evaluated with an exact Wilcoxon rank sum test and categorical differences were evaluated using Fisher’s exact test.

RESULTS: One hundred and twenty patients were enrolled (60 in each group). There was no significant difference in demographic data to include baseline vaginal pain. Postoperative vaginal pain scores were significantly lower in the liposomal/bupivacaine group versus the plain bupivacaine group. Scores are reported as medians on POD 1 (liposomal 0 [0-2], plain 2 [0-4], P = 0.03), POD 2 (liposomal 2 [1-4], plain 3 [2-5], P = 0.05), and POD 3 (liposomal 2 [1-4], plain 3 [2-5], P = 0.02). As expected, vaginal pain scores increased from POD 1 to POD 2, 3 in both groups. There was a significant decrease in ibuprofen (P = 0.01) and acetaminophen (P = 0.03) usage in the liposomal group; however, no significance in total opioid consumption through POD 3 (P = 0.82). There was no difference in successful voiding trials (liposomal 72%, plain 82%, P = 0.30), return of bowel function (P > 0.99), or quality of life factors (sleep, stress, mood, and activity).

CONCLUSION: Preoperative regional pudendal anesthesia with a combination of liposomal and plain bupivacaine provided more effective vaginal pain control versus plain bupivacaine alone for reconstructive surgery that included posterior colporrhaphy. Given notable benefit, this block should be considered for multi-modal pain reduction in this patient population.
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13 The impact of preoperative pelvic pain on outcomes after vaginal reconstructive surgery
E. C. Sappenfield, P. Tulikangas, R. Wang
Hartford Hospital, Hartford, CT

OBJECTIVES: To compare outcomes after vaginal reconstructive surgery between women with and without preoperative pelvic pain.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Baseline and postoperative data were analyzed from the Outcomes Following Vaginal Prolapse Repair and Midurethral Sling (OPUS) multicenter trial. The trial involves women with anterior prolapse without symptoms of stress incontinence randomized to receive either a midurethral sling (MUS) or sham incisions during surgery. Participants completed the visual analogue pain scale adapted for suprapubic pain (VAS) and Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory (PFDI) questionnaire at baseline, 3 months, and 12 months. Preoperative pelvic pain was defined as a response of “5” or greater on pain VAS or answering “moderately” or “quite a bit” on the PFDI question “do you usually experience pain in the lower abdomen or genital area?” Outcomes and complication rates were compared between women with and without pelvic pain.

RESULTS: OPUS participants included 112 women with pelvic pain (58 had MUS and 54 had sham incisions) and 212 women without pelvic pain (105 had MUS and 107 had sham incisions). Women who had a MUS and pelvic pain were younger than women without pelvic pain (60.3 ± 12.1 vs 65.1 ± 8.6; P < 0.001). Women who had sham incisions and pelvic pain were more likely of Hispanic ethnicity than those without pelvic pain (27.8% vs 9.4%; P < 0.001). Women with pelvic pain had greater improvement on pain VAS scores post-surgery at 3 months (-3.1 ± 2.9 vs -0.4 ± 1.6, P < 0.001) and at 12 months (-3.4 ± 3.0 vs -0.6 ± 1.6, P < 0.001) compared to those without pain. Similar improvements were present on the PFDI and pelvic floor impact questionnaires. The differences observed were not affected by whether women were in the MUS or sham arm of the trial. Urinary tract infection, mesh erosion, and incomplete bladder emptying did not differ between groups.

CONCLUSION: Women with preoperative pelvic pain experience significant improvements in pain and pelvic floor symptoms with vaginal reconstructive surgery. Reassuringly, performance of a MUS did not have an impact on these results.
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14 Development and validation of the value of uterus (VALUS) instrument for women undergoing pelvic organ prolapse surgery
O. H. Chang, M. D. Walters, M. Yao, B. Lapin
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OBJECTIVES: Currently, there are no validated instruments to quantify a woman’s valuation of her uterus. The objective of this study was to develop a reliable and valid instrument to measure a patient’s value of her uterus.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Value of Uterus (VALUS) is a 9-question instrument that was developed based on existing literature and the authors’ experience with uterine preservation (Figure 1). For content validity, VALUS was reviewed by 2 OB/GYN specialists and 6