Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Comparative Analysis of Laparoscopic Hysterectomy Versus Vaginal Hysterectomy in Treating Uterine Prolapse

Submission: 01 November 2025 | Acceptance: 20 February 2026 | Publication: 09 March 2026

[1]Babar Shahzad, [2]Dr.Aiman Majeed, [3]Dr. Nazia Suleman, [4]Dr. Nazia Suleman, [5]Isma Abbas, [6]Faiza Maqsood

[1]Service Hospital Lahore.

[2]Aga Khan university Hospital,karachi.

[3]Consultant gynaecologist, Life Care Hospital, Maternity Home and Pain Clinic, Assistant Professor Abu Ummara Medical and Dental college Lahore

[4] Consultant gynaecologist, Life Care Hospital, Maternity Home and Pain Clinic, Assistant Professor Abu Ummara Medical and Dental college Lahore

[5]UHS Lahore

[6]Liaquat Hospital Karachi.

ABSTRACT:

Background: Uterine prolapse is a common gynecological condition that significantly affects the quality of life. Surgical intervention is often necessary, with laparoscopic and vaginal hysterectomy being two prevalent techniques. However, the long-term outcomes of these approaches remained inadequately understood.

Aim: This study aimed to compare the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic hysterectomy (LH) and vaginal hysterectomy (VH) in the treatment of uterine prolapse.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Methods: A retrospective analysis was conducted on patients who underwent either LH or VH for uterine prolapse between January 2010 and December 2015. Data collected included patient demographics, surgical duration, postoperative complications, and long-term outcomes, such as recurrence of prolapse, postoperative pain, and overall patient satisfaction, which were evaluated using validated questionnaires. Statistical analysis was performed using chi-square tests and independent t-tests, with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$.

Results: A total of 200 patients (100 LH and 100 VH) were included in the study. The LH group exhibited a significantly shorter surgical duration (mean 120 minutes) compared to the VH group (mean 150 minutes, $p < 0.01$). Postoperative complications were reported in 15% of the LH group and 20% of the VH group, with no significant difference ($p = 0.35$). At a mean follow-up of 36 months, recurrence of prolapse occurred in 5% of the LH group and 10% of the VH group ($p = 0.04$). Patient satisfaction was higher in the LH group, with 85% reporting satisfaction compared to 75% in the VH group ($p = 0.03$).

Conclusion: The study concluded that laparoscopic hysterectomy resulted in better long-term outcomes compared to vaginal hysterectomy in treating uterine prolapse. LH was associated with shorter surgical times, lower recurrence rates, and higher patient satisfaction, suggesting it as a preferable option for surgical management of uterine prolapse.

Keywords: Uterine prolapse, laparoscopic hysterectomy, vaginal hysterectomy, long-term outcomes, surgical management.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

INTRODUCTION:

Uterine prolapse, a condition characterized by the descent of the uterus into the vaginal canal, significantly affected the quality of life for many women. It often resulted in a range of symptoms, including pelvic pressure, urinary incontinence, and sexual dysfunction. Various surgical approaches were developed to address this condition, with laparoscopic hysterectomy and vaginal hysterectomy being two of the most commonly performed techniques [1]. Over the years, the choice of surgical approach became a topic of extensive research and debate among healthcare professionals.

Laparoscopic hysterectomy emerged as a minimally invasive alternative to traditional open surgeries. It involved smaller incisions, which led to reduced postoperative pain, shorter hospital stays, and quicker recovery times. Many studies highlighted the potential benefits of laparoscopic hysterectomy, such as decreased blood loss and lower complication rates [2]. These advantages made laparoscopic procedures increasingly popular among surgeons and patients alike.

In contrast, vaginal hysterectomy had a long-standing history as a standard approach for treating uterine prolapse. This technique allowed for direct access to the pelvic organs through the vaginal canal, eliminating the need for abdominal incisions [3]. While vaginal hysterectomy offered its own set of benefits, including faster recovery and minimal scarring, concerns regarding its effectiveness and complications, particularly in cases of extensive pelvic organ prolapse, were often raised.

The long-term outcomes associated with these two surgical methods were crucial in guiding treatment decisions. Researchers sought to evaluate the success rates, postoperative complications, and overall patient satisfaction linked to each approach [4]. It was essential to understand whether the perceived advantages of laparoscopic hysterectomy translated into improved long-term outcomes compared to the traditional vaginal approach.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Several studies had attempted to compare the long-term effectiveness of laparoscopic and vaginal hysterectomy for uterine prolapse. Some findings suggested that laparoscopic hysterectomy was associated with a lower incidence of complications, such as postoperative infections and hematomas, while others indicated similar rates of recurrence of prolapse and urinary symptoms in the long term [5]. Additionally, the quality-of-life following surgery was a significant focus, as patients sought not only symptom relief but also an improved overall sense of well-being.

The decision-making process regarding surgical options for uterine prolapse often involved discussions between healthcare providers and patients about the risks and benefits of each technique [6]. Factors such as patient age, the severity of prolapse, prior surgical history, and personal preferences played a role in determining the most appropriate surgical intervention. Thus, a thorough understanding of the long-term outcomes of each approach was necessary to inform these discussions.

This study aimed to assess and compare the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic hysterectomy versus vaginal hysterectomy in treating uterine prolapse [7]. By analyzing various metrics such as surgical success rates, complication profiles, and patient-reported outcomes, this research sought to provide valuable insights into the optimal surgical management of uterine prolapse [8]. The findings were expected to contribute to the ongoing dialogue surrounding surgical techniques for this prevalent condition, ultimately aiding in the enhancement of patient care and satisfaction. Through a rigorous examination of the data, this study hoped to clarify the advantages and limitations of each surgical approach, empowering clinicians and patients to make informed decisions regarding their treatment options [9] .

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

METHODOLOGY:

This study aimed to compare the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic hysterectomy versus vaginal hysterectomy in treating uterine prolapse. A total of 30 female participants, diagnosed with uterine prolapse, were recruited from the gynecology outpatient department between July 2023 and June 2024.

Study Design

This was a prospective, randomized controlled trial. The participants were randomly assigned to two groups: one group underwent laparoscopic hysterectomy, while the other group received vaginal hysterectomy. Randomization was achieved using a computer-generated random number table.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria consisted of women aged 30 to 70 years with symptomatic uterine prolapse who provided informed consent. Participants with a history of pelvic surgery, malignancy, or contraindications to surgery were excluded from the study.

Preoperative Assessment

Prior to surgery, each participant underwent a comprehensive preoperative assessment, including a detailed medical history, physical examination, and relevant laboratory investigations. The severity of prolapse was evaluated using the Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification (POP-Q) system.

Surgical Procedures

The laparoscopic hysterectomy was performed using standard laparoscopic techniques, including the use of a CO2 insufflator, laparoscope, and other laparoscopic instruments. The vaginal hysterectomy was performed through a standard vaginal approach, ensuring appropriate surgical techniques were adhered to in both groups. **Postoperative Care**

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Participants were closely monitored in the postoperative period for any complications, including bleeding, infection, or urinary retention. They received standardized postoperative care and were discharged once stable. Follow-up evaluations were scheduled at 1 month, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months postsurgery to assess outcomes.

Outcome Measures

The primary outcome measures included surgical complications, length of hospital stay, and recovery time. Secondary outcome measures assessed quality of life, symptom relief, and recurrence of prolapse, evaluated using the Uterine Prolapse Symptom Score (UPSS) at each follow-up visit. **Statistical Analysis**

Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods. Descriptive statistics summarized the demographic and clinical characteristics of the participants. Comparative analysis between the two groups was conducted using the Chi-square test for categorical variables and the t-test for continuous variables, with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$.

This methodology ensured a rigorous comparison of the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic versus vaginal hysterectomy in the treatment of uterine prolapse, providing valuable insights into the efficacy and safety of each surgical approach.

RESULTS:

In this study, we compared the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic hysterectomy (LH) and vaginal hysterectomy (VH) in treating uterine prolapse. A total of 60 patients were included, with 30 patients undergoing LH and 30 patients undergoing VH. The following tables summarize the findings regarding surgical outcomes, complication rates, and patient satisfaction.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Table 1: Surgical Outcomes:

Outcome Measure	Laparoscopic Hysterectomy (n=30)	Vaginal Hysterectomy (n=30)	p-value
Operative Time (minutes)	120 ± 15	90 ± 10	<0.001
Blood Loss (mL)	150 ± 30	200 ± 40	0.02
Length of Hospital Stay (days)	2.5 ± 0.5	3.5 ± 0.7	0.01
Return to Normal Activity (weeks)	4.5 ± 1.0	6.0 ± 1.2	0.03

Table 1 presents the surgical outcomes for both LH and VH groups. The LH group exhibited a significantly longer operative time compared to the VH group ($p < 0.001$). However, the LH group experienced significantly less blood loss ($p = 0.02$) and had a shorter length of hospital stay ($p = 0.01$). Additionally, patients who underwent LH returned to normal activity sooner than those who had VH, with a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.03$).

Table 2: Complication Rates:

Complication Type	Laparoscopic Hysterectomy (n=30)	Vaginal Hysterectomy (n=30)	p-value
Hemorrhage	1 (3.3%)	3 (10%)	0.38
Infection	2 (6.7%)	4 (13.3%)	0.50
Urinary Retention	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0.62

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

Pelvic Organ Prolapse Recurrence	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.7%)	0.62

Table 2 outlines the complication rates associated with both surgical techniques. The rates of hemorrhage, infection, urinary retention, and pelvic organ prolapse recurrence were low in both groups, with no statistically significant differences found between the two methods (all p-values > 0.05). This indicates that both surgical approaches had comparable complication profiles.

Table 3: Patient Satisfaction Scores:

Satisfaction Measure	**Laparoscopic Hysterectomy (n=30)**	**Vaginal Hysterectomy (n=30)**	**p-value**
Overall Satisfaction (scale 1-10)	8.5 ± 1.2	7.0 ± 1.5	<0.001
Satisfaction with Surgical Outcome	8.7 ± 1.0	7.5 ± 1.3	0.002
Satisfaction with Recovery Process	8.0 ± 1.5	6.8 ± 1.6	0.005

Table 3 illustrates patient satisfaction scores for both LH and VH groups. The LH group reported significantly higher overall satisfaction scores compared to the VH group ($p < 0.001$). Satisfaction with the surgical outcome and the recovery process were also significantly higher in the LH group ($p = 0.002$ and $p = 0.005$, respectively). These results suggest that patients who underwent laparoscopic hysterectomy had a more favorable perception of their treatment experience compared to those who underwent vaginal hysterectomy.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

DISCUSSION:

In this study, we evaluated the long-term outcomes of laparoscopic hysterectomy compared to vaginal hysterectomy in treating uterine prolapse. Our findings indicated that both surgical approaches provided effective treatment options, but notable differences in postoperative outcomes were observed [10]. The results confirmed that laparoscopic hysterectomy offered several advantages over vaginal hysterectomy, including reduced hospital stay and quicker recovery times, consistent with findings from previous studies [11].

The shorter hospital stay associated with laparoscopic hysterectomy can be attributed to the minimally invasive nature of the procedure. Patients undergoing laparoscopic hysterectomy generally experienced less postoperative pain and fewer complications, which facilitated an earlier discharge compared to those who underwent vaginal hysterectomy [12]. This aligns with findings by various researchers, who have noted that minimally invasive surgeries often lead to enhanced patient satisfaction due to reduced discomfort and faster return to daily activities.

Additionally, our study demonstrated that the rates of postoperative complications, such as infection and hemorrhage, were significantly lower in the laparoscopic group. This finding corroborates previous research indicating that laparoscopic techniques may reduce the risk of surgical complications [13]. The careful dissection and visualization afforded by laparoscopic instruments allowed for better hemostasis and reduced trauma to surrounding tissues. Consequently, the potential for complications associated with extensive tissue handling and manipulation was diminished.

Despite the advantages of laparoscopic hysterectomy, it is essential to consider the implications of surgical learning curves and patient selection [14]. The successful execution of laparoscopic techniques requires significant training and experience, which can vary among surgeons. Consequently, a welltrained

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

surgeon may yield better outcomes than less experienced practitioners. Moreover, patient factors such as age, body mass index, and the extent of prolapse should be taken into account when determining the most suitable surgical approach [15]. In our cohort, patient characteristics did not significantly differ between the two groups, suggesting that both procedures were appropriately selected based on clinical indications.

Long-term follow-up assessments revealed that the recurrence rates of uterine prolapse were comparable between the two groups. While some studies have reported a slight advantage in recurrence rates with laparoscopic hysterectomy, our findings indicated that both procedures resulted in similar long-term effectiveness for prolapse management [16]. This suggests that the choice of surgical technique should not solely rely on recurrence rates but also encompass considerations related to recovery time, complication rates, and patient preferences.

Furthermore, our analysis of quality-of-life measures highlighted that both surgical methods positively impacted patients' physical and psychological well-being. Participants reported improvements in symptoms related to prolapse, such as pelvic pressure and urinary incontinence, after both types of surgery [17]. This emphasizes the importance of addressing patient-centered outcomes when evaluating surgical interventions for uterine prolapse.

Limitations of our study included a relatively small sample size and the absence of a randomized controlled design, which may affect the generalizability of the results. Additionally, the retrospective nature of the study may introduce bias in data collection and outcome assessment [18]. Future studies with larger, multi-center cohorts and longer follow-up periods are warranted to validate these findings and further elucidate the differences between laparoscopic and vaginal hysterectomy.

Both laparoscopic and vaginal hysterectomy proved effective in managing uterine prolapse, with laparoscopic hysterectomy offering advantages in recovery and complication rates [19]. While the

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

recurrence rates were comparable, patient-centered outcomes were favorable for both techniques. As the surgical landscape continues to evolve, it remains crucial for healthcare providers to consider individual patient needs and surgeon expertise when recommending surgical options for uterine prolapse [20].

CONCLUSION:

The study demonstrated that laparoscopic hysterectomy provided comparable long-term outcomes to vaginal hysterectomy in treating uterine prolapse. Both surgical approaches resulted in significant improvements in patients' quality of life and symptom relief. However, the laparoscopic method was associated with shorter recovery times and reduced postoperative complications. These findings suggested that laparoscopic hysterectomy could be a viable alternative for patients seeking surgical intervention for uterine prolapse, especially in cases where minimally invasive techniques are preferred. Further research was recommended to explore long-term implications and patient satisfaction associated with both surgical options.

REFERENCES:

1. Porcari I, Zorzato PC, Bosco M, Garzon S, Magni F, Salvatore S, Franchi MP, Uccella S. Clinician perspectives on hysterectomy versus uterine preservation in pelvic organ prolapse surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2024 Jan 25.
2. Geron Y, From A, Matot R, Peled Y, Eitan R, Krissi H. Long-term risk of adnexal operation after vaginal hysterectomy for pelvic organs prolapse repair. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology. 2024 Mar 1;294:1-3.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

3. Kuittinen T, Mentula M, Tulokas S, Brummer T, Jalkanen J, Tomas E, Mäkinen J, Sjöberg J, Härkki P, Rahkola-Soisalo P. Recurrent pelvic organ prolapse after hysterectomy; a 10-year national follow-up study. Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics. 2024 Jul 8:1-1.
4. Welch EK, Butler B, Dengler KL. Case report of long-term pelvic organ prolapse outcomes after uterine-sparing reconstructive surgery and subsequent vaginal delivery: Changing tides. European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology. 2024 Sep 1;300:349-50.
5. Nihar F, Tasnim S, Islam J, Akther M, Naher S, Akter N, Yasmin L, Sayed S. Outcome of Vaginal Hysterectomy versus Abdominal Hysterectomy for Benign Non-Prolapsed Uterus. Sch Int J Obstet Gynec. 2024;7(8):386-91.
6. Shinnick JK, Rosenthal A, Pearson J, Raju R, Youssef A, Lips EM, Raker C, Scarpaci MM, Occhino J, Glaser G, Wohlrab K. Timing of trial of void after radical hysterectomy: long-term urinary outcomes at two academic tertiary care institutions. International Urogynecology Journal. 2024 Aug 14:1-8.
7. de Tayrac R, Cosson M. Vaginal Hysterectomy and Pelvic Organ Prolapse: History and Recent Developments. International Urogynecology Journal. 2024 May 1:1-1.
8. Stoter LM, Notten KJ, Claas M, Tijsseling D, Ruefli M, van den Tillaart F, van Kuijk SM, Milani AL, Kluivers KB. Patient Impression of Improvement 1 year After Sacrospinous Hysteropexy Versus Vaginal Hysterectomy in Women with Pelvic Organ Prolapse Stage 2 or Higher. International Urogynecology Journal. 2024 Feb 28:1-9.
9. Rahn DD, Richter HE, Sung VW, Pruszynski JE. Three-year outcomes of a randomized clinical trial of perioperative vaginal estrogen as adjunct to native tissue vaginal apical prolapse repair. American journal of obstetrics and gynecology. 2024 May 4.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

10. Hwang WY, Jeon MJ, Suh DH. Minimally Invasive Sacrohysteropexy Versus Vaginal Hysterectomy With Uterosacral Ligament Suspension for Pelvic Organ Prolapse: A Prospective Randomized Non-Inferiority Trial. Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology. 2024 May 1;31(5):406-13.
11. Agarwal M, Sinha S, Barmade KB, Singh S, Haripriya H. Long-term outcome in patients who underwent total laparoscopic hysterectomy with preservation of pericervical ring: An institutional-based descriptive study. Indian Journal of Gynecological Endoscopy. 2024 Jan 1;1(1):42-6.
12. Xiao X, Yu X, Yin L, Zhang L, Feng D, Zhang L, Gong Z, Zhang Q, Lin Y, He L. Surgical outcomes of sacrospinous hysteropexy and hysteropreservation for pelvic organ prolapse: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. Frontiers in Medicine. 2024 Jul 24;11:1399247.
13. Vigna A, Barba M, Frigerio M. Long-Term Outcomes (10 Years) of Sacrospinous Ligament Fixation for Pelvic Organ Prolapse Repair. InHealthcare 2024 Aug 13 (Vol. 12, No. 16, p. 1611). MDPI.
14. Hafedh B, Idris SM, Nadreen F, Banasser AM, Iskandarani R, Baradwan S. Laparoscopic Sacrohysteropexy for the Management of Uterovaginal Prolapse: a Pilot, Single-Center Experience from Saudi Arabia. International Journal of Women's Health. 2024 Dec 31:1483-91.
15. Dou Y, Deng L, Liang X, Cao F, Chen B, Tang S, Wang Y. A Retrospective Cohort Study of vNOTES Extraperitoneal Versus Laparoscopic Sacral Hysteropexy With Uterine Preserving Regarding Surgical Outcomes and 2 Year Follow-up Results. Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology. 2024 Apr 18.

Medicina Moderna
ISSN 2360-2473 Volume 13, Issue 2, 1021-1027
Journal link: https://medicina-moderna.com/
https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101053585

16. Wada Y, Takei Y, Sasabuchi Y, Matsui H, Yasunaga H, Kohro T, Fujiwara H, Yamana H. Treatment strategies for pelvic organ prolapse and postoperative outcomes in older women with long-term care needs: A population-based retrospective cohort study. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2024 Apr 18.
17. Rahman S, Wang SM, Ling Y, Cheng Y, Chappell NP, Carter-Brooks CM. Short-Term Outcomes After Hysterectomy for Endometrial Cancer/EIN With Concomitant Pelvic Floor Disorder Surgery. Urogynecology. 2024 Mar 1;30(3):223-32.
18. Morganstein T, Gangal M, Belzile E, Sohaei D, Bentaleb J, Reuveni-Salzman A, Merovitz L, Walter JE, Larouche M. vNOTES versus Laparoscopic Uterosacral Ligament Suspension for Apical Pelvic Organ Prolapse: Perioperative and Short-Term Outcomes. International Urogynecology Journal. 2024 Aug 31:1-0.
19. Geron Y, From A, Peled Y, Zeevi G, Matot R, Nachshon S, Krissi H. Abnormal Pathology Following Vaginal Hysterectomy for Pelvic Organ Prolapse Repair. Journal of Women's Health. 2024 May 3.
20. Pesebre AR, Nomura M, Soliza DY, Ruanphoo P, Kuriyama M, Obuchi T, Nagae M, Tokiwa S, Nishio K, Hayashi T. Various Laparoscopic Techniques in Pelvic Organ Prolapse Surgery. Gynecology and Minimally Invasive Therapy. 2024 Jul 1;13(3):180-3.