**Table 1**: Comparison of clinical, operative and pathological characteristics of 135 patients with pelvic organ prolapse treated with laparoscopic promontofixation. Values are median (IQR) or frequency (proportion).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Promontory fixation  N= 45 | No promontory fixation  N= 92 | p | All population |
| Age at surgery *F* |  |  |  |  |
| Comorbidity *G*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Natural childbirth *I*  0  1  2  3  ≥ 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Cesarian childbirth *J*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Weight of heaviest baby *K*  < 4000g  ≥ 4000g |  |  |  |  |
| History of hysterectomy *M*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| History of prolapse surgery *O*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| BMI *W*  BMI< 25 (normal)  BMI 25 – 30  BMI> 30 (obese) |  |  |  |  |
| POPQ anterior *AG*  ≤ 1  ≥ 2 |  |  |  |  |
| POPQ medium *AH*  ≤ 1  ≥ 2 |  |  |  |  |
| POPQ posterior *AI*  ≤ 1  ≥ 2 |  |  |  |  |
| TVL preop (cm) *AF* |  |  |  |  |
| UI  SUI AN  Masqued UI AO  Mixte UI AP  No UI  Missing |  |  |  |  |

**Table 2**: Comparison of radiological data on recto-colpo-cystogram before surgery of 135 patients with pelvic organ prolapse treated with laparoscopic promontofixation. Values are median (IQR) or frequency (proportion).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Promontory fixation  N= 45 | No promontory fixation  N= 92 | p | All population |
| Cystocele *AY*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Hysteroptose/ Colpoptose *AZ*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Rectocele *BA*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Enterocele *BC*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Fond vaginal in action *AW* Missing |  |  |  |  |
| Rectocele in action *BF*  Missing |  |  |  |  |

**Table 3**: Comparison of surgical data of 135 patients with pelvic organ prolapse treated with laparoscopic promontofixation. Values are median (IQR) or frequency (proportion).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Promontory fixation  N= 45 | No promontory fixation  N= 92 | p | All population |
| Technique *I*  PF  PF + other (hysterectomy) |  |  |  |  |
| Operating time G |  |  |  |  |
| UI.treatment *J*  Yes  No |  |  |  |  |
| Prothesis material *R*  Polypropylene  Mersilen  Polypropylen |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-up *H* |  |  |  |  |
| Per operative complication |  |  |  |  |
| Post operative complication |  |  |  |  |
| Re-intervention for complication |  |  |  |  |

Table 4: results after surgery of 135 patients with pelvic organ prolapse treated with laparoscopic promontofixation. Values are median (IQR) or frequency (proportion).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Promontory fixation  N= 45 | No promontory fixation  N= 92 | p | All population |
| **Anatomic results**  POPQ ant *T*  0-1  2-4  POPQ med *U*  median  0 – 1  2 – 4  POPQ post *V*  (nombre de 0 + 1 ou 2+3+4)  0 – 1  2 – 4  TVL preop (cm) *R* |  |  |  |  |
| **Radiologic results:**  Cystocele *AR*  Yes  No  Hysteroptose/ Colpoptose *AS*  Yes  No  Rectocele *AT*  Yes  No  Elytrocele *AU*  Yes  No  Rectocele in action *BF*  Missing  Descending perineum *BJ*  Yes  No  Missing |  |  |  |  |
| **Subjective results:**  Patient’s satisfaction (Yes/ Yes/ Yes) *AE+AF+AG*  Constipation de novo or increased  Dyschesie de novo or increased  Hands helping |  |  |  |  |

Table 4: Reasons of re-operations:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reasons of re-operation** | **Number of cases**  **(% on total number of reinterventions)** |
|  |  |