

Abstract 2022-RA-463-ESGO Table 1

| Comparative table of diagnostic and test results before and after Brachytherapy |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
|---|------------|-----------------|-------|-------------|---|-------------|--------------------|---------|-------|
|   | Value      | Cervical Cancer |       |             | p | Value       | Endometrial cancer |         |       |
|   |            | Min             | Max   |             |   | Min         | Max                |         | p     |
| Age, mean(SD)   | 44(13)     | 21              | 77    |             |   | 56(7)       | 45                 | 66      |       |
| BM, mean(SD)  | 28(6.7)    | 14.9            | 50.39 |             |   | 30.8(6.9)   | 18.6               | 42.8    |       |
| Mean age of first sexual relationship (SD)                                      | 18(4)      | 13              | 38    |             |   | 20(4)       | 14                 | 25      |       |
| Domestic violence, n(%)   |            |                 |       | 0.149       |   |             |                    |         | 0.149 |
| Witness   | 12(28%)    |                 |       |             |   | 5(42%)      |                    |         |       |
| Victim  | 12(28%)    |                 |       |             |   | 6(50%)      |                    |         |       |
| Aggressor   | 7(16%)     |                 |       |             |   | 2(18%)      |                    |         |       |
| Total score SyDSF, mean(SD)   |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Before BT   | 16.1(5)    | 7               | 31    |             |   | 16(3.5)     | 9                  | 22      |       |
| After BT  | 15.3(5.7)  | 3               | 29    |             |   | 17(4.9)     | 7                  | 24      |       |
| Total score CIDQ, mean(SD)  |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Before BT   | 17.4(3.8)  | 13              | 28    | 0.735       |   | 19.7(5.4)   | 14                 | 32      | 0.044 |
| After BT  | 17.7(4)    | 14              | 31    |             |   | 17(3.5)     | 14                 | 26      |       |
| Total score PHQ15, mean(SD)   |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Before BT   | 8(5.9)     | 0               | 24    | 0.080       |   | 6.9(3.9)    | 3                  | 17      | 0.235 |
| After BT  | 6.5(4.4)   | 0               | 18    |             |   | 5.2(2.1)    | 2                  | 9       |       |
| Physical symptoms, n(%)   |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Physical symptoms presence, before  | 30(70%)    |                 |       | 0.332       |   | 9(75%)      |                    |         | 1.000 |
| Physical symptoms presence, after   | 25(58%)    |                 |       |             |   | 8(67%)      |                    |         |       |
| FACT-G, mean(SD)  |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Physical Well-being, before   | 19.3(6.8)  | 0               | 28    | 0.271       |   | 24.3(2.6)   | 20                 | 28      | 0.893 |
| Physical Well-being, after  | 21.6(6.1)  | 0               | 28    |             |   | 24.1(3)     | 19                 | 28      |       |
| Social/Family Well-being, before  | 22.3(7.5)  | 10              | 28    | 0.004       |   | 21.5(6.1)   | 10                 | 30      | 0.505 |
| Social/Family Well-being, after   | 20.3(3.5)  | 9               | 28    |             |   | 20.3(5.8)   | 11                 | 33      |       |
| Emotional Well-being, before  | 15.4(5.6)  | 3               | 24    | 0.043       |   | 17.5(3.8)   | 12                 | 24      | 0.324 |
| Emotional Well-being, after   | 16.9(5)    | 4               | 24    |             |   | 18.6(4.7)   | 10                 | 24      |       |
| Functional Well-being, before   | 19.1(5.7)  | 5               | 28    | 0.913       |   | 21.1(3.5)   | 16                 | 28      | 0.755 |
| Functional Well-being, after  | 19.1(5.1)  | 7               | 28    |             |   | 20.9(3.5)   | 13                 | 27      |       |
| Total score before Brachytherapy  | 16.2(3.1)  | 31              | 101   | 0.530       |   | 84.5(11.2)  | 68                 | 100     | 0.844 |
| Total score after Brachytherapy   | 77.8(14.5) | 33              | 104   |             |   | 84.1(12.9)  | 62                 | 105     |       |
| Total score PHQ9, mean(SD)  |            |                 |       |             |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Before BT   | 7.4(2.6)   | 0               | 26    | 0.105       |   | 5(5)        | 0                  | 13      | 0.413 |
| After BT  | 5.6(5)     | 0               | 20    |             |   | 3.3         | 0                  | 11      |       |
| Depression PHQ9, n(%)   |            |                 |       | 0.361/0.713 |   |             |                    |         |       |
| Minimal depression, before  | 20(47%)    |                 |       |             |   | 7(58%)      |                    |         |       |
| Minimal depression, after   | 20(47%)    |                 |       |             |   | 8(67%)      |                    |         |       |
| Mild depression, before   | 10(23%)    |                 |       |             |   | 1(8%)       |                    |         |       |
| Mild depression, after  | 14(33%)    |                 |       |             |   | 2(17%)      |                    |         |       |
| Moderate depression, before   | 7(16%)     |                 |       |             |   | 4(33%)      |                    |         |       |
| Moderate depression, after  | 7(16%)     |                 |       |             |   | 2(17%)      |                    |         |       |
| Moderately severe depression, before  | 2(5%)      |                 |       |             |   | 0           |                    |         |       |
| Moderately severe depression, after   | 1(2%)      |                 |       |             |   | 0           |                    |         |       |
| Severe, before  | 4(9%)      |                 |       |             |   | 0           |                    |         |       |
| Severe, after   | 1(2%)      |                 |       |             |   | 0           |                    |         |       |
| Total score HPV, mean(SD)   | 01.2(14.1) | 68              | 124   |             |   | 103.3(12.1) | 79.000             | 120.000 |       |

**Conclusion** Sexual dysfunction in gynecological neoplasms has been reported to be as high as 90% in this preliminary analysis; receiving brachytherapy did not significantly modify the prevalence before or after its application. It is important to identify the psychosocial factors in each patient's context to intervene in a timely manner and that each of the women with an oncologic pathology is evaluated in a comprehensive manner.

## 2022-RA-465-ESGO PELVIC EXENTERATION WITH NEUROVASCULAR AND BONY RESECTIONS FOR GYNAECOLOGICAL TUMOURS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

<sup>1</sup>Andreas Denys, <sup>1</sup>Sofie Thielemans, <sup>1,2</sup>Rawand Salihi, <sup>1</sup>Gwen Sys, <sup>1</sup>Philippe Tummers, <sup>1</sup>Gabrielle H van Ramshorst. <sup>1</sup>Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium; <sup>2</sup>AZ Sint-Lucas, Ghent, Belgium

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.840

**Introduction/Background** Pelvic exenteration (PE) with neurovascular or bony resections can be curative in gynaecological oncology, but has significant impact on quality of life (QoL) and high morbidity. The primary outcome of this systematic review was the QoL and secondary outcomes included morbidity and mortality after PE with neurovascular or bony resections.

**Methodology** The protocol was registered in PROSPERO, and included specific search strategies for PubMed, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, Google Scholar, Web of Science and ClinicalTrials.gov. Studies published from 1966 onwards reporting on QoL of patients who underwent PE with neurovascular or bony resections were considered eligible. Study selection, data extraction, rating of evidence (GRADE) and risk of bias (ROBINS-I) were performed independently by two reviewers using Rayyan.

**Results** Of 341 identified records, 10 studies on 89 patients were included: 1 prospective study, 6 retrospective studies, and 3 case reports. All studies were very low quality with an overall serious risk of bias. The primary tumour was located in the cervix (n=42), uterus (n=22), vulva (n=11), vagina (n=3), ovary (n=3), Gartner duct (n=1) or synchronous tumours (n=3). For 4 patients the primary tumour was not reported. Bony resections included the pubic (n=11) and pelvic bone (n=9), hemipelvectomy (n=7), sacrectomy (n=2) and the transverse process of L5 (n=1). Margins were negative in 69 patients and were not reported for 6 patients. 14 patients had positive margins (R1: n=6; R2: n=3; 'positive': n=5). 30-day mortality was 1.1% (1/89). 3 studies reported on improved QoL after surgery, of which only one used a validated QoL questionnaire. Most frequently reported complications were infectious.

**Conclusion** Despite the sparsity of published studies, QoL seems to be improved after PE with neurovascular or bony resections in a highly selected patient group. There is a need for collecting QoL outcomes in a validated and uniform manner.

## 2022-RA-570-ESGO GYNECOLOGICAL CANCER TREATMENT AND COUPLE'S SEXUALITY

Krzysztof Nowosielski, Beata Wróbel, Aleksandra Pałka, Filip Dąbrowski. Department of Gynecology, Obstetrics and Gynecological Oncology, Medical University of Silesia, University Clinical Center, Katowice, Poland

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.841

**Introduction/Background** The aim of the study was to explore changes occurring in couples' sexuality after gynecological cancer treatment and to extract those areas that should be thoroughly investigated in study designed to propose interventions to improve couples' sexuality after cancer.

**Methodology** 69 gynecological cancer survivors were eligible for this pilot retrospective cohort study. During the control visit BETTER model was used for sexual counselling. DSM-5 criteria were used to assess female and male sexual dysfunction. Changes in Sexual Function Questionnaire (CSFQ) and Female Sexual Distress Scale (FSDS-R) was used to assess couples' sexuality after treatment.

**Results** 30 couples were finally included in the study. Six women met the DSM-5 criteria for sexual dysfunction (20.0%). However, sexual distress (FSDS-R) was noted in 46.7%, sexual problems (CSFQ) – in 56.7%. Women survivors had worse attitudes toward sex (3.73 vs 4.48), lower sexual quality of life (63.3 vs 78.55), lower scores in arousal/excitement domain of CSFQ (7.43 vs 10.75), worse perception of their body during sex (1.36 vs 0.72) and lower sexual satisfaction both in self-concentrated and partner-concentrated domain (24.4 vs 53.5 and 28.6 vs 32.1, respectively) compared to male partners. Ten men reported Erectile Dysfunction. A decrease in importance of sex (2.7 vs 3.5), frequency of mutual masturbation (1.9 vs 3.2), and orgasm (2.9 vs 6.9) was showed. A lower satisfaction from women as a lover (3.2 vs 4.3), from sex (3.6 vs 4.1) and lower frequency of orgasm (3.8 vs 7.7) was seen in partners.

**Conclusion** Treatment of gynecological cancer does not decrease frequency of sexual activity but causes changes in its diversity. Differences in perception of sexual function, needs, satisfaction and sexual activity between woman and partner