



Overview of Intraoperative Injuries of the Urinary Tract System during Caesarean section

Ali El-Shabrawy Ali, Wael Sabry Noseir , Ahmed Ismail Mohamed, Basma El-Sayed Kamar

Obstetrics & Gynecology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt.

Corresponding author: **Basma El-Sayed Kamar**, Email: basmakamar59@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Urologic injury is the most common injury at the time of either obstetric or gynecologic surgery, with the bladder being the most frequent organ damaged. Risk factors for bladder injury during cesarean section include previous cesarean delivery, adhesions, emergent cesarean delivery, and cesarean section performed at the time of the second stage of labor. Most bladder injuries are recognized at the time of surgery, which is important, as quick recognition and repair are associated with a significant reduction in patient mortality. Although cesarean delivery is a cornerstone of obstetrics, there is a paucity of data in the literature either supporting or refuting specific techniques that are performed today. Damage to the urinary tract, which is a complication of cesarean section, is rarely described in the literature. There is also no evidence that supports the creation of a bladder flap, although routinely performed during cesarean section, as a method to reduce the risk of bladder injury. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to evaluate the factors, diagnosis and treatment of the urinary tract injury during cesarean section.

Keywords: Intraoperative Injuries; Caesarean section; Urinary Tract injury

INTRODUCTION

Urinary bladder is an adjacent viscus susceptible for intraoperative injury during cesarean section (CS). Prolonged labor, scarred uterus, intraabdominal adhesion, emergency CS, advanced labor, cesarean hysterectomy etc., are the predisposing factors for bladder injury during CS. While operating on such conditions, one should be meticulous to explore the possibility of bladder injury (1).

Cesarean section is the most common surgery performed in the United States with over 30% of deliveries occurring via this route. This number is likely to increase given decreasing rates of vaginal birth after cesarean section (VBAC) and primary cesarean delivery on maternal request, which carries the inherent risk for intraoperative complications (2).

There is evidence to support double-layer closure of the hysterotomy, the routine use of adhesive barriers, and performing a Pfannenstiel skin incision versus a vertical midline subumbilical incision to decrease the risk for bladder injury during cesarean section (3).

The last years have brought a significant increase in the number of births by cesarean section, and as a result there is expected to be an increasing number of patients with adhesions in the pelvis minor on a more frequent basis. Intrauterine adhesions are the most significant risk factors of damage to the bladder. The incidence of damage to the bladder during the

caesarean section is relatively small. However, it is extremely important to anticipate the possibility of this complication, its early intraoperative diagnosis and implementation of appropriate treatment when they occur (4,5).

Over the last century, the reduced rates of morbidity and mortality of mothers during caesarean section are noticeable, but a growing number of urological complications are expected to be seen. The most common urological complication of caesarean section is the damage of the urinary bladder (6).

RISK FACTORS

Adhesions were found in 60% of women who had bladder injury versus 10% of the women among the control group ($P < 0.01$). As would be expected, the rate of cystotomy also increases with the increased number of cesarean deliveries: 0.13% first, 0.09% second, 0.28% third, 1.17% fourth, 1.94% fifth and 4.49% sixth cesarean delivery (7).

Bladder injury was more likely to occur during emergent delivery (31% versus 11%), which is similar to other reports, meticulous and careful dissection is not always the most important priority when attempting to expeditiously deliver a distressed fetus. Bladder injury was also more likely to occur in patients who had cesarean section during labor (83% versus 61%). For patients with a prior cesarean delivery, failed TOLAC (Trial of labor after cesarean section) was seen more in the bladder injury group than control group (64% versus 22%). Concurrent uterine rupture was seen in 14% of bladder injury versus 0% of controls. Finally, 60% of patients with bladder injury were found to have adhesions at the time of repeat cesarean delivery versus the 10% of controls. No statistically significant differences were found regarding type of uterine incision (classical versus low vertical), induction of labor, presence of chorioamnionitis, fetal position, gestational age, or maternal illnesses (7).

The primary reason previous cesarean delivery has been found to be a significant risk factor for bladder injury is secondary to adhesive disease formed at the index surgery. The incidence of adhesive disease after a primary cesarean delivery ranges from 46 to 65%. Surgical adhesions can form for approximately one month after surgery, but most adhesion formation will occur immediately at the time of surgery. The pathogenesis of adhesion formation is a complex process in which fibrin, coagulation factors, and inflammatory cells contribute to repairing the damaged peritoneum. Risk factors for the development of adhesions include infection, excessive manipulation of tissue, increased blood loss during surgery, adhesiolysis, tissue ischemia, and infection (8).

The timing of cesarean delivery during either the first versus second stage of labor also has an impact on bladder injury. The risk of incidental cystotomy increases when cesarean delivery is performed during the second stage of labor versus the first stage (0.4% versus 0.1%, respectively. P value .004). There are multiple differences between a cesarean section performed during the second versus first stage of labor that contribute to these findings. For women undergoing cesarean delivery for an arrest disorder, specifically arrest of descent, there can be significant surgical trauma around the bladder in attempting to displace and deliver an infant that may be secured in the true pelvis. Furthermore, it is often more difficult to delineate the bladder from the lower uterine segment in a uterus that has been labored. Although incidental cystotomy was found to be higher in patients who were undergoing cesarean delivery during the second stage of labor, this finding was still rare (0.4%). These findings should not lead one to prematurely counsel a patient toward cesarean delivery in order to mitigate an insignificant complication if the patient has not had an adequate trial of labor (8).

Finally, the risk of bladder injury in women who had a previous cesarean delivery does not appear to be affected by the planned mode of delivery. This is an important point, as women who are considering a TOLAC require extensive counseling, and physicians must be aware of the risks and benefits of TOLAC **(9)**.

In a multicenter retrospective study that looked at over 25,000 previous cesarean deliveries in which they calculated that the risk of bladder injury was 0.43%. They determined there was no difference in risk for bladder injury between TOLAC and elective repeat cesarean delivery (0.44% compared with 0.42%), they did determine that the absolute risk of bladder injury in patients with previous cesarean delivery increased as follows: successful VBAC (0.2%), elective repeat cesarean delivery after one previous cesarean (0.3%), elective repeat cesarean delivery after more than one prior cesarean delivery (0.7%), unsuccessful TOLAC (1.1%). Unsuccessful TOLAC to be associated with the highest incidence of bladder injury **(10)**. Regarding composite maternal risk, VBAC is still associated with fewer maternal complications, and an unsuccessful TOLAC is associated with more complications than elective repeat cesarean delivery. Nevertheless, the overall risk of bladder injury is still small at only 1.1%. These results are not significant enough to dissuade women who desire TOLAC **(8)**.

DIAGNOSIS AND MANAGEMENT

Ninety-five (95) % of bladder injuries during cesarean section occur at the dome of the bladder with the remaining occurring at the trigone. The average length of bladder injury is 4.2 cm (1–10 cm). The most likely time bladder injury occurs is during the creation of a bladder flap (43%), another 33% of bladder injuries occur at the time of entry into the peritoneal cavity, and the remaining 24% of the injuries occur during uterine incision or delivery **(11)**.

Recognition of bladder injury is imperative in order to take measures during surgery to repair this complication, as inadequate diagnosis and treatment at the time of surgery may lead to grave ramifications. The most important prognostic factor of bladder injury is intraoperative recognition and surgical correction. Injuries repaired intraoperatively have a high likelihood for a return of normal urologic function. Failure to diagnose a bladder injury during surgery may later lead to vesicovaginal, vesicouterine, or ureterovaginal fistula. Although bladder injury at the time of cesarean section is infrequent, most of the injuries are fortunately identified at the time of surgery - 62% of injuries are identified at the time of delivery of the infant and repair of the hysterotomy. Twenty-one (21) % of bladder injuries are recognized during the creation of the bladder flaps, 12% during entry into the peritoneal cavity, and 5% prior to fascial closure **(11)**.

There are multiple intraoperative findings that suggest bladder injury: extravasation of urine, appearance of the Foley bulb, gross hematuria in the Foley bag, and visible detrusor muscle laceration. The bladder may be instilled with indigo carmine, methylene blue, or sterile milk through a urethral catheter. The extravasation of this material from the bladder enables the surgeon to identify the injury and its location. Surgeons may repeat the instillation of these substances until there is no further leakage of fluid, at which point bladder integrity can be confirmed **(12)**.

After recognizing an unplanned cystotomy, the first step should be to thoroughly examine the defect to determine the extent of the injury. An important consideration is to determine whether the trigone or ureters have been affected by the cystotomy. As previously demonstrated, most bladder injuries that occur during the time of cesarean occur at the dome

of the bladder and are easily repaired with a layered closure. If there is concern whether there may have been ureteral involvement in the injury, then the obstetrician may consider having the anesthesiologist inject 40 mg of Indigo carmine into the patient's IV to examine for extravasation of dye proximal to the bladder, which would suggest ureteral injury. To reiterate an important point, if there is ever concern for possible ureteral injury that may be out of the scope of practice of the individual surgeon then urology should be consulted intraoperatively **(13)**.

Various methods have been described on how to perform bladder closure. A simple cystotomy is normally repaired in two to three layers, with the first layer consisting of a simple running closure of the mucosa with a 3-0 absorbable suture **(12)**.

It is important to note here that the use of permanent suture, especially silk, is contraindicated, as it can serve as an impetus for stone formation. The second layer may be closed with a running imbricating stitch using either 2-0 or 3-0 absorbable suture to include the submucosa and muscularis. In order to confirm bladder integrity, one may back fill the bladder with sterile milk or methylene blue dye. Two advantages of using the former material are that it is readily available on labor and delivery, and it does not stain tissue like methylene blue, which may limit one to detect the presence of a recurrent leak **(12)**. After bladder integrity is confirmed, the surgeon may consider placing a third running stitch of absorbable suture if the serosal margins can be approximated. The bladder should be continuously drained with the use of a Foley catheter for at least 7-10 days postoperatively. Upon removing the Foley catheter, one does not need to obtain a voiding cystourethrogram unless extensive repairs are performed **(14)**.

Overall the febrile morbidity has not been found to be statistically significant in comparing patients who had a bladder injury to those who did not have a bladder injury **(15)**. As a result, there is no evidence at this time to support the use of prophylactic antibiotic therapy for incidental cystotomy. Providers need to individualize their practice based on the clinical scenario but keep into consideration concerns with providing unnecessary antibiotic treatment with regards to facilitating the growth of drug-resistant organisms. Providers may consider obtaining a terminal urinalysis and culture to determine need for antibiotic therapy **(15)**.

The discussion of ureteral damage and repair is more extensive and outside the scope of this article. Ureteral injuries occurring proximal to the bladder or within the latter third of the course of the ureter are typically repaired by performing an ureteroneocystostomy **(16)**. The most important principle of this repair is to ensure there is no tension on the ureter. Surgeons may consider performing a Psoas hitch, which helps mobilize the bladder closer to the side of ureteral injury in order to facilitate a tension-free repair, which is associated with better repair rates **(17)**.

Although uncommon, incidental cystotomy may be missed at the time of surgery. There are multiple signs and symptoms suggestive of bladder injury that can manifest in the early postoperative period such as hematuria, oliguria, lower abdominal pain, ileus, ascites, peritonitis, sepsis, fistula, and elevation of the blood urea nitrogen/creatinine ration. Retrograde cystography is a useful diagnostic procedure to consider in postoperative patients who are stable and may have potential evidence for urologic injury. Providers may also use the stress cystographic technique, as small injuries may not be identified unless some pressure is placed over the bladder. Abdominal CT with cystography is a valuable tool to use in patients with acute abdominal pain who may also have findings of bladder injury. Finally, one should always consider exploratory laparotomy for patients who are unstable or where there is high suspicion for bladder injury **(18)**.

PREVENTION

1- Adhesions

Adhesions at the time of cesarean delivery are among the most important sources for bladder injury secondary to a distortion of normal anatomy and difficulty dissecting through dense adhesive disease. Surgeons can use various techniques during cesarean section to lessen the chance of creating adhesive disease. Techniques that may reduce adhesions include respect of tissue during dissection, avoidance of increased blood loss, and maintenance of tissue moisture. Closure of the hysterotomy and peritoneum may also play a role in adhesion formation (19).

Hysterotomy incisions are currently closed either in a single- or double-layer closure. Some argue that double-layer closure leads to better hemostasis, but one of the most convincing arguments for double-layer closure is to prevent uterine rupture in a subsequent trial of labor (20). Double-layer closure is an important consideration when performing a cesarean section on a woman who may be a candidate for a trial of labor in a future pregnancy to prevent her risk for uterine rupture in a subsequent TOLAC. Regarding urologic injury, the choice of closing the hysterotomy with single- versus double-layer may also be a factor in the future prevention of bladder injury. When controlling for confounders, single-layer hysterotomy closure has been found to have a nearly sevenfold increase in the odds of developing bladder adhesions when compared with double-layer closure (21).

Double-layer closure likely reduces the exposure of raw surgical surfaces, which can lead to fibrosis and adhesion formation. There are no studies that comment specifically on the type of hysterotomy closure relating to bladder injury. One may assume that increasing adhesions proximal to the bladder will inherently increase the risk for bladder injury during subsequent cesarean delivery. As a result, it may be beneficial to perform double-layer closure to decrease the risk of bladder injury. More research is needed to support this claim. (21).

Peritoneal closure during cesarean section is a controversial topic, as there is conflicting opinion on whether this step decreases the adhesion rate. A Cochrane review examining nine trials demonstrated not closing the peritoneum has been found to show improved short-term benefits such as shorter operative time, decreased postoperative fever, and decreased postoperative hospitalization. There was no difference in adhesive disease if the surgeon closed both the parietal and visceral peritoneum (22).

A systematic review and metaanalysis that demonstrated that there is a 2.6% increased risk for adhesion formation in patients who did not have closure of the peritoneum versus patients who had closure of the peritoneum (OR 2.6, 95% CI 1.48–4.56). These findings were similar to those demonstrated, which showed parietal peritoneal closure at primary cesarean delivery was associated with a nearly fivefold decreased risk for adhesions (OR 0.20, 95% CI .08–0.49). The current conflicting data with no evidence examining the long-term effects of closing the peritoneum provides limited evidence to justify peritoneal closure at this time (23).

There are multiple adhesive barriers {Seprafilm (Genzyme Biosurgery, Framingham, MA, USA); Interceed (Ethicon, Johnson & Johnson Company, USA)} on the market today that are theorized to mitigate the formation of adhesions. Multiple studies have demonstrated that adhesive barriers placed at the time of laparotomy are beneficial in reducing the risk of adhesion formation. Additionally, a retrospective cohort study recently identified that the use of adhesive barriers in comparison with no use of adhesive barriers was found to have a significant reduction of adhesions at the time of the next surgery. Two hundred and sixty-two

women who had a primary cesarean delivery were followed with 43% of women having repeat cesarean delivery. Of these 112 women, 74% who had an adhesive barrier placed at the initial surgery were found to have no adhesions at the time of repeat cesarean delivery. However, only 22% of women who did not have an adhesive barrier were found to have no adhesions at repeat cesarean delivery ($P = 0.011$) (24).

2-Bladder Flap

There are many variations in surgical technique during cesarean section with one of the most controversial being whether to create a bladder flap. The bladder flap is created by first identifying the vesicouterine peritoneum and then making a horizontal incision just superior to this line to allow the surgeon to push the bladder caudally. Although one may think the initial reason to perform a bladder flap was to prevent urologic injury, in actuality surgeons initially created a bladder flap to prevent spread of intrauterine infection to the peritoneal cavity during the preantibiotic era. A secondary benefit of the bladder flap was then believed to prevent injury to the bladder at time of delivery. There is no evidence to support this claim (25).

A small randomized clinical trial ($n=102$) showing the omission of a bladder flap leads to a reduction in the time from incision to delivery, reduced blood loss, and decreased need for analgesia. This study did not determine whether bladder flap creation has any effect on bladder injury, as the required sample size would have to be over 40,000 to show statistical significance since the rate of bladder injury is so small, conducted another small, randomized clinical trial ($n = 258$) that examined the utility of the bladder flap with the primary outcome looking at total operating room time. Secondary outcomes were bladder injury, incision-to-delivery time, incision-to-fascia time, estimated blood loss, postoperative microhematuria, postoperative pain, hospital days, endometritis, and urinary tract infections. They identified that omission of the bladder flap at both primary and repeat cesarean deliveries does not increase intraoperative or postoperative complications. However, this study also did not power their study to demonstrate whether omission of the bladder flap decreased the rate of bladder injury (25).

Although at this time there are no studies demonstrating whether creating a bladder flap reduces the incidence of bladder injury, there are theoretical reasons why one could argue against bladder flap creation. One of the most convincing arguments against the creation of a bladder flap is that most bladder injuries occur while attempting to create a bladder flap (26). Hysterotomy is created just above the vesicouterine peritoneal fold, and then the bladder naturally descends from the hysterotomy. Forgoing the creation of a bladder flap also leads to less bleeding and vascular injury. This limits the need for hemostatic sutures, which are often placed in close proximity to the bladder. At this time there is no definitive data to argue for or against bladder flap creation with regards to bladder injury. A significantly large study would be required to determine statistical significance. The data suggests that one may argue against routinely creating a bladder flap during cesarean section unless there is a specific indication for bladder dissection (27).

CONCLUSION:

The cesarean section is now the most frequently performed obstetric surgery in the world, and their number increases every year.

The cesarean delivery has been associated with low rates of maternal morbidity and mortality over the past century. However, the most common complication of pelvic surgery is

urologic injury, with bladder injury quoted as the most frequently injured organ during pelvic surgery.

Taking this into account, the obstetricians and their patients should be aware of the potential complications associated with carrying out this procedure.

Certain factors like maternal age, parity and gestational age affect the intraoperative complications of the cesarean section.

Multiple techniques are available that can be used to diagnose a bladder injury if one suspects possible injury.

No Conflict of interest.

References:

- 1- Radu, V. D., Pristavu, A. I., Vinturache, A., Onofrei, P., Socolov, D. G., Carauleanu, A., ... & Costache, R. C. (2022). Risk Factors for Urological Complications Associated with Caesarean Section—A Case-Control Study. *Medicina*, 58(1), 123.
- 2- Ghaffar, S., Shaheen, T., Ghaffar, B., Ghaffar, S., Haq, H., & Khawar, F. (2021). Operative Morbidities among Patients with Previous Caesarean Sections. *Journal of Islamic International Medical College (JIIMC)*, 16(3), 176-179.
- 3- Blackwell, R. H., Kirshenbaum, E. J., Shah, A. S., Kuo, P. C., Gupta, G. N., & Turk, T. M. (2018). Complications of recognized and unrecognized iatrogenic ureteral injury at time of hysterectomy: a population based analysis. *The Journal of urology*, 199(6), 1540-1545.
- 4- Varlas, V. N., Rhazi, Y., Bors, R. G., Penes, O., & Radavoi, D. (2021). The urological complications of vaginal birth after cesarean (VBAC)—a literature review. *Journal of Medicine and Life*, 14(4), 443.
- 5- Naicker, S., Naidoo, T. D., & Moodley, J. (2020). Obstetric-associated lower urinary tract injuries: A case series from a tertiary centre in a low-resource setting. *Case Reports in Women's Health*, 27, e00218.
- 6- Phillips, B., Holzmer, S., Turco, L., Mirzaie, M., Mause, E., Mause, A., ... & Asensio, J. A. (2017). Trauma to the bladder and ureter: a review of diagnosis, management, and prognosis. *European Journal of Trauma and Emergency Surgery*, 43, 763-773.
- 7- Jensen, A. S., & Rudnicki, M. (2023). Iatrogenic bladder and ureteral injuries following gynecological and obstetric surgery. *Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 307(2), 511-518.
- 8- Collins, S. L., Alemdar, B., van Beekhuizen, H. J., Bertholdt, C., Braun, T., Calda, P., ... & Chantraine, F. (2019). Evidence-based guidelines for the management of abnormally invasive placenta: recommendations from the International Society for Abnormally Invasive Placenta. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*, 220(6), 511-526.
- 9- Saaqib, S., Iqbal, A., Naheed, M., Saeed, T., & Khalid, M. (2020). A randomized controlled trial of cystoinflation to prevent bladder injury in the adhesive disease of multiple caesarean sections. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 15297.
- 10- Korniluk, A., Kosiński, P., & Wielgoś, M. (2017). Intraoperative damage to the urinary bladder during cesarean section—literature review. *Ginekologia polska*, 88(3), 161-165.
- 11- Leong, J. Y., Schultz, J., Zhan, T., Marks, J. A., & Chung, P. H. (2022). General surgeons' comfort and urologists' perceptions of bladder trauma management. *The Canadian Journal of Urology*, 29(2), 11102.
- 12- Rajasekar, D., & Hall, M. (1997). Urinary tract injuries during obstetric intervention. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology*, 104(6), 731-734.
- 13- Phipps, M. G., Watabe, B., Clemons, J. L., Weitzen, S., & Myers, D. L. (2005). Risk factors for bladder injury during cesarean delivery. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 105(1), 156-160.
- 14- Dauleh, W., Al Sakka, M., & Shahata, M. (2006). Urinary tract injuries during caesarean section. *Qatar Medical Journal*, 2006(2), 8.

- 15- Raut, V., Shrivastava, A., Nandanwar, S., & Bhattacharya, M. (1991). Urological injuries during obstetric and gynaecological surgical procedures. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, 37(1), 21.
- 16- Başaranoğlu, S., Deregözü, A., Köroğlu, N., Kalkan, M., Şahin, C., & KADANALI, S. (2016). Early and late diagnosis of iatrogenic urinary tract injuries during obstetric and gynecological operations. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Investigations*, 7(3), 252-257.
- 17- Sikora-Szczesniak, D. L. (2017). Injury to Urinary Organs during Natural Deliveries, Caesarean Sections and Peripartum Hysterectomies. *Med Sur Urol*, 6(195), 2.
- 18- M El-Mogy, A. A., G Abd El-Raouf, A., G Ayad, A., & M Abd El-Aal, H. (2021). Iatrogenic urinary tract injury in obstetric and gynecological procedures: five-year-experience from two university hospitals. *Al-Azhar Medical Journal*, 50(1), 153-162.
- 19- Chill, H. H., Karavani, G., Reuveni-Salzman, A., Lipschuetz, M., Shimonovitz, T., Cohen, N., & Shveiky, D. (2021). Urinary bladder injury during cesarean delivery: risk factors and the role of retrograde bladder filling. *International Urogynecology Journal*, 1-6.
- 20- Alanwar, A., Al-Sayed, H. M., Ibrahim, A. M., Elkotb, A. M., Abdelshafy, A., Abdelhadi, R., ... & Nawara, M. (2019). Urinary tract injuries during cesarean section in patients with morbid placental adherence: retrospective cohort study. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal & Neonatal Medicine*, 32(9), 1461-1467.
- 21- M Tarney, C. (2013). Bladder injury during cesarean delivery. *Current women's health reviews*, 9(2), 70-76.
- 22- Rahman, M. S., Gasem, T., Al Suleiman, S. A., Al Jama, F. E., Burshaid, S., & Rahman, J. (2009). Bladder injuries during cesarean section in a University Hospital: a 25-year review. *Archives of gynecology and obstetrics*, 279, 349-352.
- 23- Gungorduk, K., Asicioglu, O., Celikkol, O., Sudolmus, S., & Ark, C. (2010). Iatrogenic bladder injuries during caesarean delivery: a case control study. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 30(7), 667-670.
- 24- Alcocer Urueta, J., Bonilla Mares, M., Gorbea Chávez, V., & Velázquez Valassi, B. (2009). Factores de riesgo asociados a lesiones vesicales en cesárea. *Actas Urológicas Españolas*, 33(7), 806-810.
- 25- Makoha, F. W., Fathuddien, M. A., & Felimban, H. M. (2006). Choice of abdominal incision and risk of trauma to the urinary bladder and bowel in multiple cesarean sections. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 125(1), 50-53.
- 26- Glaser, L. M., & Milad, M. P. (2019). Bowel and bladder injury repair and follow-up after gynecologic surgery. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 133(2), 313-322.
- 27- Joodi, M. R., & Al-Hussainy, A. F. (2020). Lower urinary system injuries in association with previous repeated caesarian sections: Cross sectional study. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 23(1), S413.