Prevalence and Associated Co-morbid Conditions of Urinary Incontinence in Frail Elderly Males

Nahla M. Zaki, Rania M. Abou-Hashem, Hala S. Sweed, Suzan Mounir Ali*

Geriatrics and Gerontology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, Egypt ***Corresponding author**: Suzan Mounir Ali, **Mobile**: 01113001688, **E-mail**: futuresuzan@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Urinary incontinence (UI) is considered one of the main geriatric giants and it is prevalent in elderly frail males as well as females.

Objective: To determine the prevalence and associated co morbid conditions of UI in frail older males.

Subjects and methods: A cross-sectional study was conducted in Ain-Shams Geriatrics Hospital. About 350 elderly males were screened for being frail using the clinical frailty scale. Among them, 120 frail older males were included in our study, they were screened for the presence of UI, its type, duration and severity using the Arabic version of International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Urinary Incontinence Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF). All participants were subjected to comprehensive geriatric assessment with assessment of cognition, depression, functional status, past medical history, associated co morbidities and laboratory investigations.

Results: The study participants had a mean age of 72.6 years, prevalence of UI was 50% and mixed UI was the most prevalent type. UI was significantly associated with older age, higher number of comorbidities, depression, functional impairment, pyuria, congestive heart failure, diabetes, osteoarthritis, chronic kidney disease, benign prostatic hyperplasia and chronic constipation, and only congestive heart failure, pyuria and depression were the independent predictors of UI. There was no significant relationship between type of UI and its severity while a significant relationship was between its duration and severity.

Conclusion: UI is one of the geriatric syndromes that commonly exists among frail older males affecting mood, function and quality of life.

Keywords: Co-morbidities, Frail older males, ICIQ-UI SF, Urinary incontinence.

INTRODUCTION

Urinary incontinence (UI) is major geriatric problem which is defined as: "complaint of involuntary loss of urine" ⁽¹⁾. Older people have the highest prevalence of UI, apart from those with special neurological disorders (e.g., spinal cord injury) ⁽²⁾. Its prevalence was 15-30% in community dwelling older adults and 50-80% of older people residing in nursing homes ⁽³⁾.

The type distribution of UI differs in the male population from the female population, most likely as a result of anatomical and pathophysiological variations. According to recent studies, urge incontinence (40–80%), mixed forms of urine incontinence (10–30%), and stress incontinence (10%) are the three most prevalent types of UI in men ⁽⁴⁾.

It is believed that UI and frailty have a mutual or bidirectional relationship. Incident UI in people over 65 has been linked to a two-fold increased risk of impairment in daily activities and poor performance on three physical tests, suggesting that new UI may be an early indicator of the onset of frailty because both conditions share similar underlying etiologies like neurological and musculoskeletal pathologies ⁽⁵⁾.

Frail older population are more susceptible to develop UI through interaction between physiological factors including the effect of aging and gender, and pathological factors as associated co-morbidities, medications, and functional impairment. Greater concern is given to co-morbidity, physical dysfunction, polypharmacy and environmental factors due to their significant role in the development of UI in the frail older people ⁽⁶⁾.

Many factors can lead to UI in older population as age, obesity, smoking, many co morbid conditions as diabetes mellitus, congestive heart stroke, depression, benign failure. prostatic hyperplasia, chronic kidney disease, renal stones, recurrent urinary tract infection, degenerative joint disease, constipation, all these comorbidities are common in the older adult population; and UI can be caused by, associated with or worsened by them. One study found that UI is dependently associated with having at least one geriatric condition in 60% of study participants, at least two in 29% and at least three in 13% (7).

The frequency of UI in men is around onethird that of women, but it increases to the same rate in fragile older men who are 80 years and older. Males are also underrepresented in clinical trials for behavioural, pharmacological, and surgical treatments ⁽⁸⁾. This under representation is unfortunate, because results from trials in frail women cannot be directly extrapolated to men for a variety of reasons: differences in comorbidity, differences in caregivers, benign prostatic disease, prostate cancer and risk of retention ⁽⁹⁾.

So the aim of this work is to determine the prevalence and associated co morbidities of UI in frail older males.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

A cross-sectional study, was conducted in Ain-Shams Geriatrics Hospital, about 350 elderly males who attended our Geriatrics Hospital were screened for being frail using the clinical frailty scale. Among them, 120 frail older males diagnosed by the clinical frailty scale were included in our study along a period of 6 months. Their age was sixty years and above. They were screened for the presence of urinary incontinence, its type and severity using the Arabic version of International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Urinary Incontinence Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF).

Exclusion criteria included patients with mild, moderate or severe dementia, catheterized patients, and terminally ill patients.

All participants were subjected to comprehensive geriatric assessment in the form of history taking, physical examination, routine laboratory investigation with urine analysis and body mass index (BMI), with the following assessment done: Screening for dementia: using the Arabic version of Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) ⁽¹⁰⁾. The MMSE was used for exclusion of older patients with cognitive impairment in our study. Screening for depression: using the Arabic version of Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS-15) ⁽¹¹⁾. Functional assessment: by using Activities of Daily Living (ADL) ⁽¹²⁾ and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL) ⁽¹³⁾.

Diagnosis of frailty was done by the clinical frailty scale (14). Assessment of urinary incontinence as the type of incontinence was determined through answering some questions ⁽¹⁵⁾: "do you have a strong urge that leakage can occur on the way to toilet? "does leakage occur at moments of increased pressure, for example, when sneezing or coughing?" and "does leakage of few drops occur all the time?". Accordingly, urge incontinence is the involuntary loss of urine associated with urgency. Stress incontinence is the involuntary loss of urine on physical effort or sneezing or coughing. Overflow incontinence is the loss of small amounts of urine in the symptomatic presence of over-distended bladder. Functional/ disability associated incontinence was considered in subjects that have involuntary loss of urine due to functional inability to reach toilet in time due to physical or mental impairment. Mixed incontinence, in our study, was the combination of two or more types of incontinence. The Arabic version of International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Urinary Incontinence; Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF) translated and validated by Hashim et al. (16), was used in the assessment of the severity of UI.

Ethical consent:

Informed consent was taken from every older male participating in this study. The study methodology was reviewed and approved by the Research Review Board of the Geriatrics and Gerontology Department and Ethical Committee of Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University. This work has been carried out in accordance with The Code of Ethics of the World Medical Association (Declaration of Helsinki) for studies involving humans.

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of data was performed by using the 17th version of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Description of all data was in the form of mean, standard deviation (SD), and range for all quantitative variables and as frequency and percentage for all qualitative variables. Comparison between quantitative variables was done using t-test, Comparison of qualitative variables was done using Chi square test. Correlations (r-value) were assessed by Spearman rank correlation to find relation between different variables. Multivariable techniques including logistic regression were used to evaluate the independent effect of each risk factor of urinary incontinence. $P \le 0.05$ was considered significant and P<0.01 highly significant.

RESULTS

The study participants had a mean age of 72.6 years, with a mean number of 3 comorbidities, about 55% were illiterate, 77% were smokers and 34% were obese. Most of them (87%) were married. Depression screening showed that almost 39% were depressed. Regarding frailty status, 60% were mildly frail, 29% were moderately frail, and almost 11% were severely frail.

Prevalence of UI was 50% and mixed urinary incontinence was the most prevalent type of incontinence among the studied population, followed by urge urinary incontinence (40%, 38.3% respectively) while mean duration of UI among the affected patients was 3.1 years.

In our study we found that participants with urinary incontinence, compared to those without, were significantly older, with higher number of co morbidities, more likely to have pyuria and had higher degree of functional impairment in both ADL, IADL (Table 1).

https://ejhm.journals.ekb.eg/

		Ur	inary incor	ntinen	-			
			Yes		No	Chi	Square	
		-	I (60)		N (60)	•		
		Ν	%	Ν	%	\mathbf{X}^2	P-value	
Age	Range		50-89		60-90	2.848	0.005*	
	Mean ±SD	74.5	50±7.810	70.7	717±6.904	2.010	0.000	
Number of	Range		1-7		1-12	3.431	0.001*	
comorbidities	Mean ±SD	3.83	1±1.714	2.6	95±1.878			
						\mathbf{X}^2	P-value	
Smoking	Yes	45	75.00	48	80.00	0.430	0.512	
Shioking	No	15	25.00	12	20.00	0.150	0.012	
Obesity	Yes	20	33.33	21	35.00	0.037	0.847	
Obesity	No	40	66.67	39	65.00	0.037	0.077	
							1	
	Independent	19	31.67	47	78.33			
ADL	Assisted	31	51.67	12	20.00	27.638	< 0.001*	
	Dependent	10	16.67	1	1.67			
Tota	l	60	100%	60	100%			
IADL	Assisted	38	63.33	56	93.33	15.908	< 0.001*	
IADL	Dependent	22	36.67	4	6.67	13.908	<0.001	
Total	l	60	100%	60	100%			
Drumio	Positive	24	40.00	2	3.33	23.764	< 0.001*	
Pyuria	Negative	36	60.00	58	96.67	25.704	<0.001	
Tota		60	100%	60	100%			
Prostatantam	Yes	4	6.67	4	6.67	0.000	1.000	
Prostatectomy	No	56	93.33	56	93.33	0.000	1.000	
Tota		60	100%	60	100%		·	
Spinal sugger-	Yes	4	6.67	1	1.67	1 070	0 171	
Spinal surgery	No	56	93.33	59	98.33	1.878	0.171	
Tota		60	100%	60	100%		·	

Table (1): Comparison between participants with and without urinary incontinence as regards demographic characteristics

UI; Urinary incontinence, ADL; Activities of daily living, IADL; Instrumental activities of daily living, *: Significant

It was also a significant relationship between UI and presence of depression (positive screening by GDS-15 (Table 2).

 Table (2): Relationship between urinary incontinence and depression (as detected by GDS-15)

			Chi-Square						
UI	D	epressed	Not	t depressed	Total		Total Cni-S		
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	\mathbf{X}^2	P-value	
Yes	34	72.34	26	35.62	60	50.00		<0.001*	
No	13	27.66	47	64.38	60	50.00	15.424		
Total	47	100.00	73	100.00	120	100.00			

GDS (15); Geriatric depression scale (15), UI; Urinary incontinence, *: Significant

On comparing associated co morbid conditions we found that congestive heart failure, diabetes, osteoarthritis, chronic kidney disease, benign prostatic hyperplasia and chronic constipation were significantly more prevalent in participants with urinary incontinence, compared to those without incontinence (Table 3)

https://ejhm.journals.ekb.eg/

Table (3): Comparison between participants with and without urinary incontinence as regards associated
comorbidities

comorbidities	-	I	UI						
Comorbidity		Yes N (60)]	No N (60)	Chi-Square			
		Ν	%	Ν	%	X ²	P-value		
Hypertension	Yes	32	53.33	27	45.00	0.834	0.361		
Hypertension	No		46.67	33	55.00	0.034	0.501		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Chronic	Yes	7	11.67	15	25.00	3.562	0.059		
liver disease	No	53	88.33	45	75.00	5.502	0.039		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Congestive	Yes	15	25.00	5	8.33	6.000	0.014*		
heart failure	No	45	75.00	55	91.67	0.000	0.014		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Diabetes	Yes	29	48.33	18	30.00	4.232	0.040*		
Diabetes	No	31	51.67	42	70.00	4.232	0.040		
Total	Total		100%	60	100%				
Osteoarthritis	Yes	26	43.33	14	23.33	5.400	0.020*		
No		34	56.67	46	76.67	5.400	0.020*		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Lumbar	Yes	7	11.67	5	8.33	0.370	0.543		
spondylosis	No	53	88.33	55	91.67	0.370	0.545		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Stralia	Yes	11	18.33	5	8.33	2.506	0.107		
Stroke	No	49	81.67	55	91.67	2.596	0.107		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
	Yes	8	13.33	4	6.67	1 401	0.224		
Recurrent UTI	No	52	86.67	56	93.33	1.481	0.224		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Danal -4	Yes	2	3.33	4	6.67	0.702	0.402		
Renal stones	No	58	96.67	56	93.33	0.702	0.402		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Chronic	Yes	14	23.33	5	8.33	5.075	0.024*		
kidney disease	No	46	76.67	55	91.67	5.065	0.024*		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
	Yes	34	56.67	12	20.00	17.072	<i>.</i> 0.001 ⊻		
BPH	No	26	43.33	48	80.00	17.062	<0.001*		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
Chronic	Yes	29	48.33	18	30.00	4.000	0.040*		
constipation	No	31	51.67	42	70.00	4.232	0.040*		
Total		60	100%	60	100%				
1000		50	10070	50	20070				

UI; Urinary incontinence, UTI; Urinary tract infections, BPH; Benign prostatic hyperplasia, *: Significant

On comparing medication use among our participants we found that use of diuretics, laxatives, antiplatelets, antidepressants, alpha-blockers or alpha reductase inhibitors was significantly more prevalent in participants with UI, compared to those without incontinence (Table 4).

https://ejhm.journals.ekb.eg/

				UI				
Medication			Yes		No	Chi-Square		
Weucation		N (60)		N (60)				
		Ν	%	Ν	%	\mathbf{X}^2	P-value	
ACEIs	Yes	17	28.33	10	16.67	2.342	0.126	
	No	43	71.67	50	83.33	2.342	0.120	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Diuretics	Yes	18	30.00	7	11.67	6.114	0.013*	
	No	42	70.00	53	88.33	0.114	0.015	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Laxatives		20	33.33	3	5.00	15.545	< 0.001*	
	No	40	66.67	57	95.00	15.545	<0.001	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Hypoglycemic	Yes	25	41.67	15	25.00	3.750	0.053	
agents	No	35	58.33	45	75.00	5.750	0.055	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Thyroxine	Yes	6	10.00	7	11.67	0.086	0.769	
-	No	54	90.00	53	88.33	0.000	0.709	
Total	1	60	100%	60	100%			
Antiplatelets	Yes	22	36.67	9	15.00	7.350	0.007*	
Antiplatelets	No	38	63.33	51	85.00	7.550	0.007	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Antidepressants	Yes	7	11.67	1	1.67	4.821	0.028*	
Antidepressants	No	53	88.33	59	98.33	4.021	0.028	
Total	1	60	100%	60	100%			
Alpha-blockers	Yes	17	28.33	3	5.00	11.760	0.001*	
-	No	43	71.67	57	95.00	11.700	0.001	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			
Alpha reductase	Yes	10	16.67	1	1.67	8.107	0.004*	
inhibitors	No	50	83.33	59	98.33	0.107	0.004	
Total	1	60	100%	60	100%			
Anticholinergics	Yes	2	3.33	0	0.00	2.034	0.154	
	No	58	96.67	60	100.00	2.034	0.134	
Total		60	100%	60	100%			

Table (4): Comparison between participants with and without urinary incontinence as regards medication use

UI; Urinary incontinence, ACEIs; Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, *: Significant

By using regression analysis to assess predictors of UI we found that the presence of pyuria, congestive heart failure and depression were the only independent predictors of UI (as a dependent factor) among our studied population (Table 5).

	Odds ratio	95.0% C.I.	P-value
Age	0.976	0.897-1.062	0.576
ADL	0.300	0.079-1.147	0.079
IADL	0.700	0.085-5.784	0.741
Pyuria	10.352	1.343-79.778	0.025*
Congestive heart failure	9.669	1.640-57.005	0.012*
Diabetes	0.386	0.006-23.887	0.651
Osteoarthritis	3.436	0.804-14.693	0.096
Chest disease	0.857	0.186-3.945	0.843
Chronic kidney disease	3.215	0.425-24.324	0.258
BPH	1.791	0.328-9.776	0.501
Chronic constipation	0.795	0.151-4.186	0.787
Number of comorbidities	1.738	0.852-3.544	0.129
Diuretics	1.534	0.283-8.297	0.620
Laxatives	5.645	0.562-56.724	0.142
Hypoglycemic agents	7.409	0.136-402.885	0.326
Antiplatelets	2.034	0.457-9.063	0.352
Antidepressants	0.155	0.006-4.198	0.268
Alpha-blockers	3.569	0.394-32.326	0.258
Alpha reductase inhibitors	9.512	0.364-248.333	0.176
GDS	8.298	1.855-37.128	0.006*

Table (5): Regression analysis to assess the predictors of urinary incontinence

ADL; Activities of daily living, IADL; Instrumental activities of daily living, BPH; Benign prostatic hyperplasia, GDS; Geriatric depression scale, *: Significant

Also there was no significant relationship between type of UI and its severity by using (ICIQ-UI SF) among the studied population, while there was a significant relationship between duration of UI and its severity being most severe in those with longer duration of incontinence (Tables 6,7).

	ICIQ-UI category											
Type of UI	Mild		Μ	oderate	e Severe Very Total		Severe		Chi	-Square		
	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%	X ²	P-value
Urge	7	77.78	8	36.36	6	26.09	2	33.33	23	38.33		
Stress	0	0.00	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	1.67		
Overflow	0	0.00	1	4.55	2	8.70	0	0.00	3	5.00		
Functional	0	0.00	4	18.18	4	17.39	1	16.67	9	15.00	10.612	0.562
Mixed	2	22.22	8	36.36	11	47.83	3	50.00	24	40.00		
Total	9	100.00	22	100.00	23	100.00	6	100.0 0	60	100.00		

Table (6): The relationship between type of UI and (ICIQ-UI SF) (Severity of Urinary Incontinence)

ICIQ; International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire, UI; Urinary incontinence

ICIQ-UI	UI Dı	ANOVA			
category	Range	Mean±SD	F	P-value	
Mild	1-5	1.667±0.411			
Moderate	0.5-10	3.114±0.631	3.460	0.022*	
Severe	0.5-7	3.283±0.516		0.022*	
Very severe	3-7	5.167±1.134			

ICIQ; International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire, UI; Urinary incontinence, *: Significant

DISCUSSION

Since UI is multifactorial in nature - being linked to lower urinary tract function , physical functioning, cognitive status, psychological distress, mobility, medical comorbidities, and medication use - it is a significant and extremely frequent health concern in older persons ⁽¹⁷⁾.

The prevalence of UI among our studied population was 50% (60 out of 120 frail older males). The mean duration of UI among the affected patients was 3.1 years. Similar to our study, where the entire study population were frail subjects, **Silva and D'Elboux**⁽¹⁸⁾ recruited prefrail and frail individuals, and showed a UI prevalence rate of 65%. Similarly, **Xu and Kane**⁽¹⁹⁾ study enrolled residents in nursing homes in Minnesota, who were more likely to be frail. They reported a UI prevalence rate of 65.8%.

This differs from the figure reported by **Wang** *et al.* ⁽²⁰⁾ in which the prevalence was 19% among a population of 440 males aged 80 years old and more. The forementioned study recruited communitydwelling older persons including frail and non-frail individuals, which may explain the lower reported UI prevalence rate compared to our study.

As regards the type of UI, our study found that mixed UI was the most prevalent type of UI among the studied population (40% of participants with UI), followed by urge UI (38.3%) however most of the studies have shown that urge UI is the most prevalent type of UI among older male ⁽²¹⁻²²⁾. As for our study, mixed UI was statistically analysed as the combination of 2 or more types of UI. In most cases, it was actually the combination of urge and functional UI. The large percentage of mixed UI was expected in this frail cohort with high mean age, impaired functional level and associated predisposing factors as associated comorbidities and medications.

In our study we found that subjects with UI were significantly older, expressing more depressive symptoms, had higher degrees of functional impairment in both ADLs and IADLs, and were more likely to have pyuria, in addition, incontinent subjects had significantly increased associated comorbidities. This goes with Siroky in his study, which investigated genitourinary changes with advancing age as reduced bladder capacity, increased uninhibited contractions, decreased urinary flow rate, and increased post-void residual urine volume, which can explain the association between UI and advancing age (23). Also significant relationship between UI and depression was observed in our study as were observed in Wang et al. (20) and Chen et al. (24) in their studies, which support same results.

The current study showed that ADL and IADL were significantly affected in patients with UI compared with those without incontinence. This goes in line with **Chen** *et al.* ⁽²⁴⁾ in their study. It was proposed that UI and functional decline are related

through different pathways: UI may predispose to disability due to increased risk of falls and fractures, functional impairment may lead to UI due to decreased ability to reach the toilet, both UI and functional decline share common underlying aetiologies (as neurological and cardiovascular), UI and disability have the multifactorial framework of geriatric syndromes, and UI may act as an early indicator of frailty ⁽²⁵⁾.

Presence of pyuria was more prevalent in incontinent subjects in our study. It remained significant after regression analysis which showed that pyuria was among the independent predictors of UI (OR=10.35). This was in agreement with Landi *et al.* ⁽¹⁷⁾ and Shamliyan *et al.* ⁽²⁶⁾.

In the current study, there was a positive relationship between UI and number of co-morbidities, where participants with UI had significantly higher number of comorbidities. Incontinent group had mean number of 3.8 comorbidities this was confirmed also by **Vetrano** *et al.* ⁽²⁷⁾, in their study.

UI in the current study was associated with several co morbid conditions as the prevalence rates of congestive heart failure (CHF), diabetes mellitus (DM), osteoarthritis, benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH), chronic constipation and chronic kidney disease (CKD), which were significantly higher in participants with UI, compared to those without UI. This goes with the results shown from different studies to confirm such associations ⁽²⁸⁻³⁰⁾.

Regarding the relation of medications use with UI, the current study showed that use of diuretics, antidepressants, laxatives, alpha-blockers, alpha reductase inhibitors, or antiplatelets was significantly more prevalent in participants with UI, compared to those without UI. This comes in agreement with Finkelstein⁽³¹⁾ who found increased risk of UI among men using diuretics (OR=2.11), antidepressants (OR=1.79), and laxatives (OR=2.34). On the contrary, some studies found that use of antidepressants was associated with a decreased prevalence of UI (32) and others failed to find an association (33). Regarding laxatives, Blekken et al. (34), concluded that UI was associated with constipation and laxative use as shown in our study, while the use of alpha blockers has shown to precipitate stress UI, but mainly in females ⁽³⁵⁾.

This study is considered one of the few studies that addressed UI in frail older males. According to the forementioned findings, UI is prevalent geriatric syndrome which is associated and affected by multiple risk factors of wide diversity including advanced age, functional impairment, frailty status, several comorbid conditions and depressive symptoms, this emphasizes the multi-dimensional approach to these patients regarding assessment and management.

The limitation of this study can be seen in the absence of a control non-frail group, which limited the study of the relationship between UI and frailty.

CONCLUSION

Urinary incontinence is one of the geriatric syndromes that commonly exists among frail older males affecting mood, function and quality of life.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Sources of funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contribution: Authors contributed equally in the study.

REFERENCES

- 1. D'Ancona C, Haylen B, Oelke M *et al.* (2019): An International Continence Society (ICS) report on the terminology for adult male lower urinary tract and pelvic floor symptoms and dysfunction. Neurourol Urodyn., 38(2): 433-477.
- 2. Holroyd-Leduc J, Mehta K, Covinsky K (2004): Urinary incontinence and its association with death, nursing home admission, and functional decline. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 52: 712-718.
- **3. Prud'homme G, Alexande L, Orme S (2018):** Management of urinary incontinence in frail elderly women. Obstetrics, Gynaecology and Reproductive Medicine, 28(2): 39-45.
- 4. Hunskaar S, Burgio K, Clark A *et al.* (2005): Epidemiology of urinary incontinence (UI) and faecal incontinence (FI) and pelvic organ prolaps (POP). Incontinence, 1: 255-312.
- 5. Wagg A, Gibson W, Ostaszkiewicz J *et al.* (2015): Incontinence in the frail elderly persons. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 34: 398-406.
- Carlos V (2012): Geriatric urinary incontinence special concerns on the frail elderly. In: Alhasso, A. & Fernando, A., ed., Urinary incontinence. Rijeka: In Tech, Pp. 113-130. https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/34723
- 7. Shaw C, Wagg A (2017): Urinary incontinence in older adults. Medicine, 45(1): 23–27.
- 8. Sandhu J (2010): Treatment options for male stress urinary incontinence. Nat Rev Urol., 7: 222–8.
- **9.** Scherr D, Swindle P, Scardino P (2003): National Comprehensive Cancer Network Guidelines for the management of prostate cancer. Urology, 61: (2A): 14-19.
- **10. Amr O, El-Banouby M, Ibrahim M** *et al.* (2021): Comprehensive geriatric assessment among demented and nondemented patients with chronic kidney disease. EJGG., 8(1):35-43.
- **11.** Chaaya M, Sibai A, Roueiheb Z *et al.* (2008): Validation of the Arabic version of the short Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS-15). Int Psychogeriatr., 20(3):571-81.
- 12. Katz S, Ford A, Moskowitz R *et al.* (1963): Studies of illness in the aged. The index of ADL: A standardized measure of biological and psychosocial function. JAMA., 21(9): 914-919.
- **13.** Lawton M, Brody E (1969): Assessment of older people: selfmaintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. Gerontologist, 9(3): 179-186.
- Rockwood K, Song X, MacKnight C et al. (2005): A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. CMAJ., 173(5): 489-495.
- **15.** Lagro-Janssen A, Breedveldt-Boer H, van Dongen J *et al.* (1995): NHG standard urinary incontinence. Huisarts en Wetenschap., 49: 501-510.

- **16.** Hashim H, Avery K, Mourad M *et al.* (2006): The Arabic ICIQ-UI SF: An alternative language version of the English ICIQ-UI SF. Neurourology and Urodynamics, 25:277-282.
- **17.** Landi F, Cesari M, Russo A *et al.* (2003): Potentially reversible risk factors and urinary incontinence in frail older people living in community. Age and Ageing, 32(2): 194–199.
- **18.** Silva V, D'Elboux M (2012): Factors associated with urinary incontinence among elderly individuals who meet frailty criteria. Text Context Nursing, Florianópolis, 21(2): 338-47.
- Xu D, Kane R (2013): Effect of urinary incontinence on older nursing home residents' self-reported quality of life. J Am Geriatr Soc., 61(9): 1473-1481.
- **20.** Wang C, Hung C, Tang T *et al.* (2017): Urinary incontinence and its association with frailty among men aged 80 years or older in Taiwan: A cross-sectional study. Rejuvenation Res., 20(2): 111-117.
- **21.** Wehrberger C, Madersbacher S, Jungwirth S *et al.* (2012): Lower urinary tract symptoms and urinary incontinence in a geriatric cohort-a population-based analysis. BJU International, 110: 1516–1521.
- **22. Aniuliene R, Aniulis P, Steibliene V (2016):** Risk Factors and types of urinary incontinence among middle-aged and older male and female primary care patients in Kaunas region of Lithuania: Cross Sectional Study. Urology Journal, 13 (1): 2551-2561.
- 23. Siroky M (2004): The aging bladder. Review Urol., 6(1): 3-7.
- 24. Chen Y, Hwang S, Chen L *et al.* (2009): Urinary incontinence among institutionalized oldest old Chinese men in Taiwan. Neurology and Urodynamics, 28(4): 335–338.
- **25.** Coll-Planas L, Denkinger M, Nikolaus T (2008): Relationship of urinary incontinence and late-life disability: Implications for clinical work and research in geriatrics. Journal of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 41(4): 283-290.
- **26.** Shamliyan T, Wyman J, Ping R *et al.* (2009): Male urinary incontinence: prevalence, risk factors, and preventive interventions. Reviews in Urology, 11(3): 145-149.
- 27. Vetrano D, Foebel A, Maregoni A *et al.* (2016): Chronic diseases and geriatric syndromes: The different weight of comorbidity. European Journal of Internal Medicine, 27: 62-67.
- **28.** Palmer M, Hardin S, Behrend C *et al.* (2009): Urinary incontinence and overactive bladder in patients with heart failure. The Journal of Urology, 182(1): 196–202
- **29.** Park J, Hong G (2016): Association of functional ability and benign prostatic hyperplasia with urinary incontinence in older Korean men. International Neurology Journal, 20(2): 137-142.
- **30.** Lai S, Pastore S, Piloni L *et al.* (2018): Chronic kidney disease and urological disorders: systematic use of uroflowmetry in nephropathic patients. Clinical Kidney Journal, 12(3): 414-419.
- **31. Finkelstein M (2002):** Medical conditions, medications, and urinary incontinence. Analysis of a population-based survey. Canadian Family Physician, 48(1): 96-101.
- **32.** Brandeis G, Baumann M, Hossain M *et al.* (1997): The prevalence of potentially remediable urinary incontinence in frail older people: a study using the Minimum Data Set. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 45(2): 179-184.
- **33.** Hall S, Maserejian N, Link C *et al.* (2012): Are commonly used psychoactive medications associated with lower urinary tract symptoms? European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 68(5): 783-791.
- 34. Blekken L, Nakrem S, Vinsnes A et al. (2016): Constipation and laxative use among nursing home patients: Prevalence and associations derived from the residents assessment instrument for long-term care facilities (interRAI LTCF). DOI:10.1155/2016/1215746
- **35. Ruby C, Hanlon J, Boudreau R** *et al.* **(2010):** The effect of medication use on urinary incontinence in community-dwelling elderly women. Journal of the American Geriatrics Society, 58(9): 1715-1720.