

가

Characteristic Findings and Their Clinical Appraisal of Proctography and Cinedefecography in Patients with Pelvic Outlet Obstructive Disease

Kyong Rae Kim, M.D., Young Sok Kim, M.D., Soon Sup Chung, M.D., Chang Hee Lee, M.D.¹, Gi Bong Chae, M.D.², Hye Rin Roh, M.D.², Won Jin Choi, M.D.², Ung Chae Park, M.D.

Department of Surgery and ¹Radiology, College of Medicine, Konkuk University, Chungju, ²Department of Surgery, College of Medicine, Kang-won University, Chuncheon, Korea

Purpose: We were assessed the characteristic findings of defecography and cinedefecography in patients with pelvic outlet obstructive disease, and compared the characteristic physiologic findings between proctography and cinedefecography.

Methods: Physiologic findings of 196 patients who were performed at least two items of physiologic tests were retrospectively evaluated. Patients were categorized as rectocele (Group I: n=119), nonrelaxing puborectalis syndrome (Group II: n=58), rectoanal intussusception (Group III: n=16), significant sigmoidocele (Group IV: n=3). The proctographic and cinedefecographic features were analyzed according to disease categories. The sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, false positive rate, false negative rate, diagnostic rate, and reproducibility were calculated, and we analyzed the difference between proctography and cinedefecography according to the disease groups.

Results: On the proctographic examinations; 1) 112 patients were confirmed as a clinically significant rectocele (n=128, sensitivity; 94%, specificity; 79%, accuracy; 88%, false positive rate; 21%, false negative rate; 6%, kappa; 0.749). 2) A clinically significant nonrelaxing puborectalis were 36 patients (n=73, sensitivity; 62%, specificity; 73%, accuracy; 70%, false positive rate; 27%, false negative rate; 38%, kappa; 0.328). 3) 12 patients were confirmed as

significant rectoanal intussusception (n=31, sensitivity; 75%, specificity; 89%, accuracy; 88%, false positive rate; 11%, false negative rate; 25%, kappa; 0.425). 4) 3 patients were confirmed as clinically significant sigmoidocele (n=15, sensitivity; 100%, specificity; 94%, accuracy; 94%, false positive rate; 6%, false negative rate; 0%, kappa; 0.316). On the combination of proctography and cinedefecography; 1) 117 patients were confirmed as a clinically significant rectocele (n=122, sensitivity; 98%, specificity; 94%, accuracy; 96%, false positive rate; 6%, false negative rate; 2%, kappa; 0.925). 2) A clinically significant nonrelaxing puborectalis were 50 patients (n=64, sensitivity; 86%, specificity; 90%, accuracy; 88%, false positive rate; 10%, false negative rate; 14%, kappa; 0.738). 3) 16 patients were confirmed as significant rectoanal intussusception (n=22, sensitivity; 100%, specificity; 97%, accuracy; 97%, false positive rate; 3%, false negative rate; 0%, kappa; 0.826). 4) 3 patients were confirmed as clinically significant sigmoidocele (n=9, sensitivity; 100%, specificity; 97%, accuracy; 97%, false positive rate; 3%, false negative rate; 0%, kappa; 0.488). As compared with combined study (proctography plus cinedefecography), the proctography show decreased diagnostic rates in the evaluation of rectocele (P<0.05), nonrelaxing puborectalis (P<0.01), and rectoanal intussusception (P<0.05). And, the proctography also show increased false positive rate in the evaluation of rectocele (P<0.01), nonrelaxing puborectalis (P<0.01), and rectoanal intussusception (P<0.05).

Conclusions: In our study, proctography showed a tendency to overdiagnosis. Therefore, the combined study of proctography and cinedefecography should be taken as a diagnostic tools for pelvic outlet obstructive disease. Adhering to these findings, other anorectal physiologic studies should be added for the clinically significant diagnosis. *J Korean Soc Coloproctol 2003;19:94-100*

Key Words: Proctography, Cinedefecography, Pelvic outlet obstructive disease

1964 Burhenn¹

가

가

가

2

가

가

Table 1. Patients' demographics of overall subjects (n=196)

Age (years)	48.6 (range, 16~86)
Gender (male vs. female)	36 : 50
Duration of symptom (years)	6.2 (range, 0.3~35)
Mean number of parity (times)	2.5 (range, 0~10)
Prior medical history excluding of anorectal disorders	
Psychosis/neurosis	16
Diabetes mellitus	10
Essential hypertension	8
Cerebrovascular accident	6
Neurogenic bladder	2
Diverticular disease	2
Cerebral palsy	1
Hypothyroidism	1
Prior surgical history excluding of anorectal surgery	
Hysterectomy	7
Spinal injury	6
Laminectomy	3
Forceps delivery	2

Table 2. Proctographic criteria of the pelvic outlet obstructive diseases

Rectocele	A poor rectal emptying of barium paste from the bulged outpocket of anterior rectum with a more than 3 cm in its size
NRPR (nonrelaxing puborectalis) syndrome	1) A clear visualization of puborectalis indentation 2) Difference in anorectal angle between push and rest is less than zero
Rectoanal intussusception	A circular & funnel shaped filling defect at least 3 cm in diameter
Sigmoidocele	The lowest portion of sigmoid is located below the pubococcygeal line
Perineal descent	1) Fixed descent: over 4 cm descent of perineum at rest 2) Dynamic descent: over 4 cm difference of perineal descent in the dynamic change between rest and strain

1) 1994 10 2002 9 8 (group IV: n=3) (Table 4). kappa 0.75 가 . 가

196 48.6±19.1 (, 16~86) , 36 : 50, 6.2 (, 0.5~35) , 2.5 (, 0~10) . 16 가 chi-square test (SPSS ver.10.0) . 가 : A) “ .” B) “ .” C) “ .” D) “ .” E) “ .” F) “ .” G) “ .” H) “

2) 196 (Table 2, 3) (group I: n=119), (group II: n=58), (group III: n=16)

Table 3. Diagnostic criteria of the pelvic outlet obstructive diseases based on the proctographic plus cinedefecographic findings

- Normal findings: A rapid and complete evacuation of contrast material with normal relaxation of the puborectalis muscle and opening of the anal canal, simultaneously
- Significant rectocele: A poor rectal emptying of barium paste from the bulged outpocket of anterior rectum with a more than 3 cm in its size despite maximal trial of simulated defecation
- NRPR (nonrelaxing puborectalis) syndrome: A clear indentation of puborectalis, narrow anorectal angle, and closed anal canal during the simulated defecation
- Rectoanal intussusception: A circular, undisappeared funnel shaped configuration at least 3 cm in diameter despite maximal trial of simulated defecation
- Significant sigmidocele: The lowest portion of sigmoid below the pubococcygeal line, resulting outlet obstruction by abnormally descended sigmoid colon

Table 4. Classification of patients

Diagnosis	Number of patients (n=196)(%)
Group I (Rectocele)	119 (61)
Group II (NRPR)	58 (30)
Group III (Rectoanal intussusception)	16 (8)
Group IV (Sigmidocele)	3 (1)

NRPR = nonrelaxing puborectalis

Table 5. Number of studies for the functional diagnosis of patients with pelvic outlet obstruction

Study items	Number (n=364)
Proctography and cinedefecography	196
Anorectal manometry	84
Colonic transit time study	41
EMG/PNTML	43

EMG = electromyography; PNTML = pudendal nerve terminal motor latency

.” D “ 가 128 112 (kappa=0.749),
 ” 9 2 가 73 36 (kappa=0.328),
 , 가 31 12 (kappa=0.452),
 (n=68) 15 3 (kappa=0.316)
 (n=45)
 122 117 (kappa=0.925),
 64 50 (kappa=0.758),
 22 16 (kappa=0.826),
 14 9 3 (kappa=0.488)
 가
 (n=196), (n=84), (Table 6).
 (n=41),
 (n=43) (Table 5).

.³ 94%, 79%, 88%,
 21%, 6% .
 62%, 73%,
 70%, 27%, 38% .
 75%,
 89%, 88%, 11%.

Table 6. Correlation between proctography and defecography (proctography plus cinedefecography)

Clinical diagnosis (n=196)	Proctography only			Proctography+Cinedefecography		
	Proctographic CSD diagnosis	Kappa		Proctography plus CSD cinedefecography	Kappa	
Rectocele (n=119)	128	112	0.749	122	117	0.925
NRPR (n=58)	73	36	0.328	64	50	0.758
RA Intu (n=16)	31	12	0.452	22	16	0.826
Sigmoidocele (n=3)	15	3	0.316	9	3	0.488

kappa (k): $k \geq 0.75$ = excellent correlation; $0.4 \leq k < 0.75$ = moderate correlation; $0.2 \leq k < 0.4$ = poor. CSD = clinically significant diagnosis; NRPR = nonrelaxing puborectalis; RA Intu. = Rectoanal intussusception.

Table 7. Statistics between proctography and defecography (proctography plus cinedefecography)

	Sensitivity (%)		Specificity (%)		Accuracy (%)		FPR (%)		FNR (%)	
	P	P+CD	P	P+CD	P	P+CD	P	P+CD	P	P+CD
Rectocele	94	98	79	94	88	96*	21	6*	6	2
NRPR	62	86	73	90	70	88 [†]	27	10 [†]	38	14
RA Intu	75	100	89	97	88	97*	11	3*	25	0
Sigmoidocele	100	100	94	97	94	97	6	3	0	0

* $P < 0.05$, [†] $P < 0.01$. P value = between proctogram and defecogram; FPR = False Positive Rate; FNR = False Negative Rate; P = proctography; P+CD = Proctography plus cinedefecography; NRPR = nonrelaxing puborectalis; RA Intu. = Rectoanal intussusception.

25% .
 100%, 94%, 94%, 6%, 가 (光
 斑 screen flare-out) ,
 98%,
 94%, 96%, 6%,
 2% .
 86%, 90%, 88%,
 10%, 14% .
 97%, 100%, 97%,
 3%, 0% . -
 97%, 97%, 3%, 100%,
 0% .

가 3.8
 가 (P<0.05, Table 7). 가 9 가

가 가 가
 가
 , anismus, paradoxical
 puborectalis contraction, rectoanal dyssynergia, spastic
 pelvic floor syndrome, nonrelaxing puborectalis syndrome
 가

.4 가 가 , 가 .
 가 가 가
 가 가
 .4.5 , 가 가
 가 11,12 가

.6.7 , 13

7 :

가

,

-

가

가

가

가

가

5%

18

19

1.2%

가

가

가

1 ,

2 ,

3

3

가

가

가

가

18

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

3 mm

14-16

50%

60%

가

가 가

16,17

3

가 가

cm

가

가

REFERENCES

1. Burhenne HJ. Intestinal evacuation study: a new roent-

- genologic technique. *Radiol Clin North Am* 1964;33:79-84.
 2. Wexner SD, Bartolo DCC. Constipation: Etiology, evaluation and management. 1st ed. New York: Butterworth Heinemann Ltd; 1995; p. 77-85.
 3. , . 가 . 1998;31:319-34.
 4. Kuijpers JHC, Bleijenberg G. Assessment and treatment of obstructed defecation. *Ann Med* 1990;22:405-11.
 5. Jorge JMN, Wexner SD, Ger GC, Salanga VD, Noguera JJ, Jagelman DG. Cineradiography and electromyography in the diagnosis of nonrelaxing puborectalis syndrome. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1993;36:668-76.
 6. Lubowski DZ, King DW. Obstructed defecation: current status of pathophysiology and management. *Aust N Z J Surg* 1995;65:87-92.
 7. Yoshioka K, Keighley MRB. Randomized trial comparing anorectal manometry and controlled anal dilatation for outlet obstruction. *Br J Surg* 1987;74:1125-8.
 8. Yoshioka K, Matsui Y, Yamada O, Sakaguchi M, Takada H, Hioki K, et al. Physiologic and anatomic assessment of patients with rectocele. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1991;34:704-8.
 9. Siproudhis L, Dautreme S, Ropert A, Bretagne JF, Heresbach D, Raoul JL, et al. Dyschezia and rectocele: a marriage of convenience. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1993;36:1030-6.
 10. , . 1996;12:19-30.
 11. Wexner SD, Cheape JD, Jorge JMN, Jagelman DG. Prospective assessment of biofeedback for the treatment of paradoxical puborectalis syndrome. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1992;35:145-50.
 12. Park UC, Choi SK, Piccirillo MF, Verzaro R, Wexner SD. Patterns of anismus and the relation to biofeedback therapy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1996;39:768-73.
 13. Ger G-C, Wexner SD, Jorge JM, Salanga VD. Anorectal manometry in the diagnosis of paradoxical puborectalis syndrome. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1993;36:816-25.
 14. Kuijpers JHC, Bleijenberg G. Assessment and treatment of obstructed defecation. *Ann Med* 1990;22:405-11.
 15. Kuijpers JHC. Application of the colorectal laboratory in diagnosis and treatment of functional constipation. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1990;33:35-9.
 16. Van Tets WF, Kuijpers JH. Internal rectal intussusception; fact or fancy? *Dis Colon Rectum* 1995;38(10):1080-3.
 17. Pfeifer J, Oliveira L, Park UC, Gonzalez A, Agachan F, Wexner SD. Are interpretations of video defecographies reliable and reproducible? *Int J Colorect Dis* 1997;12:67-72.
 18. Jorge JMN, Yang YR, Wexner SD. Incidence and clinical significance of sigmoidoceles as determined by a new classification system. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1994;37:1112-7.
 19. , . 2000;16:215-22.
-