind A, Dunn R, Morgan D, DeLancey J, McGuire E, & Wei J (2014). The Michigan Incontinence Symptom Index (M-ISI): A clinical measure for type, severity, and bother related to urinary incontinence. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 33(7), 1128–1134. [PubMed: 23945994]
- Suskind A, Dunn R, Morgan D, DeLancey J, Rew K, & Wei J (2015). A screening tool for clinically relevant urinary incontinence. *Neurourology and Urodynamics*, 34(4), 332–335. [PubMed: 24464849]
- Urologic Diseases in America 2012 Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Zondervan K, Yudkin P, Vessey M, Dawes M, Barlow D, & Kennedy S (1999). Prevalence and incidence of chronic pelvic pain in primary care: Evidence from a national general practice database. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 106(11), 1149–1155. [PubMed: 10549959]