

# Appendix H Evidence tables

## H.1 2006 evidence table

### Assessment and investigation

#### History taking and physical examination

*Accuracy of history vs urodynamic findings (i.e. urodynamic testing is the reference standard)*

| Study                            | Study type and EL                 | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)                            | Patient characteristics  | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)                | Reference standard (urodynamics)  | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values %<br>(95% CI)  | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values %<br>(95% CI)   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Lagro-Janssen 1991 <sup>49</sup> | Diagnostic study (DS)<br>EL = III | 103             | UD diagnosis:<br>58% SUI, 18% MUI, 18% DO, 6% normal | F 20–65 years, presenting to GPs with UI ( $\geq 2$ episodes per month)<br><br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, neurological UI, diabetes mellitus, temporary cause for UI, UTI | 5-item questionnaire; abdominal and vaginal exam | Complete urodynamic evaluation (static and dynamic UPP, cystometry, uroflowmetry) | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 78 (66, 87)<br>MUI 68 (46, 85)<br>UUI 61 (39, 80)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 84 (70, 92)<br>MUI 79 (69, 86)<br>UUI 95 (89, 98) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 87 (76, 94)<br>MUI 42 (26, 59)<br>UUI 73 (48, 89)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 73 (60, 84)<br>MUI 92 (83, 96)<br>UUI 92 (84, 96) | Funding: none declared.<br>History taken by GP researcher, and urodynamics by nurse. Not clear if both parties blinded.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>Values quoted in paper. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)                             | Patient characteristics   | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)           | Reference standard (urodynamics)  | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)   | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI)  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Summitt 1992 <sup>50</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 87              | UD diagnosis:<br>44% SUI, 28% MUI, 20% DO, 9% normal  | F mean age 53 years (21–76) evaluated for primary complaint of UI | 7-item questionnaire and 24 h voiding diary | Medium-fill single-channel cystometogram (standing) to diagnose DO<br><br>Multichannel urodynamics*; static and stress urethral pressures taken supine and standing; multichannel cystometry standing to diagnose SUI/MUI   | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 82 (67, 91)<br>MUI 67 (47, 82)<br>UUI 71 (47, 87)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 84 (71, 91)<br>MUI 89 (79, 95)<br>UUI 96 (88, 99) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 79 (64, 89)<br>MUI 70 (49, 84)<br>UUI 80 (55, 93)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 85 (73, 93)<br>MUI 88 (77, 94)<br>UUI 93 (85, 97) | Funding: none declared.<br>*done 1 week after the history.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>Not stated who took the history or undertook UD. |
| Sand 1988 <sup>51</sup>    | DS<br>EL = III    | 218             | UD diagnosis:<br>52% SUI, 17% MUI, 14% DO, 17% normal | F mean age 52 years (18–80) with lower urinary tract symptoms     | Structured urogynaecology history form      | UCP at rest and with rectal squeeze in sitting and standing positions with 150 ml saline in bladder, and in sitting position for max. cystometric capacity.<br>Simultaneous medium-fill urethrocystometry performed in sitting and standing positions using saline at 38 °C | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 22 (15, 30)<br>MUI 79 (64, 89)<br>UUI 33 (19, 51)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 83 (74, 89)<br>MUI 43 (36, 51)<br>UUI 98 (95, 99) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 58 (43, 72)<br>MUI 23 (16, 31)<br>UUI 77 (50, 92)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 49 (42, 56)<br>MUI 91 (83, 95)<br>UUI 90 (85, 94) | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)   | Patient characteristics   | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)   | Reference standard (urodynamics)   | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)   | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI)  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Ouslander 1987 <sup>52</sup>  | DS<br>EL = III    | 135             | UD diagnosis:<br>46% SUI, 19% MUI, 27% DO/hyperreflexia, 8% other | F ≥ 65 years (65–95) referred to outpatient clinic for evaluation of UI. 20% had neurological disorder; 62% had hysterectomy, 30% prior cystocele repair and/or bladder neck suspension. 16% had stress UI symptoms, 64% MUI, 16% urge UI | Detailed medical history form and checklist; pelvic, rectal, neuro exam; urine cultures     | Water cystometogram (rate 100 ml/min), with cough and stress provocation; pressure flow study, UPP with a dual-channel microtip transducer | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 23 (14, 34)<br>MUI 72 (52, 86)<br>UUI 33 (20, 50)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 89 (80, 94)<br>MUI 34 (25, 43)<br>UUI 90 (82, 94) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 64 (43, 80)<br>MUI 20 (13, 29)<br>UUI 55 (35, 73)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 58 (48, 66)<br>MUI 84 (71, 92)<br>UUI 79 (70, 85) | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health.<br><br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis. |
| De Muylder 1992 <sup>53</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 408             | UD diagnosis:<br>34% SUI, 25% MUI, 32% DO, 8% other               | F mean age 48 years (18–78). Clinical diagnosis: 42% stress UI, 28% MUI, 30% UUI  | Structured questionnaire designed for the study, urogynaec exam, urine culture and analysis | Combined filling and voiding cystometry with multichannel pressure recording; UCPP, Valsalva and coughing                                  | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 50 (42, 58)<br>MUI 43 (34, 53)<br>UUI 65 (57, 73)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 63 (57, 68)<br>MUI 77 (72, 81)<br>UUI 87 (82, 90) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 41 (33, 48)<br>MUI 39 (30, 48)<br>UUI 70 (62, 78)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 71 (65, 76)<br>MUI 80 (75, 84)<br>UUI 84 (79, 88) | Funding: none declared.<br><br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.  |
| Diokno 1987 <sup>54</sup>     | DS<br>EL = III    | 200             | UD diagnosis:<br>61% SUI, 17% MUI, 7% DO, 16% normal/other        | F mean age 69 years (55–90), who consulted the continence program clinic  | 'Thorough medical history' and complete physical exam                                       | Multichannel UD: uroflowmetry, cystometry, stress cystourethrography, provocative full-bladder stress testing                              | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 76 (68, 83)<br>MUI 42 (27, 59)<br>UUI 14 (4, 40)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 49 (39, 60)<br>MUI 77 (70, 82)<br>UUI 97 (93, 99)  | PPV (%):<br>SUI 70 (61, 77)<br>MUI 26 (16, 40)<br>UUI 25 (7, 59)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 57 (46, 68)<br>MUI 87 (81, 92)<br>UUI 94 (89, 96)  | Funding: National Institute on Aging.<br><br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.                                |
| Iosif 1980 <sup>55</sup>      | DS<br>EL = III    | 401             | UD diagnosis:<br>53% SUI, 10% MUI, 12% DO, 24% other              | F with UI referred to hospital for assessment. Clinical diagnosis: 45% SUI, 50%, 6% UUI   | Clinical assessment – no further details  | Urethrocystometry; UPP   | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 64 (57, 70)<br>MUI 85 (72, 93)<br>UUI 35 (23, 50)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 78 (71, 83)<br>MUI 54 (49, 60)<br>UUI 98 (96, 99) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 77 (70, 82)<br>MUI 18 (13, 23)<br>UUI 74 (54, 87)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 65 (59, 71)<br>MUI 97 (94, 99)<br>UUI 92 (96, 99) | Funding: none declared.<br><br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)                            | Patient characteristics  | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)  | Reference standard (urodynamics)                                    | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)   | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI)  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Umstad 1991 <sup>56</sup>     | DS<br>EL = III    | 168             | UD diagnosis:<br>40% SUI, 14% MUI, 24% DO, 21% other | F mean age 47 years (22–72) undergoing urodynamic assessment for the first time for assessment of UI | 'detailed history and thorough physical exam'  | UD with empty bladder, during filling, and at capacity              | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 76 (65, 85)<br>MUI 58 (39, 76)<br>UUI 45 (31, 60)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 66 (56, 75)<br>MUI 82 (75, 87)<br>UUI 81 (74, 87) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 60 (50, 70)<br>MUI 35 (22, 50)<br>UUI 43 (29, 58)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 80 (71, 88)<br>MUI 92 (86, 96)<br>UUI 83 (75, 88) | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.                     |
| Ishiko 2000 <sup>57</sup>     | DS<br>EL = III    | 198             | UD diagnosis:<br>63% SUI, 21% MUI, 15% DO, 2% other  | F mean age 59 years (27–73) visiting hospital clinic for evaluation                                  | Scored 15-item questionnaire (Gaudenz) completed by pts  | Urethrocystometry   | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 83 (76, 89)<br>MUI 61 (46, 74)<br>UUI 86 (69, 95)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 92 (83, 96)<br>MUI 87 (80, 91)<br>UUI 96 (92, 98) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 95 (89, 97)<br>MUI 54 (40, 68)<br>UUI 81 (64, 91)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 76 (66, 84)<br>MUI 89 (84, 93)<br>UUI 98 (94, 99) | Funding: none declared.<br>Not stated whether ICS recommendations for UD followed. |
| Sandvik 1995 <sup>58</sup>    | DS<br>EL = III    | 236             | UD diagnosis:<br>54% SUI, 24% MUI, 17% DO, 5% other  | F referred from primary health care owing to UI  | History from structured questionnaire designed for the study; single questions used to establish whether F had stress or urge UI, with mixed being positive response to both | Medium-fill water urethrocystometry with pt in semi-supine position | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 66 (58, 74)<br>MUI 84 (72, 91)<br>UUI 56 (41, 70)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 88 (81, 93)<br>MUI 66 (59, 73)<br>UUI 96 (92, 98) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 87 (78, 92)<br>MUI 44 (35, 53)<br>UUI 74 (57, 86)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 69 (61, 76)<br>MUI 93 (87, 96)<br>UUI 91 (87, 94) | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS recommendations followed for UD.                    |
| Fitzgerald 2002 <sup>59</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 293             | UD diagnosis:<br>51% SUI, 21% MUI, 13% DO, 16% other | F mean age 57 years (15–87) evaluated at tertiary referral clinic; 31% had advanced stage POP        | Presenting UI symptom  | Multi-channel UD  | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 17 (12, 24)<br>MUI 85 (74, 92)<br>UUI 27 (15, 43)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 91 (85, 95)<br>MUI 36 (30, 43)<br>UUI 92 (88, 95) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 66 (50, 79)<br>MUI 26 (20, 32)<br>UUI 32 (19, 50)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 52 (46, 58)<br>MUI 90 (83, 95)<br>UUI 90 (85, 93) | Funding none declared<br>ICS recommendations followed for UD.                      |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)                                       | Patient characteristics   | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)   | Reference standard (urodynamics)                                 | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)   | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI)                                      | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Sunshine 1989 <sup>60</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 109             | UD diagnosis:<br>60% SUI, 20% MUI, 2% DO, 18% other             | F aged 20–79 years evaluated for UI   | Detailed history and physical exam  | Cystometry, UPP, cystourethroscopy                               | Sensitivity:<br>SUI 78%<br>MUI 100%<br>UUI 22%<br><br>Specificity:<br>SUI 72%<br>MUI 83%<br>UUI 100%                 | PPV:<br>SUI 83%<br>MUI 18%<br>UUI 100%<br><br>NPV:<br>SUI 66%<br>MUI 100%<br>UUI 91%                 | Funding: none declared.<br>Results as reported in paper.<br>UD done within a month of the initial history.<br>Not stated whether ICS recommendations for UD were followed. DO diagnosed when unprovoked contractions occurred at detrusor pressure > 10 cmH <sub>2</sub> O |
| Weidner 2001 <sup>61</sup>  | DS<br>EL = III    | 950             | UD diagnosis:<br>51% SUI, 14% MUI, 19% DO, 6% normal, 11% other | F mean age 55 years referred for UD investigations for UI; presenting symptom 30% SUI, 52% MUI, 14% UUI, 4% constant leakage<br><br>Exclusions: stage 3–4 POP; F undergoing repeat examinations | Standardised history, physical exam (incl. stress test, urethral axis determination), 7 day diary | Multichannel urodynamics   | Sensitivity:<br>SUI 39%<br>MUI 49%<br><br>Specificity:<br>SUI 86%<br>MUI 57%   | PPV:<br>SUI 74%<br>MUI 53%<br><br>NPV:<br>SUI 58%<br>MUI 53%   | Funding: none declared.<br>The 535 women included in the Cundiff 1997 study are also in this study population. <sup>936</sup><br>Study = retrospective analysis of data.<br>Methods and terminology used conformed to ICS recommendations.                                 |
| Carey 1997 <sup>62</sup>    | DS<br>EL = III    | 863             | UD diagnosis:<br>39% SUI, 27% MUI, 34% other (no SUI)           | F referred to urogynaecology clinic with stress and/or urge UI or other urinary symptoms. Clinical diagnosis: 23% SUI, 56% MUI, 11% UUI, 10% no UI  | History using a standardised questionnaire, physical exam   | Subtracted dual-channel cystometry, filling rate 100 ml/min; UPP | Sensitivity (%):<br>SUI 33 (29, 39)<br>MUI 68 (61, 73)<br><br>Specificity (%):<br>SUI 83 (80, 86)<br>MUI 48 (44, 52) | PPV (%):<br>SUI 56 (49, 62)<br>MUI 33 (29, 37)<br><br>NPV (%):<br>SUI 66 (63, 70)<br>MUI 80 (76, 84) | Funding: none declared.<br>Not stated whether definitions conformed to ICS (DO diagnosed if pressure incr. of 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O or more)   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)  | Patient characteristics   | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)  | Reference standard (urodynamics)   | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)                 | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI) | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Cantor 1980 <sup>63</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 214             | UD diagnosis: 55% DO (45% 'stable')  | F 16–84 years with UI and suspected DO or excluding DO prior to surgery<br><br>Exclusions: under 16 years; neurological disease   | Urological and gynaecological history taken (not stated how)                                       | VCU, detrusor pressure calculated by subtracting rectal from urogynaecological pressures | Sensitivity (%): UUI 91 (84, 95)<br>Specificity (%): UUI 45 (35, 55) | PPV (%): UUI 67 (59, 94)<br>NPV: UUI 80 (67, 88)                | Funding: none declared.<br>Pressure increase of > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O on bladder filling taken as diagnosis of DO; or detrusor pressure incr. on coughing or standing.   |
| Awad 1983 <sup>64</sup>   | DS<br>EL = III    | 108             | UD diagnosis; 78% DO   | F mean age 75 years (65–93) referred to a urodynamic unit owing to UI; 8% had clinical diagnosis of SUI, 71% MUI, 20% UUI<br><br>Exclusions: significant cystitis; specific lesions at cystoscopy | No information on how clinical diagnosis reached   | Liquid cystometry in 91; gas cystometry in 17; filling rate 60 ml/min for both methods   | Sensitivity (%): UUI 24 (16, 34)<br>Specificity (%): UUI 92 (74, 98) | PPV (%): UUI 91 (72, 97)<br>NPV (%): UUI 26 (18, 36)            | Funding: Medical Research Council, Canada.<br>Not stated whether ICS criteria for UD diagnosis followed.   |
| Walter 1982 <sup>65</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 303             | UD diagnosis: 16% overactive detrusor, 4% underactive, 79% normal, 1% inconclusive | F median age 54 years (19–82) referred to urology or gynaecology departments with provisional diagnosis of UI (43% SUI, 36% MUI, 21% UUI)   | Questionnaire covering gynaecological, neurological, and urological symptoms; physical examination | Flowmetry; medium-fill water cystometry (30 ml/min)                                      | Sensitivity (%): UUI 57 (43, 70)<br>Specificity (%): UUI 86 (81, 90) | PPV (%): UUI 44 (33, 57)<br>NPV (%): UUI 91 (87, 94)            | Funding: Danish Foundation for Medical Research and Carl Petersen's Foundation.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>UD diagnosis only reported as overactive or underactive or normal  |
| Petros 1992 <sup>66</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 169 (70 UUI)    | UD diagnosis not reported  | F mean age 50 years (35–71), with UI  | Standard questionnaire   | Supine filling cystometry at 100 ml/min, 'sink test' cystometry                          | Sensitivity:* UUI 40%<br>Specificity:* UUI 74%                       | PPV:* UUI 53%<br>NPV:* UUI 63%                                  | Funding: Swedish Research Council; Goran Gustafssons Foundation; University of Uppsala; Royal Perth Hospital.<br>*values reported in the paper (but no raw data so unable to calculate 95% CI).<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis. |

| Study                                | Study type and EL | No. of patients                        | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)  | Patient characteristics  | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)  | Reference standard (urodynamics)   | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)             | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI) | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Digesu 2003 <sup>67</sup>            | DS<br>EL = III    | 4500 (843 having OAB formed study grp) | UD diagnosis: 21% SUI, 15% MUI, 39% DO, 8% voiding difficulty, 17% other | F mean age 55 years (22–73), lower urinary tract symptoms referred to a tertiary urodynamic clinic (28% OAB)<br>Exclusions: neurological disorders | Self-completed questionnaire and FVC; 'complete' history and vaginal exam                              | VCU  | Sensitivity: OAB 28%<br>Specificity: OAB 86%                     | PPV: OAB 54%<br>NPV: OAB 68%                                    | Funding: none declared.<br>Calculations made by authors (incomplete raw data, hence unable to calculate 95% CI).<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.   |
| Glezerman 1986 <sup>68</sup>         | DS<br>EL = III    | 128                                    | UD diagnosis: SUI (alone) 75%, mixed 6%, 5% DO, 13% other/normal         | F mean age 48 years (22–74), stress UI symptoms  | 21-symptom questionnaire for urological history; pelvic, gross neuro, exam; urine culture, Bonney test | Cystomanometry   | Sensitivity (%): 100 (96, 100)*                                  | PPV (%): 77 (69, 83)  | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>*assuming that all F enrolled had SUI symptoms only (no MUI); no info on MUI symptoms given.  |
| Versi 1991 <sup>69</sup>             | DS<br>EL = III    | 252                                    | UD diagnosis: 47% SUI (other % not specified)                            | F, age unknown, symptom of stress UI   | 20-item questionnaire; midstream urine<br>Clinical diagnosis determined by computer                    | Uroflowmetry, subtracted provocative fluid fill cystometry, VCU  | Sensitivity (%): SUI 100 (97, 100)                               | PPV (%): SUI 47 (41, 53)  | Funding: Birthright (RCOG) [in part].<br>UD SUI diagnosis made if > 1 g increase on pad test and evidence of urethral sphincter incompetence during the VCU study.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis. |
| Fischer-Rasmussen 1986 <sup>70</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 212                                    | UD diagnosis: 39% SUI, 61% 'other'                                       | F mean age 55 years (29–84), referred to gynaecology dept owing to UI  | History, symptoms, pelvic exam from initial consultation   | Cystometry in supine position, continuous water filling rate of 30 ml/min. Valsalva manoeuvre with bladder vol. of 300 ml; cough in supine and erect positions | Sensitivity (%): SUI 52 (44, 61)<br>Specificity: SUI 85 (76, 91) | PPV (%): SUI 85 (76, 91)<br>NPV: SUI 53 (45, 61)                | Funding: none declared.<br>Calculations made by authors.<br>Not stated whether ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis, although detrusor contractions > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O regarded as abnormal.           |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence (UD diagnosis)  | Patient characteristics  | Type of test (clinical diagnosis)  | Reference standard (urodynamics)  | Sensitivity and specificity<br>All values % (95% CI)   | Positive and negative predictive value<br>All values % (95% CI)                         | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Hastie 1989 <sup>71</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 89              | UD diagnosis: 93% 'stable', 7% 'unstable'  | F referred to urology dept for assessment; main presenting complaint stress UI (61% SUI only, 28% SUI and frequency, 11% SUI with urgency)   | Structured questionnaire for history; physical examination                   | Multichannel filling (50–100 ml/min) and voiding cystometry with subtracted detrusor pressure   | Sensitivity (%): SUI 100 (93, 100)   | PPV (%): SUI 61 (50, 70)  | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>Retrospective analysis of data.   |
| Videla 1998 <sup>72</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 74              | UD diagnosis: 82% SUI*, 15% MUI, 1% DO, 1% normal  | A retrospective review of women mean age 54 years (30–86) who satisfied 4 criteria for a clinical diagnosis of stress UI: SUI as the main presenting complaint, urine loss on cough stress test, residual vol. ≤ 50 ml, functional bladder capacity ≥ 400 ml on 24 h FVC | Clinical diagnosis based of SUI  | Multichannel UD   | Sensitivity (%): SUI 85 (75, 91)   | PPV (%): SUI 82 (72, 89)  | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis.<br>*calculated from data given.  |
| Swift 1995 <sup>73</sup>  | DS<br>EL = III    | 108             | UD diagnosis: 44% SUI, 17% MUI, 9% DO, 31% other (sensory urge UI, urethral diverticula, interstitial cystitis, urethral syndrome) | F mean age 58 years with lower urinary tract symptoms  | History and physical exam, catheterised urinalysis for culture and PVR urine | Observed urine loss with cough during multichannel UD<br>Stress LPP<br>Cough stress test following negative cystometogram<br>Equalisation through cough UPP | Sens* 91%<br>Spec 100%<br>Sens 78%<br>Spec 100%<br>Sens 77%<br>Spec 100%<br>Sens 49%<br>Spec 98% | PPV 100%<br>NPV 88%<br>PPV 100%<br>NPV 84%<br>PPV 100%<br>NPV 76%<br>PPV 82%<br>NPV 44% | Funding: none declared.<br>Calculations made by authors.<br>*all results for SUI with or without urge (SUI+MUI).<br>ICS criteria used for UD diagnosis. |

#### Pelvic floor muscle assessment

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim of study | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Outcomes | Results | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------------------|
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------|---------|---------------------|



| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients               | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Romanzi 1999 <sup>75</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Assess reliability and reproducibility of a digital pelvic muscle rating scale*, from results of 2 raters (a general gynaecologist who had never used a PFM rating tool, and a subspecialist urogynaecologist who routinely used the tool)<br><br>Assess test-retest reproducibility of EMG, and evaluate score correlation to EMG findings | 57 (37 had second evaluation) | F, self-selecting volunteers; mean age 44 years (SD 14), 62% had urinary symptoms (37% SUI, 31% MUI, 45% UUI, 46% frequency, 49% urgency, 37% urinary flow problems)   | Inter-rater results for PFM rating scale (Pearson correlation coefficients)<br><br>Intra-rater results for PFM rating scale (for test-retest)<br><br>EMG test-retest<br><br>EMG vs PFM rating scale results | 1st test $r = 0.79$ , $P < 0.001$<br>Retest $r = 0.81$ , $P < 0.001$<br><br>Gynaecologist: $r = 0.85$ , $P < 0.001$<br>Urogynaecologist: $r = 0.84$ , $P < 0.001$<br><br>$r = 0.86$ , $P < 0.001$<br><br>1st test: $r = 0.46$ , $P = 0.002$ (gynaecologist), $r = 0.51$ , $P < 0.001$ (urogynaecologist)<br>Retest: $r = 0.45$ , $P = 0.006$ and $r = 0.57$ , $P < 0.001$ | Funding: in part by BARD Inc.<br>*4-point scale (0–3) that rates pressure (max. pressure from levator contraction), duration (length of time able to hold a maximal contraction), and displacement (caudal/anterior rotation of examining fingers by the contracting muscle beds); total score possible = 9.<br>Clinicians alternated examination order; both performed the digital assessment blind to the result of the other.<br>EMG: single-user vaginal surface EMG sensor.<br>Retest done after 1–4 weeks.<br>$r =$ Pearson correlation coefficient. |
| Laycock 2001 <sup>76</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To develop a digital technique to assess PFM*; to validate the technique and test for validity and reliability; to translate the assessment into an exercise-based regimen  | 20                            | F with UI  | Test-retest agreement   | Power: 9/20 exact, 10 differed by 0.5, 1 by 1 grade; $r = 0.93$ , $P < 0.001$<br>Endurance: 14/20 exact, variation of 1 s in 6, and 1 in 1; $r = 0.99$ , $P < 0.001$  | Funding: none declared.<br>*the PERFECT scheme; Power, Endurance, Repetitions, Fast, Every, Contraction, Timed.<br>Power measured on a modified Oxford grading system (0–6, no to strong contraction, with + and – used to augment existing grades). Endurance measured as duration a voluntary contraction can be sustained before strength falls by $\geq 35\%$ (muscle starts to fatigue); up to 10 s.<br>Assessment done prior to cystometry, repeated after 2–5 weeks.<br>$r =$ Spearman's rank correlation coefficient                               |
| Bo 2001 <sup>77</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate inter-rater reproducibility of the modified Oxford grading system for vaginal palpation, and to compare these results with vaginal squeeze pressure  | 20 (7 with symptoms of SUI)   | F physical therapy students, mean age 25 years (21–38).<br>8 were exercising PFM 'now and then'; 1 exercising PFM 1–2×/week; 1 never; 8 tried once before; no data for | Inter-tester reproducibility of Oxford grading system*  | Agreement for 9 of 20; in 10 the disagreement was 1 category, and 3 categories in 1<br><br>$r = 0.70$ , $P < 0.01$ (Spearman's)<br>Kappa score 0.37 (SEM 0.16)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Two experienced physiotherapists conducted the study. Palpation test done in random order; contraction classified qualitatively, then using the modified *Oxford grading system (0 = no contraction, 1 flicker, 2 weak, 3 moderate, 4 good, 5 strong). Test repeated after 5 min by second physiotherapist.<br>After vaginal palpation, PFM strength measured by  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|--|---|
|                               |                       |  |                 | 2<br>Exclusions: pelvic surgery, neurological or pelvic diseases                                     | Mean muscle strength (cmH <sub>2</sub> O) based on vaginal squeeze pressure vs Oxford grading results | Mean 17.5 (95% CI -6.4 to 41.3) for Oxford grade 'weak' ( <i>n</i> = 3)<br>Mean 17.9 (95% CI 14.2 to 21.5) for 'moderate' ( <i>n</i> = 7)<br>Mean 21.5 (95% CI 14.6 to 28.2) for 'good' ( <i>n</i> = 8)<br>Mean 22.6 (95% CI -42.8 to 88.1) for 'strong' ( <i>n</i> = 2)                 | vaginal squeeze pressure using vaginal balloon, size 1.6×1.7 cm, connected to transducer. Middle of balloon located 3.5 cm inside introitus vagina. 6 maximal contractions performed.<br>Overall mean maximal strength (mean of 6 maximal contractions) 19.7 (95% CI 16.5 to 22.9).<br><i>P</i> = NS for weak, moderate, good or strong muscle contractions when comparing results from vaginal squeeze pressure. |
| Jeyaseelan 2001 <sup>78</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine inter-rater reliability for the modified Oxford grading system | 30              | F with 'varying types of incontinence' attending a hospital clinic for routine treatment appointment | Inter-rater agreement   | Results presented in graph only. Clinicians 2 and 4 did not agree on any values; agreement improved after training.<br><br>% agreement of clinicians 1, 2, 3 vs clinician 4 were 77.8, 80, 70 (after clinician 2 given training); underestimation 22.2, 10, 20; overestimation 0, 10, 10 | Funding: University of Manchester Medical Bequest Fund.<br>Clinicians 1,2,3 compared with clinician 4 (an expert in digital vaginal assessment).  |

#### Assessment of prolapse

| Study                    | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Swift 2003 <sup>79</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate correlation of POP symptoms with the degree of pelvic organ support as defined by the POP-Q examination | 497 (477 had complete data) | F mean age 44 years (18–82), undergoing gynaecological exam<br>4% stage 0 POP, 45% stage I, 48% stage II, 3% Stage III, 0 stage IV | No. of positive responses* per pt for questions re symptoms and bother of symptoms per stage of support | stage 0 (symptoms/bother): 0.27/0.19<br>stage I: 0.55/0.35<br>stage II: 0.86/0.56<br>stage III : 2.07/1.36<br>( <i>P</i> = NS for linear trend by stage) | Funding: none declared.<br>F examined by physicians familiar with POP-Q system.<br>POP-Q classification: stage 0 no prolapse; stage I leading edge of prolapse > 1 cm above hymen; stage II leading edge ≤ 1 cm proximal or distal to plane of hymen; stage |

| Study                         | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|---|
|                               |                           |  |                 |  | No. of positive responses* per pt for questions re symptoms and bother of symptoms per leading edge of support | <p>-3 cm (symptoms/bother): 0.27/0.19</p> <p>-2 cm: 0.55/0.35</p> <p>-1 cm: 0.87/0.57</p> <p>0 (at hymen): 0.75/0.47</p> <p>+1 cm: 1.40/1.11</p> <p>+2 cm and +3 cm: 2.0/1.56</p> <p>+4 to +7 cm: 2.2/1.8</p> <p>(<i>P</i> = 0.005 for linear trend by leading edge)</p>     | <p>III, leading edge &gt; 1 cm below plane of hymen but protrudes no further than 2 cm less than the total vaginal length; stage IV essentially complete eversion of the total lower genital tract.</p> <p>*7-item questionnaire used to establish symptoms related to POP; sense of something falling out of vagina, ability to see/feel bulge, low back or groin pain after standing#, UI, anal incontinence, straining to defecate. Possible responses yes/no/sometimes. If yes or sometimes, also asked about bother factor.</p> <p>#low back/groin pain later excluded from analysis because was present in 48%, in similar proportions for all prolapse stages.</p> |
| Samuelsson 1999 <sup>80</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Investigate age-specific prevalence of POP among women 20–59 years and to study possible related factors | 487             | F mean age 39 years (20–60) scheduled for gynaecological health exam   | POP prevalence   | 30.8%<br>(5% [ <i>n</i> = 8] of these had prolapse that reached introitus when straining)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Examination undertaken by midwives using standardised form designed for the study.<br>POP = presence of uterine prolapse, cystocele, rectocele, absence of urethrovesical crease (alone or any combination).   |
|                               |                           |  |                 |  | POP symptoms   | <p>Sense of heaviness in abdomen in women with POP vs no POP 9.7 vs 7.5%, <i>P</i> = NS</p> <p>Voiding difficulties 7.1 vs 3.9% (cystocele vs no cystocele grp), <i>P</i> = NS</p> <p>Difficulty emptying bowel 17.6 vs 12.8% (rectocele vs no rectocele), <i>P</i> = NS</p> |   |
| Bradley 2005 <sup>81</sup>    | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | To measure associations between symptoms (individual and grouped) with anterior, posterior,              | 270             | Postmenopausal women enrolled at one site of the Women's Health Initiative clinical trial completed a questionnaire modified | Prolapse stage (POP-Q)   | 2.2% stage 0<br>33.3% stage I<br>62.6% stage II<br>1.9% stage III<br>0 stage IV  | Funding: National Center for Research Resources and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.<br>POP-Q exam performed by 2 experienced urogynae nurses. Points Ba and Bp used to  |

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
|       |                   | uterine, and maximum vaginal descensus in older women; and determine presence or absence of specific symptoms in care-seeking women<br>Symptoms gathered from modified Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory questionnaire |                 | from the Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory on pelvic floor symptoms and underwent a Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification (POP-Q) examination.<br>Mean age 68 years (57–84), mean BMI 30 (range 16–48). 3% prior surgery for UI or prolapse. 12% currently treated for a pelvic floor disorder, usually with pelvic muscle exercises<br>Exclusions: women without intact uterus | Symptoms reported<br><br>Association of symptoms with prolapse* | Median 4 (0–19) from possible 30<br>'At least 25%' reported:<br>stress UI (53%)<br>urge UI (49%)<br>frequency (29%)<br>urgency (29%)<br>intermittent urinary stream (26%)<br>straining for bowel movements (25%)<br>sense of incomplete bowel movements (35%)<br>involuntary loss of gas (35%)<br><br>For anterior prolapse: changing position to urinate and seeing/feeling a bulge, $P \leq 0.01$<br>For posterior prolapse, incomplete bladder emptying, weak stream and intermittent stream, $P \leq 0.01$<br>For apical prolapse difficulty emptying bladder and seeing/feeling bulge, $P \leq 0.01$<br>'See or feel a bulge' was reported by 11 women (4%), and all had maximal point of prolapse at hymen or beyond; 57 (21%) with this level of descensus on exam did not report this symptom | represent anterior and posterior vaginal descensus, respectively. Few patients had POP-Q points less than -2 or greater than +1 so categorical prolapse variables were created, giving 4 levels for anterior prolapse ( $Ba \leq -2, -1, 0$ and $\geq +1$ cm from hymen); and 3 levels for posterior prolapse ( $Bp \leq -2, -1, \text{ and } \geq 0$ cm).<br><br>*dichotomous definition for prolapse; present when POP-Q point of interest ( $Ba, Bp$ , or maximal point of descensus) was measured at or past the hymen ( $\geq 0$ cm).<br><br>Median symptoms scores were compared in women with varying levels of vaginal descensus. Results were re-examined after adjusting for age, and coffee drinking using multiple logistic regression models. |

## Urine testing

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Type of test                      | Reference standard   | Sensitivity and specificity        | Positive and negative predictive value | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
| Buchsbaum 2004 <sup>82</sup> | DS<br>EL = II     | 265             | F with UI, attending a university urogynaecology clinic<br>Excluded: $\geq 2$ UTIs within 12 months, dysuria or frequency with no UI, haematuria (frank or microscopic) | Urine reagent strips* (Chemstrip) | Urine culture (urine collected by catheterisation for post-void residual immediately after voiding; or by clean catch technique if PVR provided insufficient vol.) | Sensitivity 29%<br>Specificity 99% | PPV 82%<br>NPV 92%                     | Funding: no extramural financial support.<br>*observed for 2 min; considered positive if leucocytes and/or nitrites present.<br>Culture kept for 20 h before considered negative; results positive if $> 10000$ of a single organism present on a urine specimen obtained by single catheterisation.<br>No info on whether comparison was blind |

## Impact of treating UTI on UI

| Study                        | Study type and EL  | No. patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                          | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Ouslander 1995 <sup>83</sup> | Cohort study (though pts randomised to immediate or delayed tx, the comparisons were for pts with or without bacteriuria)<br>EL = 2+ | 191 (71% F)<br>10 (5%) excluded as misclassified as having bacteriuria<br>90 overall had bacteriuria and were randomised to tx; 2 dropped out | M/F nursing home residents with chronic UI and bacteriuria* (incontinent on a regular basis, defined as several times per week or several times per day)<br>Exclusions: daytime UI not documented by random wet checks; permanent | Pts treated for bacteriuria: Immediate tx with norfloxacin 400 mg b.d. for 7 days; $n = **$<br>Delayed tx (2–3 weeks after immediate | Pts without bacteriuria, receiving no treatment ( $n = 88$ ) | 3 days assessment after antibiotic treatment | Eradication of bacteriuria in treated grp<br>Incontinence (% wet checks that were wet); change from baseline | 81% (of all 88 pts treated, whether immediate or delayed tx)<br>Pts with bacteriuria at baseline ( $n = 88$ )<br>Change from 34% (95% CI 30% to 38%) to 35% (95% CI 31% to 39%)<br>Pts without bacteriuria at baseline ( $n = 88$ )<br>Change from 29% (95% CI 26% to 32%) to 30% (95% CI 27% to 34%) | Funding: none declared.<br>*cultured specimens that grew $> 50000$ colony forming units were considered to have significant growth. If significant growth of $\geq 1$ urinary pathogens occurred on a second specimen, the patient was considered to be bacteriuric.<br>Wet checks done hourly from 7 am to 7 pm; total = 33. During these hours pts wore disposable briefs or pads. Vol. $> 5$ ml or pad |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                     | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|       |                   | owing to illness (3 from non-bacteriuric grp withdrew owing to illness) | indwelling bladder catheter; failed a cognitive status screening test; severe behavioural disturbance during wet-checking procedures; poor prognosis; care reimbursed by Medicare | grp); $n = **$<br>Total $n = 88$ |            |                     | % pts with $\geq 33\%$ reduction in incontinence frequency (wet checks) | Pts with bacteriuria vs those without:<br>16% vs 19%, $P = NS$ | weight > 5 g considered wet. Fewer checks done in practice owing to meal time, etc.<br>Wet episode = volume > 5 ml or increase in pad weight of > 5 g.<br>**because of no sig. differences between variables between the immediate tx and delayed tx groups, the data were presented for the bacteriuric grp as a whole. |

## Assessment of residual urine

| Study       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence                                    | Patient characteristics   | Type of test                | Reference standard               | Sensitivity and specificity  | Positive and negative predictive value   | Additional comments  |
|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Ding 199684 | DS<br>EL = 1 b    | 46 (74% women)  | 59% had PVR > 100 ml and 37% had PVR > 200 ml | M/F age range 40–95 years, inpatients of geriatric hospital dept or outpatients attending continence clinic | Portable bladder ultrasound | Catheterisation (12 Fr catheter) | If PVR > 100 ml regarded as positive:<br>Sens 90%<br>Spec 88%<br>If PVR > 200 ml regarded as positive:<br>Sens 92%<br>Spec 83% | If PVR > 100 ml regarded as positive:<br>PPV 91%<br>NPV 86%<br>If PVR > 200 ml regarded as positive:<br>PPV 76%<br>NPV 95% | Funding: none declared; Advanced Medical Systems provided Bladder Scan BVI-2500 for duration of study.<br>Bladder Scan BVI-2500 used.<br>Blind assessment made.<br>PVR ranged from 5 to 1150 ml.<br>$R = 0.96$ for comparison of catheter and ultrasound volumes<br>Setting: hospital geriatric medicine dept. |

| Study            | Study type and EL | No. of patients                    | Prevalence | Patient characteristics   | Type of test                | Reference standard               | Sensitivity and specificity  | Positive and negative predictive value | Additional comments  |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|------------|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Goode 200085     | DS<br>EL = II     | 95                                 | –          | F mean age 67 (32–92) community-dwelling seeking assistance owing to UI | Portable bladder ultrasound | Catheterisation (12 Fr catheter) | Sens* 67%<br>Spec 97%  | Unable to calculate from data          | Funding: none declared.<br>Bladder Scan BVI-2500 used. No info on whether comparison was blind.<br>*PVR urine vol. > 100 ml regarded as 'positive'.<br>Other findings: mean PVR by US 49 ml (SD 50) vs 32 ml (SD 42) by catheterisation; post-catheterisation US mean vol. 22 ml (SD 25), added to PVR by catheterisation was not sig. different to PVR by US.<br>Setting: hospital outpatient dept. |
| Ouslander 199486 | DS<br>EL = 1 b    | 201 (74% F);<br>186 had both tests | –          | M/F mean age 85 years (SD 8), nursing home residents                    | Portable bladder ultrasound | Catheterisation (14 Fr)          | If PVR < 50 ml regarded as positive (n = 70):<br>Sens 90%<br>Spec 71%<br>For PVR < 100 ml (n = 118):<br>Sens 95%<br>Spec 63%<br>For PVR > 100 ml (n = 68):<br>Sens 63%<br>Spec 95%<br>For PVR > 150 ml (n = 37):<br>Sens 59%<br>spec 97%<br>For PVR > 200 ml (n = 26):<br>Sens 69%<br>Spec 99% | Unable to calculate from data          | Funding: National Institute on Aging.<br>Bladder Scan BVI-2000 used in 140 and BVI-2500 in 61 (owing to availability of BVI-2500 device during the study).<br>Test–retest reliability reported: r = 0.98 for 1 observer (187 pairs), and r = 0.97 for second observer (143 pairs)  |

| Study          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence | Patient characteristics                                  | Type of test  | Reference standard               | Sensitivity and specificity | Positive and negative predictive value | Additional comments  |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|--|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Nygaard 199687 | DS<br>EL = lb     | 47              | –          | F mean age 61 years (27–86) presenting for UI evaluation | Bimanual exam | Catheterisation (12 Fr catheter) | Sens* 14%<br>Spec 67%       | PPV 7%<br>NPV 82%                      | Funding: none declared.<br>*PVR urine vol. > 50 ml regarded as 'positive'.<br>Setting: secondary care. |

### Symptom scoring and QOL assessment

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---|--|
| Avery 2004 <sup>90</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Report on development and evaluation of the ICIQ | 144 (84% F)     | ICIQ tested in several samples (men and women), in clinics and in the community, age range 20–101 years.<br><br>Test–retest reliability measured in pts from the clinic sample who repeated the questionnaire within ~2 weeks; mean age 58 years (25–91) | Agreement between test–retest responses for the 9 symptom items* | Frequency of leakage*: 92%,<br>$k = 0.73$ , 3.1–3.5, 3.0–3.5<br>Frequency of leakage – bother: 89%,<br>$k = 0.68$ , 6.1–7.1, 5.6–6.7<br>Frequency of protection use: 96%,<br>$k = 0.9$ , 1.6–2.0, 1.7–2.1<br>Usual amount of leakage: 92%,<br>$k = 0.71$ , 1.4–1.7, 1.4–1.6<br>Worst amount of leakage: 90%,<br>$k = 0.67$ , 1.7–2.0, 1.7–2.0<br>Interference with everyday life: 90%,<br>$k = 0.74$ , 5.3–6.4, 5.2–6.2<br>Interference with social life: 88%,<br>$k = 0.7$ , 4.4–5.6, 4.4–5.5<br>Interference with sex life: 89%,<br>$k = 0.75$ , 3.0–4.7, 2.8–4.5<br>Overall QOL: 85%, $k = 0.58$ , 5.0–6.1, 5.0–6.0<br>$P < 0.001$ for all items | Funding: none declared.<br>*crude agreement (%), kappa value, 95% CI for test and retest |



| Study                              | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients                           | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes                                     | Results   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Jackson 1996 <sup>91</sup>         | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Develop a questionnaire that is sensitive to changes in symptoms of the female urinary tract especially UI (= BFLUTS)                            | 85 (test-retest reliability in 50)        | F mean age 51 years (24–80) attending hospital for UD assessment  | Test-retest reliability*                     | Kappas for each symptom question ranged from 0.32 to 0.82<br>78% of questions had identical answer on both occasions, and 97% within one category; no response changed by more than 2 categories<br>Correlation for symptom score between tests: $r = 0.86$ , $P < 0.001$ (95% CI 0.76 to 0.93), and for the problem score $r = 0.90$ , $P < 0.001$ , (95% CI 0.79 to 0.96) | Funding: none declared.<br>*retest in 2 weeks, analysed using chi-square test, kappa statistic, and Spearman's correlation coefficient.   |
| Kulseng-Hanssen 2003 <sup>92</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Design and validate a short questionnaire (the SUIQQ) to assess severity of symptoms and QOL in women with stress and mixed UI                   | 65 (59 completed both questionnaires)     | F with stress or mixed UI   | Differences in mean results from test-retest | None sig. different from zero difference (results presented in a graph, some data in text)<br>Cronbach's alpha:<br>0.75 stress incontinence<br>0.77 urge incontinence<br>0.72 QOL   | Funding: none declared.<br>Stress incontinence index composed of 3 items (activities that cause UI, how often SUI experienced). Urge incontinence index composed of 2 questions (frequency and extent of UUI).<br>Questionnaires completed at home, mean interval 22 days (SD 14).                |
| Patrick 1999 <sup>93</sup>         | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Report results of further development of I-QOL   | 288                                       | F aged 18–76+ years with UI (49% stress, 51% mixed), participating in an RCT evaluating duloxetine for UI tx                                  | Test-retest reliability (Cronbach's alpha)   | I-QOL summary score: alpha = 0.95<br>For each subscale:<br>behaviour alpha = 0.87, psychosocial impacts alpha = 0.93, social embarrassment alpha = 0.91<br>[test-retest scores not quoted]  | Funding: Eli Lilly and Co.<br>Retest measured after 2 weeks, during the placebo run-in period.<br>Cronbach's alpha measure of > 0.7 considered reliable.  |
| Wagner 1996 <sup>94</sup>          | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Develop a self-report QOL measure specific to UI (I-QOL) that could be used as an outcome measure in clinical trials and in patient care centres | 62 (of whom 60 provided test-retest data) | M/F (68% F) with UI who were interviewed about their condition*<br>Mean age 64 years (SD 14)<br>25% had mild UI, 28% moderate, and 39% severe | Test-retest reliability                      | Intraclass correlation coefficient<br>$r = 0.93$<br>No numerical data   | Funding: Eli Lilly and Co.<br>*the 'I-QOL' questionnaire was developed from interviews of 20 individuals with urinary incontinence. Refining the questionnaire was accomplished by structured interviews of 17 individuals with urinary incontinence.<br>Test-retest interval mean 18 days (SD 4) |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Bushnell 2005 <sup>95</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To report the psychometric performance of 15 different language versions of the Incontinence Quality of Life (I-QOL) measure | 1901   | F aged > 18 years treated with duloxetine in 1 of 4 RCTs across 15 countries   | Test-retest data (intraclass correlation coefficient results) | Range: 0.72–0.91 for the total score, median 0.87  | Funding: none declared.<br>Test-retest reliability was assessed across the 2 week interval between randomisation visit and baseline from the trials (or from baseline to the 2 or 3 week visit in 2 countries).<br>The intraclass correlation coefficient was used, with 0.7 considered to be the recommended level for grp comparisons.        |
| Stothers 2004 <sup>96</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine the reliability and further validate the SEAPI-QMM quality of life index   | 315 (68% F)<br>+35 controls (71% F)                                  | M/F mean age 63 years (18–92) with UI<br>Controls: referred to clinic for evaluation of urological disease unrelated to UI   | Test-retest reliability                                       | Cronbach's alpha correlation for domains:<br>0.88 social interaction, 0.81 personal strain, 0.73 for global health and QOL<br>(Item-specific correlation ranged from 0.4 to 0.72)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Questionnaire self-administered by pts in a clinic 5 days apart.<br>Controls scored 0 on both test and retest.<br>Scores for UI pts not reported.  |
| Kelleher 1997 <sup>97</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Assess KHQ for validity and reliability  | 293 (97% completed questions correctly)<br>110 completed test-retest | F mean age 51 years (17–85), referred to tertiary urogynae centre for UD investigation<br>UD diagnosis: 48% stress UI, 29% DO, 4% mixed UI, 10% low compliance, 4% sensory urgency, 5% normal UD | Limitations domain of KHQ (role, physical, social, personal)  | Test-retest values, <i>r</i> :<br>Role: 35.89/37.84 ( <i>r</i> = 0.94)<br>Physical: 42.79/44.29 ( <i>r</i> = 0.96)<br>Social: 20.32/22.87 ( <i>r</i> = 0.80)<br>Personal*: 10.51/12.61 ( <i>r</i> = 0.87)<br>Cronbach's alpha: 0.785, 0.725, 0.758 and 0.892, respectively | Funding: none declared.<br>Questionnaire completed at home prior to UD, repeated at UD clinic ( <i>n</i> = 110) after mean 9.2 days (2–16).<br>Reliability assessed by its internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha statistic where $\geq 0.7$ considered acceptable).<br>Test-retest reliability measured by Spearman's correlation coefficient. |
|                             |                       |  |  |  | Emotional problems  | 37.34/39.16 ( <i>r</i> = 0.92)<br>Cronbach's alpha: 0.876  | Retest values tended to be higher than test but differences 'not statistically significant'.  |
|                             |                       |  |  |  | Sleep/energy disturbance                                      | 46.40/48.10 ( <i>r</i> = 0.88)<br>Cronbach's alpha: 0.784  |   |
|                             |                       |  |  |  | Severity measures   | 44.44/47.0 ( <i>r</i> = 0.94)<br>Cronbach's alpha: 0.778   | *58% and 51% scored 0 on this q on test-retest.   |
| Hagen 2002 <sup>98</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Test-retest reliability; concurrent and construct validity; sensitivity to   | 237  | 3 groups of women with UI: (1) community-dwelling with stable, unspecified UI; mean age 76 years ( <i>n</i> = 79)  | Test-retest reliability of UDI*                               | Mean change in score –6.1 (95% CI –11.0, –1.5, <i>P</i> = 0.01)<br>Kappa score for each q ranged from 0.699 to 0.350 (1 q: pain on urinating kappa score < 0.04)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Questionnaires designed to be self-completed; 33% needed a nurse to read the questions and note responses. Test-retest done median 3 days apart (IQR 3–  |

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes                        | Results  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
|                          |                       | change of UDI and IIQ  |                 | (2) F attending outpatient clinic for UI assessment; stress, mixed or urge UI, mean age 60 years ( $n = 75$ )<br>(3) F on waiting list for colposuspension, mean age 50 years ( $n = 83$ )   | Test-retest reliability of IIQ* | Mean change in score $-9.7$ (95% CI $-15.5, -3.9, P = 0.001$ )<br>Kappa score for each q ranged from 0.732 to 0.381 (2 questions: effect of leakage on entertainment activities, or on having friends visit at home kappa score $< 0.04$ ) | 7).<br>*Assessed using paired $t$ tests and kappa statistics (kappa score $< 0.4$ indicating poor agreement).<br>Kappa score of 1 indicates absolute agreement. |
| Wyman 1987 <sup>99</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Analyse psychosocial impact of UI in women (IIQ); examine relationship between psychosocial impact and UD diagnosis; investigate relationship between psychosocial impact and objective measurement of UI severity | 69              | F, community-dwelling recruited to participate in clinical study of behavioural management; $\geq 55$ years (mean 68), capable of independent toileting, $\geq 1$ leakage episode/week, UD diagnosis of SUI (68%) or DO with/without SUI (32%) | Test-retest reliability of IIQ* | No numerical data reported<br>$r = 0.73, P = 0.0001$ at 1 week<br>$r = 0.65, P = 0.001$ at 6 weeks   | Funding: none declared.<br>UDI and IIQ questionnaires completed after clinical evaluation and prior to randomisation.<br>*Pearson's correlation coefficient.    |

| Study                              | Study type and EL     | Aim   | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Stach-Lempinen 2001 <sup>100</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Psychometric assessment of the Urinary Incontinence Severity Score (UISS) and Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) in urinary incontinent women  | 82 and 29 control grp (overall 51 provided test-retest data) | F, with UI recruited for a study that included baseline investigation and re-evaluation 13 months (range 6–21 months) after treatment. 67% genuine stress UI, 13% mixed, 16% urge UI, 4% normal UD and no UI symptoms<br><br>Control grp: F mean age 55 (44–68) with urinary leakage but did not require medical intervention<br><br>Exclusions: diabetic neuropathy, recently diagnosed cancer, neurogenic UI, continence surgery within 5 years | Test-retest reliability (Spearman's rank correlation)           | $r = 0.88$ , $P < 0.001$<br><br>No test-retest scores reported  | Funding: Emil Aaltonen Foundation, and grant from Medical Research Fund of Tampere University Hospital.<br><br>Retest done after ~1 week (when awaiting post-treatment visits).<br><br>29 control women who had UI but were not bothered by it completed the HRQoL measurements. |
| Matza 2005 <sup>101</sup>          | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate test-retest reliability of 4 patient-reported outcome instruments designed for use with OAB pts (OAB-q; Urgency questionnaire; Primary OAB symptom questionnaire; Patient perception of bladder condition) | 47 (75% F)   | M/F mean age 66 years, from 5 urology clinics; clinical diagnosis of OAB  | Difference in test-retest score, and agreement for OAB-q* items | Symptom bother: 5.8 ( $P = 0.01$ ), $r = 0.83$<br>Coping: 2.4 ( $P = \text{NS}$ ), $r = 0.93$<br>Concern: 4.1 ( $P = \text{NS}$ ), $r = 0.85$<br>Sleep: 0.8 ( $P = \text{NS}$ ), $r = 0.94$<br>Social interaction: 2.1 ( $P = \text{NS}$ ), $r = 0.80$<br>HRQOL total score: 2.1 ( $P = \text{NS}$ ), $r = 0.92$<br>( $P < 0.001$ for all $r$ values) | Funding: Pfizer Inc.<br>Retest after 2 weeks.<br>*Spearman's correlation coefficient.  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes                           | Results   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Hanley 2001 <sup>102</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate reliability, validity, and sensitivity to change of the severity index in a wide range of women in Scotland | 237  | F, from 3 'groups'; community-dwelling with stable incontinence; F undergoing initial assessment and non-surgical tx at a continence clinic; F awaiting surgical tx for stress UI (colposuspension)   | Kappa scores for each question*    | For Q1 (frequency of leakage):<br>$k = 0.69$<br>For Q2 (quantity of leakage):<br>$k = 0.83$<br>$P < 0.001$ for both<br>[Severity index scores on test–retest not reported]                              | Funding: none declared.<br>*Severity index derived by multiplying the frequency by the amount of leakage; this gives an index of 1–8 (1–2 = slight, 3–4 moderate, 6–8 severe) <sup>10</sup><br>Revised index splits severe in 2 categories; this index given to women 3 days apart.  |
| Radley 2006 <sup>937</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Develop and evaluate a new web-based, electronic pelvic floor symptoms assessment questionnaire                      | 126 (62% of 204 whom completed the first questionnaire)* | A cross-section of F attending primary care (two general practices, and two community health clinics, who were recruited without knowledge of any pre-existing pelvic disorders). Mean age 53 years (SD 13)<br><br>(A further 228 F attending a urogynaecology clinic were also included in this study, but retest was not undertaken in this group because they were typically offered interventions after their clinic visit) | Intraclass correlation coefficient | Significant correlation reported within all domains<br>Urinary (intraclass correlation coefficient range 0.73–0.90)<br>Bowel (range 0.80–0.88)<br>Vaginal (range 0.70–0.91)<br>Sexual (range 0.50–0.95) | Funding: grants from University of Sheffield (medical division devolved funding), and Jessop Wing small grants scheme.<br>Retest after 7 days for F in primary care; F also asked whether there had been any change in their health since the original test; retest only undertaken in F who reported 'no change at all'.<br>*reasons for no retest in 38% were not given. |

## Bladder diaries

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Larsson 1992 <sup>103</sup> | Case-series<br>EL = 3 | To compare the findings of frequency–volume charts in women with genuine stress UI vs women without lower urinary tract symptoms (some reproducibility data of chart also reported for women with SUI) | 80 (women with genuine stress UI) | F mean age 47 years (31–69)  | Limits of agreement for differences* for FVC parameters (day 1, day 2)                                     | Total voided volume 0.53–1.89<br>Frequency 0.60–1.67<br>Mean voided volume 0.56–1.79<br>Largest single voided volume 0.47–2.13  | Funding: none declared.<br>*i.e. 2 SDs; for every 95% of cases, the second measurement lies between the quoted multiple of the first.   |
| Groutz 2000 <sup>104</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Test–retest reliability of 72 h voiding diary and pad test, and compare test–retest reliability of 24, 48, and 72 h tests. Tests repeated after 1 week   | 106 (84% women)                   | M/F 22–84 years referred for evaluation of lower urinary tract symptoms; 34% urge UI symptoms, 22% stress UI, 26% mixed UI, 16% frequency-urgency syndrome (no UI)<br>Exclusions: UTI, drugs affecting voiding, restricted mobility, grade 3–4 prolapse, daily urine output > 2500 ml, nocturnal output > 35% total output | Voiding diary (mean/72 h, 1st and 2nd diary results)<br><br>Pad test (mean/72 h, 1st and 2nd test results) | frequency (overall): 31.5 ± 11.8; 30.7 ± 10.9 (CCC 0.826)<br>day frequency: 26.9 ± 10.3; 26.2 ± 10.3 (CCC 0.797)<br>night frequency: 4.6 ± 3.8; 4.5 ± 4.3 (CCC 0.605)<br>leakage episodes: 7.6 ± 9.0; 7.7 ± 9.8 (CCC 0.860)<br>urgency episodes: 8.0 ± 11.0; 6.6 ± 10.0 (CCC 0.702)<br>voided vol. (ml): 1820 ± 1013; 1849 ± 961 (CCC 0.872)<br>No. pads: 6.86 ± 3.98; 6.87 ± 4.11 (CCC 0.875)<br>Weight gain (g): 172.4 ± 317.0; 159.7 ± 316 (CCC 0.935) | Funding: Zeneca Pharmaceuticals; Institute for Bladder and Prostate Research.<br>CCC = Lin's concordance correlation coefficient. 0.7 taken as 'minimum test–retest reliability.'<br>Compliance with 72 h tests: 97% across all diary parameters; voided volume compliance 92% at 24 h, 76% at 72 h; pad test 96% at 24 h, 90% at 72 h.<br>CCC, but not test results, also reported for 24 and 48 h:<br>frequency (overall):<br>days 1, 2, 3: 0.673, 0.704, 0.690<br>days 1–2, 2–3: 0.781, 0.770<br>leakage episodes:<br>days 1, 2, 3: 0.810, 0.758, 0.787<br>days 1–2, 2–3: 0.839, 0.827<br>urgency episodes:<br>days 1, 2, 3: 0.577, 0.698, 0.633<br>days 1–2, 2–3: 0.688, 0.709<br>No. pads:<br>days 1, 2, 3: 0.737, 0.726, 0.729<br>days 1–2, 2–3: 0.856, 0.828<br>Pad weight gain (g):<br>days 1, 2, 3: 0.721, 0.889, 0.890<br>days 1–2, 2–3: 0.877, 0.946 |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Nygaard 2000 <sup>105</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Assess reproducibility of leakage episode and frequency data from a 7 day diary; test repeated after 4 weeks  | 138             | F 27–78 years, stress UI, who were enrolled in a study evaluating the FemSoft device.   | Frequency (mean /24 h, 1st and 2nd diary results)<br><br>Leakage episodes/week* (mean, 1st and 2nd diary results) | 7.99 ± 2.76 (1st diary), 8.02 ± 3.05 (2nd diary); difference 0.03; correlation coefficient 0.831<br><br>20.8 ± 17.8 (1st), 19.1 ± 17.9 (2nd); difference 1.7; correlation coefficient 0.906  | Funding: Rochester Medical Inc.<br>*data from 1 outlier not used.<br>Correlation coefficients for first 3 and last 4 days of the 7 day diary: 0.887 for leakage episodes, and 0.908 for frequency (results shown in graphs only).  |
| Wyman 1988 <sup>106</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | (1) Test–retest variability and correlations of frequency and leakage episodes based on a 7 day diary; (2) assess effect of urodynamic diagnosis on test–retest analysis; (3) investigate relationship between history and diary* | 50              | F 55–86 years recruited to a trial of behavioural therapy. ≥ 1 leakage episode/week. Urodynamic stress UI 68%, DO ± stress UI 32%<br><br>Exclusions: permanent catheterisation, persistent UTI, reversible causes of UI | Diurnal frequency (mean/week)<br><br>Nocturnal frequency (mean/week)<br><br>Leakage episodes (mean/week)          | Diary test; retest:<br>SUI: 61.0 ± 21.7; 58.2 ± 20.9, <i>r</i> = 0.92<br>DO: 59.7 ± 16.9; 62.9 ± 17.7, <i>r</i> = 0.85<br><i>r</i> = 0.89 for total grp, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>Diary test; retest:<br>SUI: 8.1 ± 5.8; 7.7 ± 5.6, <i>r</i> = 0.92<br>DO: 9.6 ± 4.9; 9.4 ± 4.7, <i>r</i> = 0.65<br><i>r</i> = 0.86 for total grp, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>Diary test; retest:<br>SUI: 20.4 ± 21.6; 19.9 ± 23.1, <i>r</i> = 0.92<br>DO: 12.6 ± 13.0; 12.4 ± 11.4, <i>r</i> = 0.89<br><i>r</i> = 0.91 for total grp, <i>P</i> < 0.0001 | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Center for Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health.<br>Test–retest reliability reported by urodynamic diagnostic group. Diary kept for 2 consecutive weeks.<br><i>R</i> = Pearson's correlation coefficient; <i>P</i> value from paired <i>t</i> tests.<br>No statistical differences found between test–retest results or correlations when assessed by urodynamic diagnostic group.<br>*not relevant to the UI guideline questions therefore results not reproduced here. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---|--|
| Locher 2001 <sup>107</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate reliability of a 14 day diary for assessing frequency of leakage episodes and to determine the number of consecutive days needed to obtain adequate internal consistency | 214             | F, community-dwelling enrolled in 1 of 2 RCTs investigating behavioural treatment; leakage episodes $\geq 2 \times$ week. In 1 study ( $n = 138$ ), mean age 66 years (55–90); 71% urge UI, 29% mixed UI; 23% 2–5 leakage episodes/week, 29% 5–10, 49% $> 10$ . In 2nd study ( $n = 78$ ), mean age 60 years (40–73); 53% stress UI, 47% mixed UI; 26% 2–5 episodes/week, 26% 5–10, 48% $> 10$ | Women with predominant urge UI<br><br>Women with predominant stress UI | Mean leakage episodes/day (14 day diary): 2.2<br>Leakage days 1–3 sig. higher than 14 day mean; days 7,8,9,11 sig. less than mean<br>Mean week 1: 2.4, week 2: 2.0, $P < 0.0001$<br>Correlation between weeks 1 and 2: $r = 0.93$ , $P < 0.0001$<br>Internal consistency*: $> 0.9$ (0.924) after 5 days<br><br>Mean leakage episodes/day (14 day diary): 2.1<br>Leakage day 1 sig. higher than 14 day mean; days 5, 10 sig. lower than mean<br>Mean week 1: 2.2, week 2: 2.1, $P = NS$<br>Correlation between weeks 1 and 2: $r = 0.86$ , $P < 0.0001$<br>Internal consistency*: $> 0.9$ (0.912) after 7 days | Funding: National Institutes on Aging; National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney diseases.<br>Urge or stress UI indicates urodynamic diagnosis.<br>*Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency as a function of days; 0.90 considered adequate internal consistency for reports of leakage episodes. |

## Pad testing

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Fantl 1987 <sup>114</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Reproducibility of standardised pad test in ambulatory, community-dwelling women | 67              | F referred for evaluation of UI. Urodynamic diagnosis stress UI ( $n = 46$ ), DO $\pm$ SUI ( $n = 21$ ); mean age 48 $\pm$ 11.5 years (SUI), 57 $\pm$ 9.9 years (DO $\pm$ SUI) | Test–retest differences in urine loss (mean, g)<br><br>Test–retest differences in filing vol. (mean, ml) | SUI: 9.1 (SD 21.0) $P < 0.01$ ; $r = 0.97$<br>DO $\pm$ SUI: 12.1 (SD 35.0), $P = NS$ ; $r = 0.84$<br><br>SUI: 17.8 (SD 42.3), $P < 0.01$ ; $r = 0.86$<br>DO $\pm$ SUI: 31.4 (SD 55.0), $P < 0.02$ , $r = 0.82$ | Funding: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging, National Center on Nursing Research.<br>Bladder filled to capacity with normal saline, exercise involved 50 yard walk, climbing a step, coughing, a heel-bounce, sitting/standing, and hands under running water; total duration 10–15 min. |



| Study                        | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients     | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                              |                       |   |                     |  | Test-retest differences in Urine loss/filling vol. (%)   | SUI: 2.4 (SD 6.0), $P < 0.02$ ; $r = 0.98$<br>DO $\pm$ SUI: 0.8 (SD 13.7), $P = \text{NS}$ ; $r = 0.90$  | Retest followed immediately.<br>$R =$ Pearson's correlation coefficient; $P$ values from $t$ test  |
| Simons 2001 <sup>109</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Test-retest reliability of standardised (ICS) 1 h pad test when bladder volumes attained by natural diuresis  | 56                  | F median age 56 years (IQR 44.5–66) presenting with UI                   | Test-retest differences in urine loss (mean, g)<br>Bladder volume at 1st and 2nd test (median, ml) | 9.7 (SD 29.7), 95% CI –66,+46*<br>$P = 0.017$ for difference (from median 4 [0.5–15] to 16 [4–31.5])<br>433 (IQR 331–568); 541 (IQR 377–603)<br>$P < 0.001$ for difference | Funding: none declared.<br>Serial ultrasound measurements of the 2nd test performed in an attempt to duplicate the natural fill bladder volumes.<br>Retest done in 3–10 days. Correlation test used not stated.<br>*excluding one outlier gave mean difference 4.1 g SD 19.5 (95% CI –43,+34).   |
| Kinn 1987 <sup>108</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine whether a fixed bladder vol. during physical exercise can improve accuracy of a 1 h pad test; and feasibility of performing test as part of routine urodynamic evaluation | 33                  | F mean age 56 years (38–83), stress UI (mixed in 24%)                    | Urinary leakage during test and retest   | No numerical data presented; leakage greater during retest (as seen on graph)<br>Sig. correlation reported between test and retest, $P < 0.001$ , $r = 0.74$               | Funding: none declared.<br>Retest done on same day, same investigator. Correlation test used not stated.<br>Pad tests done as part of cystometry. Cystometry done using two-channel 12 Ch soft catheter, perineal pad applied with bladder vol. 75% of max. bladder capacity.<br>Exercises undertaken during pad test took 12–15 min). |
| Devreese 1996 <sup>115</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Reliability and sensitivity of 'modified' 1 h pad test (more fluid consumed prior to test; 1 litre within 15 min followed by 0.5 litre in 1 h)                                      | 16 (of 25 enrolled) | F mean age 47 years (25–71) referred to physio dept for PFMT owing to UI | Test-retest differences  | Mean urine loss 12 vs 10 g: $r = 0.73^*$ ( $P < 0.001$ )<br>Mean end vol.: 554 vs 648 ml, $P < 0.05$ for difference: $r = 0.67^*$ ( $P < 0.01$ )                           | Funding: none declared.<br>14 exercises undertaken during pad test.<br>Retest in 1–7 days.<br>*Spearman rank correlation coefficient.  |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients                               | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Lose 1988 <sup>116</sup>                                  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Reproducibility of modified 1 h pad test (as ICS except saline $\equiv$ 50% of cystometric bladder capacity instilled into the bladder at the start of the test rather than drinking 500 ml liquid) | 25  | F mean age 53 years (40–79) referred for stress ( $n = 18$ ) or mixed UI ( $n = 7$ )<br>Exclusions: DO | Test–retest differences in urine loss   | Mean test–retest differences up to 24 g<br>$r = 0.97$ , $P < 0.001$ (results shown in graph only)                       | Funding: none declared.<br>Retest interval ranged from 1 to 85 days.<br>Correlation test used not stated.<br>Test duration 45 min. Median instilled vol. 193 ml (59–461) 14 exercises undertaken as part of the test.   |
| Lose 1986 <sup>110</sup><br>Jorgensen 1987 <sup>111</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Reproducibility of 1 h pad test (as ICS)  | 18  | F mean age 49 years (27–82) referred for stress ( $n = 13$ ) or mixed ( $n = 5$ ) UI<br>Exclusions: DO | Test–retest differences in urine loss   | Median 4 g (range 0–172)<br>Mean 23 g<br>$r = 0.68$ , * $P < 0.01$  | Funding: none declared.<br>Range of differences in initial bladder vol. 0–354 ml; and in diuresis 4–464 ml.<br>Retest in 1–15 days. Correlation test used not stated.<br>*if initial bladder vol. and diuresis taken into account, $r = 0.96$ , $P < 0.001$ . |
| Klarskov 1984 <sup>112</sup>                              | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Reliability and reproducibility of the 1 h pad test   | 50 (78% women); only 19 performed test retest | M/F median age 52 years (17–75), stress, urge or mixed UI<br>Exclusions: menstruating women            | Test–retest differences in urine loss ( $n = 19$ )<br>Urine loss as % bladder vol. for test–retest ( $n = 15$ ) | $r = 0.96$ (numerical data for g difference not given)<br>$r = 0.80$ (numerical data for difference not given)          | Funding: none declared.<br>Test interval 1–36 days. Correlation test used not stated.<br>ICS standardised 1 h pad test used.  |
| Christensen 1986 <sup>113</sup>                           | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To evaluate inter- and intra-departmental reproducibility of the 1 h pad test   | 20  | F median age 54 years (31–81); 5 stress UI, 11 mixed UI, 4 urge UI                                     | Test–retest correlation (within 1 dept)   | Median weight gain:<br>Test 24 g (0–199)<br>Retest 21 (0.185), $P = \text{NS}$ between tests<br>$r = 0.77$ , $P < 0.05$ | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS standardised 1 h pad test used.<br>Retest done after 1 week. Correlation test used not stated.<br>Differences in inter-departmental results were significant, $P < 0.05$ .   |

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients                         | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Rasmussen 1994 <sup>117</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate the possible influence of high vs low fluid intake/level of activity on the results of a 24 h pad test. Also includes reproducibility data for 'normal' days         | 13                                      | F median age 54 years (43–75); 10 stress UI, 13 mixed UI  | Test–retest differences in urine loss   | Mean 5 g, $P = NS$<br>Retest leakage 28% to 365% of first test  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retest done on following day. Linear regression analysis.   |
| Lose 1989 <sup>118</sup>       | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To establish the normal range for the 24 h pad test; assess reproducibility of the test; determine whether 24 h test more sensitive than a 1 h test, in patients with mild UI | 31                                      | F mean age 57 years (20–79) referred owing to UI (23 stress UI, 8 urge UI)<br>Exclusions: DO and/or severe urine loss ( $\geq 10$ g at the 1 h pad test)  | Median weight gain (for all 24 h tests)<br><br>Test–retest correlation for 24 h test*   | 17 g (range 2–438)<br><br>$r = 0.82, P < 0.001$   | Funding: Molnlycke Hospital Products Denmark supplied pads and plastic bags.<br>Methods, definitions and units conform to ICS standards. Test–retest done consecutively.<br>23 asymptomatic women acted as controls. Pad weight gain in this grp: Urine loss in this grp on 24 h pad test median:<br>*test–retest differences shown in graph only. Correlation test used not stated. |
| Karantanis 2005 <sup>119</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To determine whether pad test leakage would be greater on active days, and whether test repeatability would be improved by a particular level of activity                     | 108 (104 of whom completed 7 pad tests) | F median age 57 years attending a tertiary urogynaecology unit with UI. Urodynamic finding: 65% stress UI, 29% mixed UI, 6% DO and 'others' (sensory urgency, voiding difficulty, or a mixture thereof)<br>F undertook 7 consecutive 24 h pad tests at home | Mean pad weight for 7 days<br><br>Deviation from severity grading<br><br>No. pads needed to obtain same degree of repeatability as 7 tests* | 44.2 g (95% CI 38.5 to 49.9)<br>SD between women 78.9 g<br>SD within women 32.0 g<br><br>Incomplete information (data shown in graphs but incomplete numerical data)<br><br>Pearson's correlation coefficient between first 24 h and 7 days = 0.881, $P = 0.000$<br>Authors claimed that 3 days was the 'optimal number of pad-test days required to approach the repeatability seen in 7 days'; data shown in graph, no numerical data given | Funding: none declared.<br>Analysis of data from activity charts not possible owing to poor patient compliance (only 77% were completed).<br>$r =$ Pearson's correlation coefficient.<br>*optimal considered to be where correlation coefficient 'began to level' (gradient $< 45^\circ$ ).  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients    | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Victor 1987 <sup>120</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To evaluate 48 h pad test  | 46 (15 did retest) | F mean age 50 years (21–73) scheduled for surgery or further investigation for UI | Test–retest correlation for total leakage (24 h) | $r = 0.66, P < 0.001$  | Funding: grants from LIC Hygien, Sweden.<br>Test repeated after 6–28 days. Correlation test used not stated.<br>In 46 who had 48 h pad test, the leakage ranged from 3.5 g to 267 g.<br>17 F also did 1 h pad test.<br>Actual results of leakage not reported.                                  |
|                            |                       |  |                    |   | Test–retest correlation for total leakage (48 h) | $r = 0.9, P < 0.001$   |   |
| Versi 1996 <sup>121</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate reproducibility, ease of use, acceptability and compliance with a home pad test (Inco-Test) | 112                | F with lower urinary tract symptoms   | 24 h test  | Test–retest difference (% of mean):<br>6.9 ± 155<br>Correlation coefficient 0.9 (95% CI 0.87 to 0.94)  | Funding: none declared. Molnlycke supplied pads and scales.<br>Pre-weighed pads given to women. Pads not used during menstruation.<br>Test repeated after 1 week in women whose circumstances had not changed and who complied fully with 1st test.<br>$R =$ Pearsons' correlation coefficient. |
|                            |                       |  |                    |   | 48 h test  | Test–retest difference (% of mean):<br>1.6 ± 136<br>Correlation coefficient 0.94 (95% CI 0.93 to 0.95) |   |

## Urodynamics

Does urodynamic testing affect outcome?

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients                | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size                                     | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Ramsay 1995 <sup>123</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 60 (48 completed and analysed) | F with frequency, urgency, nocturia, urge and stress UI<br>Exclusions: previous tx for UI haematuria, recurrent dysuria or voiding difficulty, UTI | Urodynamic investigation then tx tailored to diagnosis*<br>( $n = 27$ randomised, 20 analysed) | Multicomponent conservative tx**<br>( $n = 33$ randomised, 28 analysed) | 3 months tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)                        | –73% vs –73%,<br>$P = NS$                       | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] No baseline characteristics presented, analysis on completers only, with no explanation for withdrawals.<br>*bladder training for DO or hypersensitive bladder (aiming for 5 h voiding interval); PFMT for SUI (tailored to individual, 3–10 repetitions 3×/day); CISC for voiding difficulty.<br>**bladder training (as inpatients), PFMT, dietary and fluid intake advice. |
|                            |                   |                                |  |  |   |                     | Frequency/day (mean change)                                | –34% vs –40%,<br>$P = NS$                       |   |
|                            |                   |                                |  |  |   |                     | Nocturia/night (mean change)                               | –59% vs –60%,<br>$P = NS$                       |   |
|                            |                   |                                |  |  |   |                     | Short pad test (mean change, g)                            | –72% vs –72%,<br>$P = NS$                       |   |
|                            |                   |                                |  |  |   |                     | Subjective assessment (VAS, mean change)                   | –3.5 vs –3.6<br>(units not stated),<br>$P = NS$ |   |
|                            |                   |                                |  |  |   |                     | Self-reported cure or improvement (no further tx required) | 60% vs 71%,<br>$P = NS$                         |   |

| Study   | Study type and EL  | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up       | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| Thompson 2000 <sup>124</sup>  | Cohort*<br>EL = 2- | 131 (109 followed up)   | F ≤ 50 years who underwent retropubic surgery for stress UI; surgery performed by a urogynaecologist**<br>Exclusions: prior retropubic urethropexy, low MUCP and/or low cough leak-point pressure   | Full pre-op UD ( <i>n</i> = 95; 77 followed up)<br>10 had surgery (Burch), tx others had not stated<br>(UD diagnosis SUI 45%, 27% MUI, 27% UUI) | Minimal pre-op assessment# ( <i>n</i> = 36; 32 followed up)<br>3 had surgery (Burch), tx others had not stated | Mean ~25 months follow-up | Subjective outcome for stress UI ( <i>n</i> = 109)<br><br>Subjective outcome with 'true' success (no urge UI or other voiding problems) ( <i>n</i> = 109) | Cure 70% vs 72%<br>Improved 18% vs 19%<br>Failed 12% vs 9%<br><i>P</i> = NS for all comparisons<br><br>True success 69% vs 78%<br>Partial success 19% vs 13%<br>Failed 12% vs 9%<br><i>P</i> = NS for all comparisons | Funding: Woman's Hospital of Texas Research and Education Foundation.<br>*retrospective chart review.<br>**Thomson also compared these findings with results for women operated on by urologists who do not use any formal urodynamic studies; data not reproduced here as not directly relevant to guideline question.<br>#uroflowmetry, subtracted CMG, MUCP, CLPP, cystourethroscopy.   |
| Black 1997 <sup>125</sup><br>Associated reference<br>Hutchings 1998 <sup>126</sup><br>(competence section)<br>Impact of other symptoms and comorbidity also described in the report – data not reproduced here. | Cohort*<br>EL = 2+ | 442 (68% of 650 treated who wished to participate and returned Q on time)<br>359 (81%) responded to 1 year follow-up Q**, surgeons completed data on 63%<br>Urodynamic data available for 267 | F mean age 52 years who had surgery for stress UI between Jan 93 and June 94<br>Exclusions: unable to read or understand English<br>Procedure: 3.8% missing info, 50% colposuspension, 12% needle suspension, 29% anterior colporrhaphy, 4.5% other | Pre-op urodynamic pressure studies ( <i>n</i> = 164)  | No pre-op urodynamics ( <i>n</i> = 103)  | 1 year                    | Mean symptom severity score at 1 year<br><br>Cure   | 5.7 vs 6.0 (difference 0.3, [95% CI -1.2 to 1.8])<br>(baseline 12.2 vs 14.6, <i>P</i> = NS)<br><br>24% vs 26%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: MRC Health Services Research and Public Health Board.<br>*137 gynaecologists/urologists from North Thames region invited to participate in the study; 47% agreed, 9% declined and 44% did not respond.<br>49 of the 64 who agreed to participate were selected (38 gynae, 11 urologists), as it was deemed a representative sample in terms of case load, specialty, setting (DGH or teaching; rural, suburban, or urban population). Surgeons provided pre-op data.<br><br>Pts completed pre-op questionnaire re sociodemographic factors, symptoms, history, mental health, expectations from surgery.<br><br>**more non-respondents had severe symptoms (33% vs 23%). Respondents more likely to have colpo (57% vs 46%) and less likely to have a needle suspension (7% vs 26%), <i>P</i> < 0.01. |

## Do preoperative urodynamic findings predict post-surgical outcomes?

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Francis 1987 <sup>127</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Identify UD changes in a grp undergoing modified Burch colposuspension   | 50              | F mean age 50 years (32–71) with genuine stress UI<br>56% had prior continence surgery, (MMK in 12, anterior colporrhaphy in 20, Burch in 5, Stamey in 1)<br>74% had prior hysterectomy  | Objective failure rate<br><br>Urethral closure pressure in objectively failed vs successful surgery            | 26% ( <i>n</i> = 13)<br><br>Mean pre-op 18 vs 33 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, <i>P</i> < 0.005 (10 of 13 with failed surgery had pre-op closure pressure < 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O)   | Funding: none declared.<br>UD method: MC pre-op and at 3 months post-op. Static and stress UCPP studied in supine empty and sitting empty positions with bladder filled with 150 ml saline Studies also conducted in sitting full position at max. cystometric capacity.<br>Not stated whether UD performed to ICS standards.  |
| Kujansuu 1983 <sup>128</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate UD before and after continence surgery, and correlate findings with operative success  | 79              | F with previous failed continence surgery, investigated clinically and by simultaneous urethrocytometry before and 15 months (SD 4) after continence surgery (11 vaginal Kelly, 7 Lyodura sling, 18 MMK, 43 Burch)<br>97% had stress UI, 3% mixed UI | Objective failure rate<br>Urethral relaxation at stress* (mean pre-op values in failed vs successful grp)      | 41% ( <i>n</i> = 32)<br>0.584 (SD 0.197) vs 0.710 (SD 0.216), <i>P</i> < 0.01  | Funding: none declared.<br>UD method: MC, with UPP measurement in the standing position. Not stated whether ICS standards for UD followed.<br>*ratio of highest intraurethral pressure between coughs in the stress UPP to the maximal UCP in the UPP at rest.<br>No other UD measurements found to 'correlate' with surgical success (MUCP, location of max. closure pressure, urethral length).              |
| Digesu 2004 <sup>129</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine whether acceleration of flow rate (AFR), pressure flow variables, and UPP measurements have a role in evaluating women with urodynamic stress UI, to predict surgical outcomes and <i>de novo</i> DO | 209             | F mean age 60 years (34–90) with UD stress UI, seen at a tertiary UD clinic, owing to undergo modified Burch colposuspension. 17% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: DO and/or POP beyond vaginal introitus; irritative urinary symptoms    | Objective cure<br>Pre-op MUCP, ODP, CDP, AFR in failed vs Successful grps (mean, SD)*<br><br><i>De novo</i> DO | 82% at 1 year post-op<br>MUCP: 37.5 (15) vs 40.5 (18), <i>P</i> = NS<br>ODP: 12.1 (8.8) vs 21.3 (12), <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>CDP: 21.2 (10) vs 25.2 (16), <i>P</i> = 0.04<br>AFR: 4.0 (2.5) vs 4.2 (3.2), <i>P</i> = NS<br>18% at 1 year post-op | Funding: none declared.<br>UD method: VCU, pressure flow studies. Acceleration of flow rate (AFR = max. flow rate ÷ time to reach max. flow), opening detrusor pressure (ODP), and urethral pressure at closure (CDP), UPP calculated pre-op. Terms and definitions for UD conform to ICS standards.<br>Complete pressure flow studies obtained from 96% F before surgery<br>VCU repeated 1 year after surgery |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients       | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
|                               |                       |  |                       |   | Pre-op MUCP, ODP, CDP, AFR in <i>de novo</i> DO vs 'normal' bladder function grps (mean, SD)    | MUCP: 45.6 (19) vs 39 (17.2), <i>P</i> = NS<br>ODP: 27.5 (16) vs 22.4 (12), <i>P</i> = 0.04<br>CDP: 36.8 (17) vs 26.5 (16), <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>AFR: 5.6 (4.6) vs 3.9 (2.7), <i>P</i> = 0.009  | *MUCP, ODP, CDP in cmH <sub>2</sub> O; AFR units ml/s <sup>2</sup> .   |
| Rodriguez 2004 <sup>130</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Examine role of VLPP in predicting risk of failure, success rates and surgical outcomes in pts who underwent the distal urethral polypropylene sling procedure | 174                   | F mean age 62 years (32–88) with stress UI<br>Mean no. of previous surgeries 0.6–0.7 across VLPP grps<br>33% had concomitant prolapse repair  | Objective* cure rates according to VLPP (cmH <sub>2</sub> O)                                    | 95% (no leak on UD)<br>92% VLPP > 80<br>93% VLPP 30–80<br>92% VLPP < 30   | Funding: none declared.<br>UD method: videoUD, according to ICS recommendations. VLPP determined at bladder volume of 200 ml.<br>Mean follow-up 14.7 months (12–30).<br>*self-reported, where failure defined as < 50% improvement.  |
| McLennan 1988 <sup>140</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine time to resumption of normal voiding after a fascia lata suburethral sling, and whether clinical, operative, or UD variables predict this time       | 61 (UD studies in 49) | F mean age 60 years (40–84) with UD stress UI, who had fascia lata suburethral sling for ISD or recurrent UI. 77% had sling alone, 23% had additional procedures<br>67% had prior continence surgery, mean 1.7 (range 1–7); 21% had failed prior continence surgery<br>46% had low VLPP (≤ 65 cm), 3% had MUCP < 20 cm, 23% urethral hypomobility | Time to normal voiding as a function of UD voiding indices (results for early vs late voiders*) | Max. flow (≥ 20 ml/s) 79% vs 43%, <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>[Logistic regression analysis: max. flow rate < 20 ml/s associated with delayed voiding (OR 4.6, 95% CI 1.06 to 20.01), <i>P</i> = 0.04.<br>Mean max. urethral closure pressure (cm) 26 vs 34, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Valsalva void 37% vs 30%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Detrusor void 79% vs 80%, <i>P</i> = NS | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review.<br>UD method: MC UD, and Cystourethroscopy. Cough and static UCPP measured at max. capacity, and MUCP calculated electronically. Not stated whether ICS criteria followed.<br>Voiding trial began day 2 post-op; suprapubic catheter removed when PVR < 100 ml with voided vol. 3× residual, or at 3–4 weeks if pt in retention. Pts then taught self-catheterisation. Time to resumption of normal voiding defined as both suprapubic catheter days and self-catheter days.<br>*early voiding = by day 7, and late voiding thereafter. 19/49 were early voiders, 30/49 took > 7 days. Mean time to normal voiding 10 (SD 9) days, median 9 (3–49). |
| Bergman 1985 <sup>141</sup>   | Case series           | Test the validity of uroflowmetry as a   | 45                    | F mean age 58 years (27–74), UD stress UI; undergoing Tanagho's   | Days of post-op drainage  | Mean 6.7 (3–28)<br>9 (20%) ≥ 7 days*  | Funding: none declared.<br>Uroflowmetry (with ≥ 200 ml urine in bladder)   |

| Study                           | Study type and EL     | Aim   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|--|--|
|                                 | EL = 3                | predictor of postoperative voiding problems   |                 | modification of Burch, 21 (47%) had total abdominal hysterectomy simultaneously<br>10 (22%) had prior continence surgery  | Pre-op uroflow findings in early vs late voiders ( <i>n</i> )  | Peak flow rate (ml/s): < 20 ml/s: 5 vs 4<br>≥ 20 ml/s: 31 vs 5,<br><i>P</i> = NS<br>Residual volume (mean, ml): 19.8 (SD 12) vs 21.6 (12.4), <i>P</i> = NS   | followed by catheterisation to determine residual volume, terminology conformed to ICS.<br>'Normal' peak flow defined as ≥ 20 ml/s.<br>Prolonged catheterisation = inability to resume spontaneous voiding or voiding with a PVR vol. > 50 ml on postop day ≥ 7.<br>*1 had pre-op history of voiding difficulty. |
| Kilicarslan 2003 <sup>131</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate whether pre-op VLPP and UCP could be used as predictors of surgery   | 58              | F mean age 52 (41–71) years, stress UI undergoing vaginal wall sling procedure (Raz)<br>Exclusions: DO, MUI, underactive detrusor, outlet obstruction, POP, neurogenic bladder  | Objective cure in 2 grps (VLPP < 50 cmH <sub>2</sub> O and MUCP < 30 vs VLPP ≥ 50 cm and MUCP ≥ 30)<br>VLPP in successful ( <i>n</i> = 46) vs failed cases<br>MUCP in successful vs failed cases | 65.4% vs 90.6%,<br><i>P</i> < 0.05<br>92.7 ± 6.3 (median 83) vs 43.6 ± 3.4 (median 46), <i>P</i> = NS<br>72.2 ± 12.3 vs 42.1 ± 3.8 (median 46),<br><i>P</i> < 0.05   | Funding: none declared.<br>Fluorourodynamics performed.<br>Objective cure: dry on 1 h extended pad test and UD studies in normal limits.<br>Mean follow-up 26 months (16–34).  |
| Hong 2003 <sup>142</sup>        | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To determine factors predictive of urinary retention in women undergoing TVT, where retention was defined as the need for ISC for at least 3 days | 375             | F mean age 52 (33–74), with stress or mixed UI (mixed in 38%)<br>17% had prior hysterectomy, 4% prior continence surgery.<br>7% had cystocele<br>Concomitant surgery; 3% hysterectomy, 3% cystocele repair, 8% vaginal repair | Retention<br>Urodynamic (multichannel cystometry) pre-op results in grp with retention vs those without  | 8.5% ( <i>n</i> = 32)*<br>Univariate analysis:<br>peak flow rate (ml/s): 22.3 vs 29.7, <i>P</i> = 0.001<br>VLPP 74 vs 65, <i>P</i> = NS<br>MUCP 44 vs 45, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Max. detrusor pressure 28 vs 30, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Multivariate analysis:<br>Peak flow rate: SE 0.0012 (95% CI 0.897 to 0.981), <i>P</i> = 0.007 | Funding: none declared.<br>*88% of whom required ISC for less than 1 month. Time to normal voiding was mean 12 days (3–31, median 9), and 12% needed sling release for retention.<br>Only data relevant to urodynamics extracted.<br>TVT done between March 1999 and May 2002.                                   |



| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
| Sand 1987 <sup>132</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To evaluate low urethral closure pressure as a risk factor for failed surgery in women undergoing colposuspension (Tanagho modification of Burch)                                | 86              | F mean age 50 years (30–72), with urodynamic stress UI. 58% had prior continence surgery (balanced in low/normal UCP groups)<br><br>Based on multichannel urodynamics with UCPP determined in resting position, pts divided into low UCP group ( $\leq 20$ cmH <sub>2</sub> O [ $n = 41$ ]), or normal ( $> 20$ [ $n = 45$ ]). Mean values of UCP were 12.5 vs 37.2 | Surgical failure at 3 months  | 35% overall<br>54% vs 18% in low vs normal UCP groups, $P < 0.0005$                                 | Funding: none declared.<br>Surgical failure = leakage on urodynamics or on stress test.<br>Low/normal UCP groups also differed in age (53 vs 47 mean, $P < 0.01$ ).<br>[linear regression analysis undertaken to investigate effect of difference in age; no numerical data given but reported that for women aged $< 50$ years, low UCP is an independent risk factor for failure.]                               |
| Meschia 1993 <sup>133</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To compare outcomes in menopausal and pre-menopausal women. Also, MUCP as a predictor of failure in total group considered<br><br>Procedure undertaken was Burch colposuspension | 98              | F mean age 50 years (33–73), with urodynamic stress UI and no signs of bladder instability<br><br>28% had MUCP $\leq 20$ cmH <sub>2</sub> O, and 72% with $> 20$ cmH <sub>2</sub> O   | Objective failure 1–3 years after surgery*                          | Overall failure 17%<br>33% vs 11% in MUCP $\leq 20$ vs $> 20$ cmH <sub>2</sub> O groups, $P < 0.05$ | Funding: none declared.<br>Failure = urinary leakage or pressure equalization or both during the cough profile or urinary leakage in the standing positions with a very strong desire to void during coughing.<br>*overall duration of followup unknown; was mean 21 months in 39% menopausal pts, and 18 in 61% pre-menopausal grp.<br>No attempt to explore effects of potential confounding factors on results. |
| Weil 1984 <sup>134</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To assess the effects of surgery on pressure profiles, and also whether pre-op urethral pressures  | 86*             | F with stress UI. None had prior surgery. All had stable bladders on cystometry<br><br>Pre-op MUCP (mean, SD): 47 (15) Burch, 45 (14) Pereyra, 43 (18)  | Continence (subjective and 'no urine loss' objectively) at 6 months | 91% of Burch grp<br>50% Pereyra<br>57% anterior colporrhaphy  | Funding: none declared.<br>Multi-channel cystometry undertaken with urethral profile measured at rest and under stress.<br>Transmission ratio = quotient between the   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | Aim   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|---|---|
|                               |                       | predict outcome   |                 | anterior colporrhaphy; transmission ratio: 75 (13), 79 (10), and 86 (13)   | Differences in pre-op variables for continent vs incontinent  | No data given for Burch – reported that no difference stat sig.<br>For Pereyra:<br>MUCP 46 (18) vs 43 (14), $P = NS$<br>Tratio 83 (9) vs 75 (10)<br>$P < 0.05$<br>For colporrhaphy:<br>MUCP 51 (16) vs 32 (15), $P < 0.05$<br>Tratio 88 (11) vs 84 (15)<br>$P = NS$ | increases in urethral and bladder pressures at coughing; an average of 2 values measured on the middle third of the urethra was used for calculations.<br>*women underwent colporrhaphy (30), Pereyra (22) or Burch procedures (34).                          |
| Minassian 2004 <sup>143</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Compare incidence and predictors of early post-operative voiding dysfunction after continence surgery | 138             | F mean age ~60 years, who had continence surgery for stress UI (63 TVT, 42 Burch, 33 polypropylene sling)  | Incidence of post-op voiding dysfunction<br><br>MUCP in pts with and without voiding dysfunction  | Overall 33% (50% TVT, 5% Burch, 24% sling)<br><br>32 vs 39 cmH <sub>2</sub> O (mean), $P = NS$  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review.<br>Voiding dysfunction = inability to void or PVR > 200 ml.<br>Only pre-op investigations' data reproduced in this table; the effects of several other demographic factors also considered in the report.    |
| Bombieri 2002 <sup>144</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate the causes of voiding difficulty and DO after colposuspension                             | 77              | F mean age 54 years (SD 12), with UD stress UI. 22% prior continence surgery. 49% prior hysterectomy 69% had some urge UI (though quoted that 23% had MUI) | Urodynamic variables associated with 'voiding performance' (day of catheter removal, multivariate analysis)<br><br>UD factors associated with <i>de novo</i> DO | Regression coefficient – 0.0166 (SE 0.00551), $P = 0.004$<br><br>None of those studied:<br>Qmax; Pdet, Qmax;<br>Pdet, max; urethral resistance  | Funding: none declared.<br>UD performed = peak flow rate, detrusor pressure at maximum flow, max. detrusor pressure, urethral resistance.<br>Qmax = peak flow rate.<br>Pdet, Qmax = detrusor pressure at maximum flow.<br>Pdet, max = max. detrusor pressure. |

## Different methods of urodynamic investigation (1 of 2 tables)

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                       | Comparison                                | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Fonda 1993 <sup>146</sup>     | DS<br>EL = II     | 70 (61% F)      | M/F mean age 74 years (60–93), UI ≥ 1/week.<br>40% had neurologic diagnosis<br><br>Exclusions: nursing home residents, UTI, acute illness | Single-channel UD                                  | Multi-channel UD                          | Diagnostic accuracy for DO (found in 60% on MC UD)                                    | Sensitivity 88% (81% in F only)<br>Specificity 75% (68% F)<br>PPV 84% (71% F)<br>NPV 81% (79% F)                       | Funding: Veteran's Aged Care Committee.<br>Tracings interpreted by person blind to clinical and lab findings.<br>UD methods conformed to ICS standards.<br>Cystometric capacity stated to not be sig. different with the 2 methods – no data given.   |
| Ouslander 1988 <sup>145</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 171 (81% F)     | M/F mean age 80 years (65–100), referred to outpatient clinic for evaluation of persistent UI (≥ 2×/week)                                 | Simple cystometry (incremental filling by gravity) | Continuous water filling multi-channel UD | Cystometric capacity (n = 164; 82% F)<br><br>Diagnostic accuracy of simple vs MC in F | Mean (SD) in F: 275 (183) vs 282 (178), P = NS<br><br>DO/detrusor hyperreflexia*: Sens 72%, Spec 80%, PPV 84%, NPV 63% | Funding: National Institute on Aging; and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.<br>MC done 1–4 weeks after simple cystometry.<br>DO diagnosed at increase in detrusor pressure of ≥ 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>*found in 64% on MC UD.   |
| Sutherst 1984 <sup>147</sup>  | DS<br>EL = II     | 100             | F mean age 47 years (22–78) attending incontinence clinic for evaluation of symptoms  | Single-channel UD* (Cystomat)                      | Multi-channel UD* with UPP                | Diagnostic accuracy of simple vs MC for DO (with or without mixed)                    | Sensitivity 100%<br>Specificity 89%<br>PPV 17%<br>NPV 100%   | Funding: none declared.<br>*in random order, on the same day.<br>Medium-fill cystometry used (50 ml/min). UD conformed to ICS standards.<br>Each method done blind to findings of other.<br>Provocative tests used with both methods.   |
| Scotti 1993 <sup>149</sup>    | DS<br>EL = III    | 145             | F mean age 58 years (32–91) with UI   | Single-channel UD + cough stress test              | MC urethrocystometry with UPP             | Diagnostic accuracy of simple vs MC UD for stress UI                                  | Sensitivity 84%<br>Specificity 84%<br>PPV 87%<br>NPV 81%   | Funding: none declared.<br>UD conformed to ICS standards. Not stated whether investigations were done blind to each other.<br>Stress UI (with or without mixed) diagnosed if positive cough stress test at full bladder capacity without vesical contraction (single-channel cystometry), or if cough UPP positive in the absence of vesical contraction. |

| Study                           | Study type and EL                            | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Hsu 1999 <sup>150</sup>         | DS<br>EL = II                                | 41              | F mean age 64 (29–82), with stress UI symptoms   | Supine stress test using cough and Valsalva manoeuvre*         | MC video UD with abdominal LPP                       | Diagnostic accuracy of stress test vs abdominal LPP for ISD (< 100 cmH <sub>2</sub> O being positive for ISD)   | Sensitivity 94%<br>Specificity 90%<br>PPV 97%<br>NPV 82%  | Funding: none declared.<br>VideoUD done by person blind to stress test. UD conformed to ICS.<br>*after bladder filling to 200 ml<br>positive stress test if efflux of urine from the urethral meatus coincided with cough or Valsalva manoeuvre.  |
| Lobel 1996 <sup>151</sup>       | DS<br>EL = III                               | 304             | F mean age 59 (26–92), 26% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: POP beyond introitus, UTI   | 'empty' supine stress test using cough and Valsalva manoeuvre* | MC cystometry with resting and dynamic UPP           | Diagnostic accuracy of empty stress test vs MC UD for stress UI (regardless of MUCP)<br><br>Diagnostic accuracy of empty stress test vs ISD diagnosis | Sensitivity 49%<br>Specificity 95%<br>PPV 98%<br>NPV 29%<br><br>Sensitivity 65%<br>Specificity 76%<br>PPV 66%<br>NPV 76%                      | Funding: none declared.<br>*within 20 min of catheterisation. UD conformed to ICS.<br>Interval between stress test and MC UD not stated.<br>Positive stress test if efflux of urine from the urethral meatus coincided with cough or Valsalva manoeuvre.<br>SUI diagnosed on MC UD if leakage on cough/Valsalva; ISD diagnosed if stress UI and MUCP ≤ 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O. |
| Hanzal 1991 <sup>152</sup>      | DS<br>EL = III                               | 981             | F with lower urinary tract symptoms. 67% had stress UI on clinical stress test<br>Exclusions: residual urine, isolated detrusor contractions during filling cystometry                                       | MC cystometry with UCPP  | Clinical stress test in supine and standing position | Diagnostic accuracy of UPP vs clinical stress test for stress UI  | Sensitivity 93%<br>Specificity 83%<br>PPV 92%<br>NPV 86%  | Funding: none declared.<br>UD methods conform to ICS.<br>UCPP measured in sitting position with bladder vol. of 300 ml and infusion rate 5 ml/min.  |
| Swithinbank 1999 <sup>153</sup> | Case series (retrospective review)<br>EL = 3 | 122 (91% F)     | M/F mean age 45 years (14–79), referred for ambulatory studies when diagnosis from routine cystometry were normal but pts still had symptoms of stress, OAB or both<br>19% had > 1 cystometogram prior to AM | Ambulatory UD (AM)   | Conventional MC cystometry                           | Findings on AM  | 53/94 with OAB symptoms had DO on AM<br><br>Of 17 with stress UI symptom, 5 had SUI on AM<br><br>Overall 79/125 had additional findings on AM | Funding: none declared.<br>AM using MMS 2020 recording device; pts monitored for 2 fills of ~3 h.<br>Time between AM and MC UD – mean 37 weeks (range 1–380).   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients              | Patient characteristics   | Intervention        | Comparison                           | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Radley 2001 <sup>154</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 106 (both tests done in 97)  | F mean age 53 years (26–81), referred for UD assessment of symptoms incl. urinary urgency with/without incontinence<br>Exclusions: heart valve disease, UTI, neuropathic UI | Ambulatory UD* (AM) | Video cystometry*                    | % diagnosed with each method, and % agreement between AM and VC | DO ( $\pm$ stress UI): 66% vs 30% (50% agreement, $P < 0.001$ )<br>Stress UI: 32% vs 40% (83% agreement, $P = \text{NS}$ )<br>Normal UD: 14% vs 39% (66% agreement, $P < 0.001$ )   | Funding: none declared.<br>*in random order ~1 month apart. Not stated whether each test done blind to findings of other.<br>Video cystometry according to ICS guidelines, and all definitions.<br>AM took 3 h- 1 h sitting, 1 h of normal activity, 1 h of provocative tests.<br>Each test said to show positive correlation with symptoms. |
|                            |                       |                              |   |                     |                                      | Correlation between symptoms (on BFLUTS) and UD findings        | Urgency: $r = 0.369$ , $P < 0.0001$ (AM);<br>$r = 0.327$ , $P = 0.001$ (VC)<br>Stress UI: $r = 0.340$ , $P = 0.001$ (AM);<br>$r = 0.434$ , $P < 0.0001$ (VC)<br>Urge UI: $r = 0.470$ , $P < 0.0001$ (AM);<br>$r = 0.2$ , $P = 0.043$ (VC) |  |
| Davis 1998 <sup>155</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 50 (also 10 controls, no UI) | F soldiers with exercise-induced UI, mean age 32 years  | Ambulatory UD       | Conventional MC cystometry, with UPP | % with unstable detrusor contractions                           | 96% vs 18% (20% vs 0% in control grp)   | Funding: none declared.<br>AM conducted 1 week after MC cystometry, using UPS 2020 device.   |
| Webb 1991 <sup>156</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 52 (69% F)                   | M/F aged 22–74 years, investigated on AM owing to unexplained findings on conventional cystometry   | Ambulatory UD       | Conventional MC cystometry           | % diagnosis on AM vs conventional UD                            | DO: 60% vs 0<br>Stress UI: 13% vs 2%  | Funding: none declared.<br>AM took 3 h: 1 h sitting, 1 h of normal activity, 1 h of provocative tests.<br>ICS standard criteria for diagnosis used.  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------|---|--|--|---|
| McInerney 1991 <sup>157</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 20 (17 F)       | M/F aged 10–60 years, presenting symptoms 'urge syndrome' (9), primary nocturnal and diurnal enuresis (4), leakage or urgency symptoms following reconstructive bladder surgery | Ambulatory UD | Conventional video cystometry                           | Proportion with DO diagnosis   | Of 9 with 'urge syndrome: 2/9 vs 0.9<br>Of 4 with enuresis: 4/4 vs 1/4   | Funding: none declared.<br>AM over 24 h.<br>Not stated whether ICS recommendations for UD followed.   |
| Davila 1994 <sup>158</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 27              | F aged 25–79 with urge UI previously undergone MC UD findings normal ( <i>n</i> = 18) or did not reproduce the symptoms presented with ( <i>n</i> = 9)                          | Ambulatory UD | Conventional MC cystometry                              | Diagnosis identified on AM vs MC cystometry ( <i>n</i> )                           | Normal: 10 vs 18<br>DO: 15 vs 3  | Funding: none declared.<br>2 AM systems used – Urodec 500 (17 pts) and the Wiest Camsys (10 pts). 'most people monitored for at least 4 h'.<br>Conventional UD performed using Surgitek UDS 1000.<br>ICS terminology and diagnostic criteria used.  |
| Pelsang 1996 <sup>159</sup>   | DS<br>EL = III        | 159             | F mean age 52 years (17–90) with leakage or voiding dysfunction   | VCU           | MC cystometry   | Accuracy of VCU vs MC UD for stress UI<br><br>Accuracy of VCU vs MC UD for urge UI | Sensitivity 61%<br>Specificity 70%<br>PPV 56%<br>NPV 74%<br><br>Sensitivity 14%<br>Specificity 97%<br>PPV 87%<br>NPV 45%   | Funding: none declared<br>Not stated whether ICS standards for cystometry followed.   |
| Kadar 1988 <sup>160</sup>     | DS<br>EL = III        | 37              | F median age 49 years (23–84) with LUTS and UI  | VCU           | Clinical assessment (with bladder filling if necessary) | Diagnostic accuracy for each type of UI  | Stress UI:<br>Sens 74%<br>Spec 78%<br>PPV 78%<br>NPV 74%<br>Mixed UI:<br>Sens 0*<br>Spec 91%<br>PPV 0<br>NPV 91%<br>Urge UI:<br>Sens 50%<br>Spec 89%<br>PPV 20%<br>NPV 97% | Funding: none declared.<br>Terms and diagnosis conformed to ICS.<br>Clinical stress UI defined as water lost coincidentally with coughing/straining; DO if pt voided uncontrollably during the exam.<br>*zero because no patients had both a clinical and urodynamic diagnosis of mixed UI. |

## Different methods of urodynamic investigation(2 of 2 tables)

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence | Patient characteristics   | Type of test                                 | Reference standard            | Sensitivity and specificity*    | Positive and negative predictive value* | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Sand 1987 <sup>148</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 218             | –          | F mean age 52 years (18–80) who had undergone multichannel UD evaluation owing to UI (83%) or urethral syndrome (17%)<br>UD diagnosis<br>70% SUI, 17% MUI, 14% DO | Supine urethroscopic cystometry (n = 203)    | Multichannel urethrocytometry | Sens: 25%<br>Spec: 94% (for DO) | PPV: 65%<br>NPV: 74% (for DO)           | Funding: none declared.<br>203 underwent dynamic urethroscopy and simultaneous supine cystometry (in which a detrusor contraction = sustained opening of the urethrovessical junction and proximal urethra during cystometry).<br>179 tested with standing, medium-fill, single-channel electronic cystometry. Detrusor contraction during cystometry was determined by a sustained pressure increase of > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O in the absence of 39rethra39<br>ICS terminology used in the study. |
|                          |                   |                 |            |   | Standing single-channel cystometry (n = 179) | Multichannel urethrocytometry | Sens: 59%<br>Spec: 82% (for DO) | PPV: 59%<br>NPV: 82% (for DO)           |   |

## Test-retest reliability of urodynamic testing

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|---|--|
| Homma 2000 <sup>162</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Examine reproducibility of cystometry in DO   | 30 (12 F)       | M/F mean age 62 years, symptoms of frequency, urgency with/without UI, and receiving placebo in a RCT of drug treatment<br>Pretreatment UD showed DO   | vol. at 1st desire to void; vol. at 1st involuntary contraction, cystometric capacity; max. pressure of involuntary contraction | All values sig. improved at 2nd measurement   | Funding: none declared.<br>2nd cystometry performed after 2–4 weeks tx with placebo.   |
| Digesu 2003 <sup>161</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate intra- and inter-observer reliability of pressure flow parameters in women<br>Women underwent VCU (83%) or saline cystometry (17%). Those with inconclusive laboratory UD studies were further investigated with ambulatory UD | 554             | F mean age 51 (22–89) with LUTS referred to a tertiary UD clinic<br>Exclusions: poor quality UD traces owing to artefacts, one or both pressure lines not recording, uninterpretable results, F unable to void | Detrusor pressure at max. flow rate; mean (SD); mean difference (SD)<br>Max. flow rate mean (SD), mean difference (SD)          | Intra-observer reliability<br>31 (17); 0.13 (1.4)<br>Inter-observer<br>31 (17); 0.27 (2.3)<br>Intra-observer reliability<br>29 (15); 0.07 (0.5)<br>Inter-observer<br>29 (15); 0.003 (0.6) | Funding: none declared<br>ICS terms and definitions used.<br>Pressures repeated after 1-week.<br>All measurements in cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>Within-patient reproducibility of measures during multiple voids on ambulatory UD also reported for 9 women (data not reproduced here).<br>Inter-observer agreement reported to be significant for all parameters except max. flow |

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----|-----------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
|       |                   |     |                 |                         | Opening detrusor pressure mean (SD), mean difference (SD) | Intra-observer reliability<br>27 (16); 0.06 (1.5)<br>Inter-observer<br>27 (15); 0.04 (1.8) | rate (no results of analysis given). No statistical analysis for intra-observer reported (though said to be 'good'). |
|       |                   |     |                 |                         | Closure detrusor pressure mean (SD), mean difference (SD) | Intra-observer reliability<br>28 (18); 0.08 (0.8)<br>Inter-observer<br>27 (18); 0.09 (2.3) |  |

*Health economics of urodynamic testing*

| Study                           | Population<br>Study method   | Intervention details   | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments   | Study type                  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Weber 2000 <sup>938</sup><br>US | A hypothetical patient population of otherwise healthy women, aged < 65 years, with predominantly stress incontinence symptoms and were candidates for primary surgical treatment.<br><br>Decision analytic model to estimate the cost and outcomes (cure, retention and incontinence) | 2 pre-operative testing strategies:<br>Basic office assessment followed by;<br>No further testing vs Urodynamic testing to confirm diagnosis | Cost per patient:<br>No further testing USD5,042;<br>Urodynamics USD5,046<br>Cure rate:<br>No further testing 96.4%;<br>Urodynamics 96.5% | Incremental cost effectiveness of Urodynamics USD3,847 per cure | Funding: none declared.<br>Model<br>US context.<br>Authors state societal perspective but costs seem to relate to health care payer only.<br>Costs for tests and procedures are based on 1998 values.<br>Sensitivity analysis suggested that the results were very sensitive to the prevalence of pure stress incontinence in the patient population. | Cost effectiveness analysis |



| Study                               | Population<br>Study method  | Intervention details   | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   | Study type                        |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Holley<br>1999 <sup>928</sup><br>US | Hypothetical patients<br>A model was used to estimate<br>the cost and correct diagnoses | 2 diagnostic tests for stress<br>incontinence:<br>cough stress test with<br>simple cystometrogram<br>(CST/CMG) vs multi-<br>channel urodynamics<br>(MCU) | Costs:<br>CST/CMG USD217, MCU<br>USD548<br>Sensitivity:<br>CST/CMG 87%, MCU 89% | Incremental cost per<br>correct diagnosis;<br>CST/MCG vs no<br>testing<br>USD249; MCU vs<br>CST/MCG USD<br>16550 | Funding: none declared.<br>Model<br>US context.<br>1998 costs.<br>Test specificity ignored in model (justified<br>on the basis that both methods have low<br>false-positive rates).<br>Charges were used as an index of costs.<br>Equipment costs were not considered.<br>Sensitivity analysis undertaken.<br>It is not possible to draw conclusions on<br>the relative cost effectiveness of the 2<br>testing strategies from the analysis<br>presented. | Cost<br>effectiveness<br>analysis |

## Other tests of urethral competence (1 of 2 tables)

| Study                           | Study type<br>and EL | No. of<br>patients | Prevalence                         | Patient<br>characteristics   | Type of test   | Reference<br>standard | Sensitivity and<br>specificity   | PPV and<br>NPV  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Montella<br>1997 <sup>164</sup> | DS<br>EL = III       | 111                | 75% had<br>positive Q-<br>tip test | F mean age 64 years<br>(33–89) with symptoms<br>of prolapse (70%)<br>and/or UI (30%). 36%<br>had prior anterior<br>vaginal wall surgery (3<br>pts > 1 procedure):<br>23% anterior<br>colporrhaphy, 10%<br>retropubic suspension,<br>6% a vaginal needle<br>procedure | Visual<br>assessment<br>and<br>measurement<br>of descent of<br>point<br>Aa*(POP-Q) | Q-tip test            | At different Aa<br>descent cut-off<br>points:<br>–2: sens 94%,<br>spec 36%<br>–1: 67%, 61%<br>0: 39%, 93%<br>1: 24%, 96%<br>2: 7%, 100%<br>3: 2%, 100% | At different<br>Aa descent<br>cut-off<br>points:<br>–2: PPV<br>80%, NPV<br>67%<br>–1: 84%,<br>41%<br>0: 94%, 34%<br>1: 95%, 30%<br>2: 100%,<br>27%<br>3: 100%,<br>26% | Funding: none declared.<br>*pts coughed 3×, and performed the Valsalva<br>manoeuvre 3× for each test; max. value taken.<br>Max. descent of point Aa measured using a ruler.<br>Descent of Aa to hymen = 0; –3 = no descent.<br>Q-tip test done blinded to Aa measurement,<br>preceded by speculum and bimanual exam. Q-tip<br>movement measured using orthopaedic goniometer.<br>Positive Q-tip test = max. straining angle of ≥ 30°<br>relative to the horizontal plane.<br>No change in pattern of results found for women who<br>had or did not have prior surgery.<br>Retest done in 10 pts. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                      | Prevalence   | Patient characteristics   | Type of test   | Reference standard                                       | Sensitivity and specificity  | PPV and NPV  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Caputo 1993 <sup>163</sup>   | DS<br>EL = III    | 114                                  | 64% had positive US test   | F presenting with UI or prolapse. Urodynamic diagnosis: 34% stress UI, 38% mixed UI, 21% DO, 7% no UI. 32% had prior anterior vaginal wall surgery/ 'anti-incontinence' procedures<br><br>Exclusions: prolapse beyond introitus while straining in the upright position | Q-tip test   | Perineal ultrasound                                      | Sens 25%<br>Spec 78%   | PPV 67%<br>NPV 37%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Same examiner performed both tests.<br>Q-tip angle from the horizontal measured using an orthopaedic goniometer; positive test $\geq 30^\circ$ change between rest and straining angles.<br>A curved linear-array 3.5 MHz US transducer used; Millar microtransducer urethral catheter used to visualise the urethrovesical junction hypermobility. Distance in millimetres between the urethrovesical junction positions at rest and after max. strain; positive test > 10 mm movement.<br>Retest done in 10 pts. |
| Sutherst 1980 <sup>171</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 67 (with SUI)<br>23 controls (no UI) | Positive Fluid-Bridge (FB) test 58%<br>36% clinical diagnosis stress UI<br>57% UD diagnosis stress UI    | F mean age 52 years with symptoms of stress UI<br><br>Controls mean age 33 years  | Fluid-Bridge test in supine position   | Clinical evidence of UI<br><br>UD diagnosis of stress UI | Sens 74%<br>Spec 62%<br><br>Sens 72%<br>Spec 53%   | PPV 72%<br>NPV 64%<br><br>PPV 54%<br>NPV 71%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Test point selected = 0.5 cm from urethrovesical junction. If the test point remains closed, the test is negative; if it opens, the test is positive.<br>UD: SUI diagnosed if evidence of stress leakage in the absence of detrusor contractions, or if UCPP measurements 'small'. UD methods, definitions and units conform to ICS.<br>Positive FB test in 39 (58%) test grp, 1 (4%) control grp, $P < 0.001$ .   |
| Sutherst 1981 <sup>172</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 100 (only 76 analysed*)              | Positive FB test in 74% test grp when supine 89% erect<br>43% clinical diagnosis SUI<br>57% UD diagnosis | F mean age 52 years, attending a stress UI clinic for UD assessment<br>27 women mean age 41 years with no UI were also tested (were attending hospital for abnormal uterine bleeding or infertility).   | Fluid-Bridge test in supine position<br>Fluid-Bridge test in erect position<br>Fluid-Bridge test in supine position<br>Fluid-Bridge test in erect position | Clinical evidence of UI<br><br>UD diagnosis of stress UI | Supine:<br>Sens 89%<br>Spec 35%<br><br>Erect:<br>Sens 100%<br>Spec 16%<br><br>Supine:<br>Sens 86%<br>Spec 42%<br><br>Erect:<br>Sens 100%<br>Spec 24% | Supine:<br>PPV 43%<br>NPV 85%<br><br>Erect:<br>PPV 40%<br>NPV 100%<br><br>Supine:<br>PPV 66%<br>NPV 70%<br><br>Erect:<br>PPV 37%<br>NPV 100% | Funding: none declared.<br>UD methods, definitions and units conform to ICS.<br>Test point selected = 0.5 cm from urethrovesical junction. If the test point remains closed, the test is negative.<br>*reasons for exclusion: 7 continent after surgery but UD abnormal; 7 owing to technical difficulties, 10 because change from supine to standing initiated detrusor contractions.<br>Positive FB test in 56 (74%) test grp when supine, 68 (89%) when erect.<br>4 (15%) control grp (supine and erect), $P < 0.001$ vs SUI grp.          |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence  | Patient characteristics  | Type of test                       | Reference standard | Sensitivity and specificity | PPV and NPV        | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|
| Niecestro 1992 <sup>173</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 66              | 53% history of SUI<br>74% positive UPP test<br>61% positive FB test<br>66% positive Marshall test | F > 18 years referred for UD investigation owing to voiding symptoms<br>Exclusions: UTI, STI | Stresscath (modified Fluid-Bridge) | Marshall test      | Sens 86%<br>Spec 87%        | PPV 77%<br>NPV 93% | Funding: none declared.<br>History followed by supine and sitting Marshall test, then by the 'Stresscath' procedure, a modified version of the Fluid-Bridge test (10F catheter passed into the bladder; with catheter eye in the bladder, urine flows out of the distal end; catheter slowly withdrawn until flow of urine stops, then pulled back 0.5 cm and the pt asked to cough. Diagnosis of bladder neck incompetence made if urine flows through catheter. Catheter pulled back 0.5 cm and test repeated until a negative result is achieved).<br>UPP diagnosis: if max. urethral pressure < 30.5 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, bladder neck incompetent; if > 30.5, considered not to have stress UI, and possibly no bladder neck incompetence.<br>*for a diagnosis of SUI owing to bladder neck incompetence. |
|                               |                   |                 |   |  | Stresscath                         | History            | Sens 73%<br>Spec 88%        | PPV 85%<br>NPV 80% |   |
|                               |                   |                 |   |  | UPP                                | Marshall           | Sens 50%<br>Spec 88%        | PPV 69%<br>NPV 78% |   |
|                               |                   |                 |   |  | UPP                                | History            | Sens 43%<br>Spec 91%        | PPV 81%<br>NPV 65% |   |

## Other tests of urethral competence (2 of 2 tables)

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|---|
| Cogan 2002 <sup>165</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To assess correlation between the Q-tip and Aa point of the POP-Q system | 274             | F enrolled in 2 studies:<br>Study 1; a RCT of anterior colporrhaphy; mean age 64 years (35–90), 93% had prior surgery for prolapse/UI, 92% prior anterior colporrhaphy, 14% prior retropubic urtheropexy (n = 71)<br>Study 2; a cohort study evaluating outcomes of continence/prolapse operations, mean age 57 years (27–85), 19% had prior surgery for | % with urethral hypermobility (Q-tip angle $\geq 30^\circ$ ) for each stage of prolapse at point Aa<br>(results for all pts) | Stage 0 (–3 cm):<br>62% (n = 5/8), 95% CI 24% to 91%<br>Stage I (–2 cm):<br>83% (n = 19/23) to 95% CI 61% to 95%<br>Stage II (–1, 0, or +1 cm):<br>95% (n = 161/170), 95% CI 90% to 98%<br>Stage III (+2 cm):<br>100% (n = 24/24) to 95% CI 86% to 100%<br>Stage IV (+3 cm):<br>100% (n = 49/49), 95% CI 93% to 100% | Funding: none declared.<br>Initial POP-Q and Q-tip tests done the day before the surgery.<br>Positive Q-tip test = max. straining angle of $\geq 30^\circ$ relative to the horizontal plane (94% had urethral hypermobility based on this threshold).<br>ICS methods and definitions used for POP-Q.<br>r = Spearman's correlation coefficient. |

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|--|---|
|                                |                       |   |                 | prolapse/UI, 4% prior anterior colporrhaphy, 17% prior retropubic urethropexy ( <i>n</i> = 203)<br>Exclusions: F needing a retropubic urethropexy  | Correlation vs between Q-tip straining angle (degrees) and point Aa (cm) results<br>Sensitivity and specificity of Aa measurement   | <i>r</i> = 0.47, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>At 3 cm cut-off: sens 28%, spec 100%<br>At 2 cm cut-off: sens 91%, spec 44%   |   |
| Noblett 2005 <sup>166</sup>    | DS<br>EL = III        | To evaluate the relationship between urethral mobility and stages 0 or 1 anterior wall prolapse and to determine whether a Q-tip test is necessary in this subgroup of patients | 134             | Consecutive F pts referred to urogynae unit for evaluation. 15% had prior surgery for UI and/or pelvic organ prolapse<br>24% stage 0 prolapse, 25% stage I, 39% stage II, 6% stage III, 6% stage IV        | Correlation between POP-Q point Aa and Q-tip test<br>% hypermobile for each stage of the POP-Q test   | Spearman's correlation coefficient for POP-Q and Q-tip was 0.787, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>stage 0: 6% hypermobile<br>stage I: 91% hypermobile<br>stages II to IV: 100% hypermobile   | Funding: none declared.<br>POP-Q undertaken prior to Q-tip, but no assessor blinded to results of other test.<br>Hypermobility defined as a straining angle of $\geq 30^\circ$ on Q-tip.<br>Sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV of point Aa also quoted relative to Q-tip angle for stages 0 vs I-IV, and for stage 0 vs I. Data not reproduced here. |
| Migliorini 1987 <sup>167</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Assess the validity of the Bonney test  | 61              | F presenting at UI hospital clinic for assessment (history, examination, UD [as per ICS criteria]). Static and cough profile urethral pressure profiles repeated with bladder neck elevation (Bonney test) | Diagnosis (based on cystometry)<br>Bonney test (% with urine loss on bladder neck elevation)<br>Urethral closure pressure (cmH <sub>2</sub> O) without or with bladder neck elevation (Bonney test); median (range) | 74% SUI (31 of the 45 had urine loss at the time of the investigation*)<br>16% MUI (6/10 had urine loss)<br>10% DO (none had urine loss)<br>None (100% positive Bonney test)<br>In pts with SUI diagnosis: without 38 (8–78); with 117 (49–232)<br>In pts with MUI: without 38 (16–70); with 111 (59–148)<br>In pts with DO: without 45 (11–75); with 116 (86–124) | Funding: none declared.<br>*without bladder neck elevation.   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|---|---|---|
| Bhatia 1983 <sup>168</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Describe the changes in urethral and urethrovesical function under resting and stressful conditions when the Bonney test was used in F with stress UI | 12              | F history and UD diagnosis of stress UI  | Urethral closure pressure (cmH <sub>2</sub> O), mean (SD)             | Resting: 40.6 (14.4)<br>Bonney test: 210 (13.6), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile<br>Urethral occlusion*: 212 (13.5), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile  | Funding: none declared.<br>Intravesical, intraurethral, and intra-abdominal pressures measured directly by 2 microtip pressure transducer catheters. Urethral and cough pressure profiles repeated during Bonney test (middle and index finger placed 1 cm lateral to each side of urethra; and repeated again with *middle and index fingers placed directly over the bladder neck with the intention of compressing the urethra and bladder neck).<br>All pts demonstrated urine loss during the recording of the cough urethral pressure profile (in the supine position with a full bladder), and none during Bonney test, nor with compression of the urethra or bladder neck.<br>*measured using a planimeter.<br>ICS terminology used.<br>No significant differences seen between Bonney test and Urethral occlusion in any outcome. |
|                              |                       |   |                 |  | Urethral Closure Pressure Profile area (cm <sup>2</sup> )*, mean (SD) | Resting: 2.11 (1.6)<br>Bonney test: 10.5 (1.7), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile<br>Urethral occlusion*: 11.1 (1.7), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile   |   |
|                              |                       |   |                 |  | Urethral cough pressure profile area* (cm <sup>2</sup> )              | Resting: 0.8 (0.95)<br>Bonney test: 9.0 (3.9), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile<br>Urethral occlusion*: 9.7 (3.98), <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs resting profile  |   |
| Miyazaki 1997 <sup>169</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Re-evaluate the Bonney test and direct urethral compression, and to present a modification of the Bonney test (the Miyazaki–Bonney test)              | 37              | F, genuine stress UI<br>Each pt underwent the Bonney test, direct urethral compression, and a Miyazaki–Bonney test* while the following observations made: urethroscopy of bladder neck and proximal urethra; resistance of cotton swab to withdrawal; proximal urethral pressures changes | Urethroscopic observations  | Bonney and Miyazaki–Bonney tests 'produced concentric closure of the bladder neck and elongation and closure of the proximal urethra'   | Funding: none declared.<br>ICS methods, definitions and units used for UD studies.<br>*Miyazaki–Bonney test was performed in 2 ways: (1) cotton swabs directed laterally to reapproximate anterolateral vaginal wall to pelvic sidewall; (2) cotton swab handles depressed to –30° and pushed anterosuperiorly and laterally to bring cotton swab down to 0°.<br>Bonney test used as 'originally described'.<br>Two methods were used to measure proximal urethral pressure changes: 12 studied using a microtip catheter; 13 using both a microtip and Foley bulb; 12 using a Foley bulb set up only.  |
|                              |                       |   |                 |  | Proximal urethral pressure changes                                    | Bonney: mean increase 52 cmH <sub>2</sub> O (25–100)<br>M-Bonney: 'little or no increase', mean 30 (20–40)<br>Direct urethral compression: no mean reported but 'easily produced pressures > 250 cmH <sub>2</sub> O'<br>No overlap of values between Bonney and direct urethral compression |   |
|                              |                       |   |                 |  | Pressure transmission ratio   | Incomplete numerical results reported   |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                        | Outcomes                         | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Bergman 1987 <sup>170</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Record and compare the changes in urethral and urethrovesical function under resting and stressful conditions when the Marshall-Marchetti test and intentional occlusion of the urethra were used in women with UI | 16              | F mean age 53 years (36–64), genuine stress UI | UCPP (AUC, cm <sup>2</sup> )     | Marshall test 8.7 ± 1.1<br>Urethral occlusion 9.1 ± 1.2<br>P = NS between tests | Funding: none declared.<br>Multi-channel UD done according to ICS standards.<br>Marshall test – moderate elevation of the urethrovesical junction using clamps on the anterior vaginal wall, one on each side and lateral to the urethrovesical junction.<br>AUC = area under the curve. |
|                             |                       |  |                 |  | Cough PP (AUC, cm <sup>2</sup> ) | Marshall test 8.8 ± 2.8<br>Urethral occlusion 9.1 ± 2.4<br>P = NS between tests |  |

## Cystoscopy (1 of 2 tables)

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes                      | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Cundiff 1996 <sup>175</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Determine whether multichannel urodynamics in combination with urethrocystoscopy improves diagnostic accuracy of UD alone | 84              | F mean age 56 years (23–79) from a 'referral urogynaecologic practice'. 93% presented with UI, 6% prolapse, 1% retention<br>'Final' diagnoses (17% had 2): 26% genuine SUI; 25% DO, 18% MUI, 11% intrinsic sphincter deficiency, 6% prolapse; 4% sensory urgency, 3% cystitis, 2% bladder cancer, 2% bladder lesion, 1% diverticulum, 1% intravesical suture (and 3% no abnormalities) | Findings on urethrocystoscopy | 65 (77%) had same diagnosis as on UD:<br>34 confirmed UD diagnoses<br>24 normal<br>10 incidental findings<br>Urethrocystoscopy 'contributed to the final diagnosis' in 16:<br>10 ISD<br>6 'critical new' diagnoses; 1 intravesical suture, 1 urethral diverticulum, 2 papillary transitional-cell carcinoma, 2 cystitis glandularis | Funding: none declared.<br>Full UD evaluation included uroflowmetry, complex cystometry, passive and dynamic UPP, pressure voiding study. Terms, methods and criteria conform to ICS. Intrinsic sphincter deficiency diagnosed if MUCP ≤ 30 cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>Urethrocystoscopy followed urodynamics.<br>Not stated what the indications for urethrocystoscopy were. |

## Cystoscopy (2 of 2 tables)

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence | Patient characteristics  | Type of test   | Reference standard   | Sensitivity and specificity*    | Positive and negative predictive value* | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Scotti 1990 <sup>176</sup> | DS<br>EL = III    | 99              | 94% UD SUI | F mean age 51 years (23–86) who had undergone dynamic urethroscopy*  | Urethroscopy (in supine position, with simultaneous supine cystometry) | Multichannel cough UPP (resting and stress UCPP supine with empty bladder, and sitting with empty and with full bladder) | Sens: 60%<br>Spec: 79%          | PPV: 75%<br>NPV: 66%                    | Funding: none declared.<br>*retrospective chart review.<br>F also underwent urinalysis, urine culture, history and physical exam; 96% had Q-tip test, 76% completed a voiding diary.<br>ICS terminology used.<br>If urethrovesical junction opened, urethroscopy considered positive for stress UI. Diagnosis of genuine stress UI if pt lost urine in 1 of 2 ways: during cough strain or increase in intraabdominal pressure; or on cough stress test.<br>*values quoted in paper; equivocal diagnoses were excluded from the calculations ( $n = 11$ ). |
| Sand 1987 <sup>148</sup>   | DS<br>EL = III    | 218             |            | F mean age 52 years (18–80) who had undergone multichannel UD evaluation owing to UI (83%) or urethral syndrome (17%)<br>UD diagnosis 70% SUI, 17% MUI, 14% DO | Supine urethroscopic cystometry ( $n = 203$ )                          | Multichannel urethrocystometry   | Sens: 25%<br>Spec: 94% (for DO) | PPV: 65%<br>NPV: 74% (for DO)           | Funding: none declared.<br>203 underwent dynamic urethroscopy and simultaneous supine cystometry (in which a detrusor contraction = sustained opening of the urethrovesical junction and proximal urethra during cystometry.<br>179 tested with standing, medium-fill, single-channel electronic cystometry. Detrusor contraction during cystometry was determined by a sustained pressure increase of > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O in the absence of valsalva.<br>ICS terminology used in the study.   |
|                            |                   |                 |            |  | Standing single-channel cystometry ( $n = 179$ )                       | Multichannel urethrocystometry   | Sens: 59%<br>Spec: 82% (for DO) | PPV: 59%<br>NPV: 82% (for DO)           |  |

## Imaging (1 of 2 tables)

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Prevalence                    | Patient characteristics     | Type of test   | Reference standard  | Sensitivity and specificity*   | Positive and negative predictive value | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Bergman 1988 <sup>177</sup> | DS<br>EL = II     | 67              | UD diagnosis: 66% SUI, 34% DO | F mean age 39 years (21–78) | US (drop in urethrovesical junction of $\geq 1$ cm positive for stress UI diagnosis) | UD diagnosis (water urethrocytometry at filling rate 60 ml/min resting; and stress UPP) | For SUI<br>Sens 86%<br>Spec 91%<br>(no pts with DO or normal diagnosis had positive US result) | Unable to calculate from data given    | Funding: none declared.<br>US of bladder base and urethrovesical junction at rest and on maximal straining in the supine position. Drop in urethrovesical junction on straining measured in cm on US.<br>Investigator blind to clinical and UD diagnosis.<br>Q-tip angle also measured; the distance between the edge of the Q-tip and the examination table measured at rest and straining.<br>ICS terminology used.<br>*values quoted in paper. |
|                             |                   |                 |                               |                             | Q-tip (change in angle of $\geq 35^\circ$ indicative of positive test)               | UD diagnosis (water urethrocytometry at filling rate 60 ml/min resting; and stress UPP) | For SUI:<br>Sens 90%<br>Spec 55%   | Unable to calculate from data given    |   |

## Imaging (2 of 2 tables)

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
| Khullar 1996 <sup>178</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To compare bladder wall thickness measured by transvaginal US scan with UD diagnosis of DO by VCU $\pm$ ambulatory UD | 180             | F mean age 54 years (20–85) with urinary symptoms attending UD clinic for investigation | UD diagnosis  | 29% SUI, 24% DO, 24% MUI, 19% normal UD, 3% sensory urgency, 2% voiding difficulty | Funding: none declared<br>ICS terminology used.<br>Bladder wall thickness taken as mean of 3 measurements (perpendicular to the luminal surface of the bladder at the thickest part of the trigone; at the dome of the bladder; at the anterior wall of the bladder).<br>Provocative cystometry conducted. Those with bladder thickness $> 5$ mm on US but not found to have DO also had ambulatory UD ( $n = 42$ , of whom 36 showed DO on ambulatory UD).<br>*calculated by authors. |
|                              |                       |   |                 |   | Bladder wall thickness (median, IQR)                      | In DO grp: 6.3 (5.3, 7.7)<br>Other grps 3.9 (3.4, 4.5)<br>$P < 0.0001$             |  |
|                              |                       |   |                 |   | Accuracy of bladder thickness $> 5$ mm for diagnosing DO* | Sens 84%<br>Spec 89%<br>PPV 94%  |  |
| Robinson 2002 <sup>179</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate whether transvaginal US assessment of   | 128             | F mean age 54 years (20–85) with irritative lower                                       | Ambulatory UD diagnosis                                   | SUI 34%, normal 29%, MUI 20%, DO 16%, voiding difficulties 1%                      | Funding: none declared.<br>Bladder wall thickness taken as mean of 3 measurements (perpendicular to the luminal surface of   |



| Study                    | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|---|--|
|                          |                       | bladder wall thickness could replace ambulatory UD when investigating women with equivocal lab UD  |                 | urinary tract symptoms (frequency and urgency with or without urge UI) with normal lab UD; and F with equivocal UD lab UD (where UD do not correlate with clinical symptoms); attending tertiary referral ambulatory UD clinic  | Bladder wall thickness (mean)  | SUI 4.8 mm (95% CI 4.4 to 5.3)<br>normal (no UI) 5.1 mm (95% CI 4.6 to 5.6)<br>MUI 5.8 mm (95% CI 5.1 to 6.5)<br>DO 6.7 mm (95% CI 6.0 to 7.4)<br><i>P</i> = 0.0001 between all diagnostic groups | the bladder at the thickest part of the trigone; at the dome of the bladder; at the anterior wall of the bladder.<br>No overlap between 95% CI for either the 'normal' or stress UI groups compared with the DO group.   |
| Heit 2000 <sup>180</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | To use intraurethral ultrasonography to correlate urethral anatomy with functional UD parameters for the purpose of distinguishing patients with intrinsic urethral sphincter deficiency from those with genuine SUI | 39              | F mean age 51 years (27–74) undergoing UD evaluation for symptoms of UI. 14 (36%) had prior continence surgery (6 retropubic urethropexies, 6 anterior colporrhaphies, 2 needle suspensions<br>Exclusions: prolapse of the anterior vaginal wall beyond the hymenal ring in the standing position with straining; UD diagnosis of DO (= 18 of 57 originally investigated) | UD diagnosis<br><br>Spec, PPV, and NPV of urethral measurements (longitudinal smooth muscle thickness and outer circumference, rhabdosphincter thickness) for distinguishing ISD from SUI, having assumed sensitivity of 80% | 24 SUI; 5 (17%) Intrinsic urethral sphincter deficiency (ISD); 10 normal<br><br>Specificities 58–75%<br>PPV 30–40%<br>NPV 93–95%  | Funding: none declared.<br>UD done blind to results of US.<br>UD: including digitally subtracted retrograde filling urethrocytometry, static and dynamic cough UPP at max. cystometric capacity, pressure-flow and Valsalva leak-point pressure studies.<br>UD stress UI diagnosed if urine leakage demonstrated during dynamic cough UPP, Valsalva LPP determinations at 150 ml bladder vol., or max. cystometric capacity and continuous cough at max. cyst capacity in the standing position with and without the transurethral catheter in place.<br>Intrinsic urethral deficiency diagnosed if LPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O and a MUCP < 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>ICS terminology used. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL  | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|---|---|---|
| Grischke 1991 <sup>181</sup> | Case series (retrospective review of 4 years data)<br>EL = 3 | Determine how bladder neck descent and posterior urethrovesical angle correlated with UD diagnosis   | 84              | F mean age 51 years (24–70), who had both UD and radiological data<br><br>UD diagnosis: 40% SUI, 25% mixed UI, 20% urge UI, 15% normal | Correlation between UD and radiological diagnosis<br><br>Posterior urethrovesical angle during straining  | Bladder neck descent (radiological diagnosis) found in 91% of women with stress UI, 90% with mixed UI, 75% with urge UI, and 53% with normal UD<br><br>152 ± 33 in SUI<br>142 ± 23 in MUI<br>138 ± 40 in MUI<br>126 ± 30 in normal UD | Funding: none declared.<br>MC UD performed.   |
| Bergman 1988 <sup>182</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3  | To prospectively assess the role of cystourethrography in the diagnosis of stress UI and to determine whether a surgical plan can be based on cystographic results | 59              | F mean age 57 (41–70) with 'pelvic floor relaxation; with (54%) or without (46%) stress UI   | Prevalence of posterior urethrovesical angle ≥ 115°, angle of urethral inclination ≥ 45°, urethra at most dependent point in bladder funneling of proximal urethra, flatness of bladder base in continent vs incontinent grps | No significant differences between incontinent and continent groups in the prevalence of the parameters measured  | Funding: none declared.<br>MC UD performed; ICS terminology followed.<br>Bead chain cystourethrography – bead chain inserted into bladder, which was filled to capacity with iodine-containing liquid. 5 radiographic landmarks measured: posterior urethrovesical angle, angle of urethral inclination (change ≥ 45° in erect position considered loss of anterior angle), most dependable portion of the bladder base, 50rethra50n50 of the proximal urethra, flatness of the bladder base. |
| Bergman 1988 <sup>183</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3  | Evaluate and compare information obtained by a small transrectal ultrasonic  | 85              | F mean age 56 years (36–72), stress UI (n = 32)<br>Control groups: (1)   | Prevalence of urethra at the most dependable position in the bladder by cystography and US  | SUI: 94%, 88%<br>Control grp 1: 55%, 52%<br>Control grp 2: 42%, 42%   | Funding: none declared.<br>MC UD performed; ICS terminology followed.<br>A ≥ 1 cm drop in urethrovesical junction measured on   |

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes | Results | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------|---------|---|
|       |                   | transducer and by X-ray cystography before and after surgery |                 | <p>symptomatic pelvic relaxation, no urinary complaints (<i>n</i> = 29)</p> <p>(2) Symptoms and UD diagnosis of bladder instability (<i>n</i> = 24); mean age 39 (21–57)</p> |          |         | <p>US was considered poor anatomical support to the urethrovesical junction.</p> <p>X-ray landmarks viewed were (1) most dependent position of the bladder base = at or posterior to the urethrovesical junction; (2) relationship between bladder base and inferior ramus of symphysis pubis; both evaluated in erect position on a lateral straining film.</p> <p>Pts with urethrovesical jct descended below posterior lower edge of the symphysis pubis on straining considered to have poorly supported urethrovesical jct on cystography.</p> <p>Sensitivity and specificity of 2 parameters (urethra at most dependent point in bladder; urethral descent on straining) reported with reference to two control groups (continent women with POP, and women with DO), though these were not sensitivities and specificities in the diagnostic accuracy sense; not possible to follow the calculations made in the published report.</p> |

## Conservative management

### Lifestyle interventions

*Cohort and cross-sectional studies evaluating association of lifestyle factors and UI or OAB*

| Study                       | Study type and EL       | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|---|---|
| Dalosso 2003 <sup>190</sup> | Cohort study<br>EL = 2+ | Investigate the association of lifestyle factors with the incidence of OAB (1 or both of urge UI several times a month, or urgency), and stress UI. [Further analysis of energy and nutrient intake published in Dalosso 2004. <sup>191,192</sup> ] | 6424            | F ≥ 40 years in Leicestershire (not women of South Asian origin) completed a repeat food-frequency questionnaire at 1 year<br><br>Part of Leicestershire MRC Incontinence Study | Incidence of UI/OAB at 1 year<br><br>Bread consumption<br><br>Chicken consumption<br><br>Vegetable consumption<br><br>Carbonated drinks<br><br>Smoking | At 1 year follow-up, 492 new cases of OAB, 421 of stress UI (incidence rates 9.2% and 8.3%)<br><br>Risk of OAB onset:<br>bread > daily vs daily or less; 0.68 (0.55, 0.86)<br><br>Risk of stress UI onset:<br>bread > daily vs daily or less; 0.76 (0.61, 0.96)<br><br>Risk of OAB onset:<br>chicken consumption (1/week vs < 1/week); 0.92 (0.70, 1.21)<br>≥ 2/week vs < 1/week; 0.64 (0.48, 0.87)<br><br>Risk of OAB onset:<br>consumption of vegetables (4/day vs 0–3/day); 0.69 (0.48, 0.98)<br>5/day vs 0–3/day; 0.83 (0.58, 1.18)<br>6/day vs 0–3/day; 0.74 (0.50, 1.09)<br>≥ 7/day vs 0–3/day; 1.12 (0.80, 1.58)<br><br>Risk of OAB onset:<br>Carbonated drinks (1/week vs < weekly); 0.90 (0.65, 1.24)<br>2–6/week vs < weekly; 1.32 (0.99, 1.76)<br>daily or more vs < weekly; 1.41 (1.02, 1.95)<br><br>Risk of stress UI onset:<br>Carbonated drinks (1/week vs < weekly); 1.10 (0.80, 1.50)<br>2–6/week vs < weekly; 1.10 (0.81, 1.50)<br>daily or more vs < weekly; 1.62 (1.18, 2.22)<br><br>Risk of OAB onset:<br>Current smoking vs never smoked; 1.44 (1.05, 1.98)<br>Ex smoker vs never smoked; 1.24 (0.97, 1.58) | Funding: Medical Research Council.<br><br>All results from multivariate analysis (risk of onset between baseline and 1 year follow-up), OR (95% CI).<br><br>No OR for smoking, veg, or chicken presented in paper in relation to stress UI.<br><br>Tea and caffeine intaken also considered but only univariate analysis reported in paper. |

| Study                            | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|--|--|
|                                  |                           |  |                 |   | BMI   | <p>Risk of OAB onset:<br/>           BMI &lt; 20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25); 0.82 (0.46, 1.44)<br/>           BMI &gt; 25–30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25); 1.24 (0.93, 1.63)<br/>           BMI &gt; 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25); 1.46 (1.02, 2.09)</p> <p>Risk of stress UI onset:<br/>           BMI &lt; 20 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25); 0.69 (0.38, 1.26)<br/>           BMI &gt; 25–30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25); 1.25 (0.94, 1.67)<br/>           BMI &gt; 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI 20–25): 1.74 (1.22, 2.48).</p>   |  |
| Dallosso 2004 <sup>191,192</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2+         | Investigate the association between diet and the development of OAB <sup>191</sup> and stress UI <sup>192</sup> in women aged > 40 years | 5816            | Population as Dallosso 2003. Useable nutrient data from 5816 women  | <p>Energy (protein, fat, carbohydrates, cholesterol, fibre)</p> <p>Vitamins and minerals (retinol, vitamins B, C, D E; folate, calcium, iron, potassium, zinc, sodium, selenium, iodine, magnesium, copper)</p> | <p>Factors associated with reduced risk of OAB<sup>191</sup> (OR, 95% CI):<br/>           Protein intake when adjusted for BMI (no numerical data)<br/>           Vitamin D (4th quintile vs lowest quintile): 0.51 (0.34, 0.78)<br/>           Potassium intake (3rd vs lowest quintile): 0.60 (0.40, 0.90)</p> <p>Factors associated with increased risk of stress UI<sup>192</sup> (OR, 95% CI):<br/>           Total fat intake (highest vs lowest quintile): 2.02 (1.33, 3.05)<br/>           Cholesterol intake (highest vs lowest quintile): 2.09 (1.40, 3.14)<br/>           Vitamin B12 (4th and 5th quintile vs lowest): 1.84 (1.21, 2.79) and 1.66 (1.10, 2.52)<br/>           Zinc (3rd and 4th quintile vs lowest): 1.57 (1.02, 2.40) and 1.89 (1.25, 2.85)</p> | <p>Funding: Medical Research Council.</p> <p>Only factors with OR and CI indicative of an association with OAB or stress UI reproduced here. No significant risk found for other factors.</p> <p>Logistic regression analysis performed.</p> |
| Hannestad 2003 <sup>200</sup>    | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Investigate an association between lifestyle factors and UI in women.  | 6876            | F ≥ 20 years, any UI; slight (few drops/month, 43%), moderate (few drops daily, 31%), severe (larger amounts at least once/week, 26%). Classification based on symptom description: 50% | <p>Smoking (OR for UI)</p> <p>Weight (OR for UI)</p>  | <p>Former smoking and current smoking (if &gt; 20 cigarettes a day); OR 1.7 (1.4, 2.0), and 1.3 (1.1, 1.6)<br/>           Former smoking if 15+ pack years history, OR 1.5 (1.3, 1.7)</p> <p>BMI 25–29 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (vs BMI &lt; 25); 1.4 (1.3, 1.5)<br/>           BMI 30–34; 1.9 (1.7, 2.1)<br/>           BMI 35–39; 2.4 (2.1, 2.8)<br/>           BMI ≥ 40; 2.7 (2.1, 3.5)</p>   | <p>Funding: Research Council of Norway; Norwegian University of Science and Technology; Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Nord-Tondelag County Council.</p> <p>All results OR (95% CI),</p>  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|---|--|
|                             |                           |  |                 | stress UI, 11% urge, 36% mixed, 3% unclassified<br>Continent women served as reference group for logistic regression analyses<br>Substudy of a population-based survey (EPINCONT) performed in one county in Norway (1995–97) | Physical activity (low impact [not sweating/out of breath] or high impact [sweating/out of breath])<br>(OR for UI)<br>Caffeinated drinks (tea, coffee)<br>(OR for UI)  | High impact physical activity (vs < 1 h per week):<br>1–2 h per week; 1.1 (1.0, 1.2)<br>≥ 3 h per week; 1.0 (0.9, 1.2)<br>Low impact physical activity (vs < 1 h per week):<br>1–2 h per week; 0.9 (0.8, 1.0)<br>≥ 3 h per week; 0.9 (0.7, 0.9)<br>Tea:<br>1–2 cups/day (vs 0 cups/day); 1.2 (1.1, 1.2)<br>3+ cups/day (vs 0 cups/day); 1.3 (1.2, 1.5)  | logistic regression analysis used.<br>No other factors investigated (alcohol, coffee) found to be associated with reduced UI risk.   |
| Moller 2000 <sup>188</sup>  | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Determine relationship between lower urinary tract symptoms* and possible associated risk factors (BMI, constipation [frequency of stool < daily], straining at stool) | 487             | F with symptoms > weekly and 564 with no symptoms. Age range 40–60 years<br>Conducted in Denmark  | BMI (OR, 95% CI)<br><br>Constipation (stool frequency < daily), (OR, 95% CI)<br><br>Straining at stool (OR, 95% CI)  | BMI increased risk of stress UI, urge UI, urgency, 'continuous incontinence', night-time incontinence (quartiles 2,3,4, vs quartile 1)<br>(Risk of incontinence or urgency quoted according to quartiles, but these not defined in the report)<br><br>Stress UI 1.4 (1.0, 2.1)<br>urgency 1.5 (1.0, 2.2)<br>hesitancy 2.6 (1.2, 5.6)<br><br>Stress UI 1.9 (1.3, 2.6)<br>urgency 1.7 (1.2, 2.4)<br>hesitancy 4.3 (1.8, 10.3)<br>sensation of incomplete emptying 2.8 (1.7, 4.6)<br>postmicturition dribble 1.9 (1.0, 3.5)<br>straining 6.4 (2.0, 20.1) | Funding: Coloplast A/S, Pharmacia and Upjohn, and other sources.<br><br>*lower urinary tract symptoms: UI, day or night-time frequency, postmicturition dribble, straining, urgency, incomplete bladder emptying, hesitancy.<br><br>Only statistically significant findings reproduced here. |
| Asplund 2004 <sup>201</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Assess relationship between nocturia and lifestyle factors (BMI, smoking, regular exercise, coffee and tea intake)   | 3669            | F aged 40–64 years.<br>Conducted in Sweden  | Factors associated with reduced risk of ≥ 2 nocturia episodes/night<br><br>Factors associated with increased risk of ≥ 2 nocturia episodes/night vs no more than 1 episode (OR, CI [not stated whether 95% CI used]) | Nocturia 'less common' in 'regular' exercisers (no numerical data)<br>2 nocturia episodes 'twice as common' in women who did not vs those who did drink tea or coffee in the evening (no numerical data)<br><br>Smoking:<br>1–15 cigarettes vs no smoking: 1.4 (1.1, 1.8)<br>> 16 cigarettes vs no smoking: 1.8 (1.1, 2.8)<br>BMI ≥ 30 vs < 20 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ; 3.5 (2.6, 4.7)   | Funding: The Jamtland County Council, Ostersund Sweden.<br><br>OR calculated by logistic regression analysis.  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes                       | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Burgio 1991 <sup>208</sup>  | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Determine prevalence, incidence and correlates of UI (smoking, caffeine, alcohol, BMI)           | 486              | Healthy women, subsample of USA Healthy Women Study (investigation of cardiovascular risk factor changes in premenopausal women) aged 42–50 years. 58% had UI | BMI*                           | Women with regular UI ( $\geq 1$ episode per month) had highest mean BMI; those who had never had UI had the lowest mean BMI (results shown in graph; BMI ranged from 25 to 29)                                     | Funding: National Institutes of Health; National Institute on Aging.<br>*reported to be the only significant result when risk factors analysed.   |
| Nuotio 2001 <sup>193</sup>  | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Evaluate association of former and current smoking with urgency in older people                  | 1059 (50% women) | M/F age 60–89 years<br>Conducted in Finland   | Smoking*                       | Former smoking vs Never: 2.62 (1.14, 6.0)<br>Current smoking vs never: 2.54 (0.79, 8.22)  | Funding: Medical Research Fund Tampere Uni Hosp; Uulo Arhio Foundation.<br><br>All results for only women: (OR, 95% CI, by logistic regression).<br>*current smoking = regularly now; former history of smoking = regularly almost every day for at least a year but not currently smoking. |
|                             |                           |  |                  |   | Alcohol (any use)              | Alcohol vs no alcohol: 1.71 (0.99, 2.92)  |   |
|                             |                           |  |                  |   | Coffee                         | 2–4 coffee cups/day vs 0–1: 1.81 (0.61, 5.41)<br>> 5 coffee cups/day vs 0–1: 1.34 (0.42, 4.29)  |   |
| Roe 1999 <sup>209</sup>     | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Compare health and lifestyle factors (diet, smoking, BMI) of people with or without incontinence | 6037 (56% women) | M/F in England; women (mean age 54 years (37–71), 11% of whom incontinent   | Diet, smoking, BMI             | No significant association between diet or smoking and UI (23% of total sample were smokers)<br>More women who were obese (BMI > 29 kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) were incontinent than continent (27% vs 13%, $P < 0.0001$ ) | Funding: study done as part of Dept Health Postdoctoral Fellowship.   |
| Bradley 2005 <sup>202</sup> | Cross-sectional survey    | To measure prevalence of pelvic floor symptoms in  | 297              | F who had been enrolled at 1 site of the Women's Health Initiative study 4–   | Prevalence of urinary symptoms | 51% stress UI<br>49% urge UI<br>29% frequency   | Funding: National center for research resources, and National institutes of   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL         | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---|---|
|                             | EL = 3                    | noncare-seeking older women and the association between symptoms and lifestyle factors   |                 | 6 years previously were invited to take part<br>Mean age 68 years (57–84), mean BMI 30 (16–56)<br>3% prior continence or POP surgery; 11% treated for UI or OAB<br>8% current smokers, 42% past or current. 18% ≥ 1 alcoholic drink per week (6% per day). 68% drank ≥ 1 cup of coffee daily (of whom 69% drank ≥ 3 per day) | Univariate analysis of association between risk factor and pelvic floor symptoms* (OR, 95% CI) | BMI as risk factor for urinary symptoms (highest vs lowest quartile):<br>Urgency 1.8 (0.8–4.0)<br>urge UI 2.2 (1.0–4.8)<br>Exercise (≥ weekly):<br>Urgency 24% vs 35%, $P = 0.03$ , OR 0.6 (0.4–1.0)<br>Coffee drinking (yes vs no):<br>difficulty emptying bladder 15% vs 3% $P = 0.01$<br>OR 8.6 (1.4–55.0)<br>weak urinary stream 23% vs 5% $P \leq 0.01$<br>OR 5.3 (1.5–19.0)<br>Smoking: no factor associated with risk of UI or OAB | child health and human development.<br>*adjusted Mantel–Haenszel odds ratio.  |
| Song 2005 <sup>189</sup>    | Cross-sectional survey    | To evaluate prevalence of UI in Fuzhou, a city in China; to clarify which risk factors predispose to UI, and compare risk factors for urge and stress UI       | 6006            | F aged ≥ 20 years (mean 40, SD 11), mean BMI 22 (SD 3)<br>3% of total population selected randomly   | Prevalence of UI<br><br>Lifestyle variables and association with UI*                           | 16.6% stress UI<br>10% mixed UI<br>7.7% urge UI<br><br>Constipation (not defined):<br>OR for stress UI 2.6 (95% CI 1.8 to 3.8)<br>OR for urge UI 2.3 (1.4 to 3.7)<br>Alcohol consumption (12 pts; drinks per week):<br>OR for stress UI 4.7 (1.1 to 20.2)<br>OR for urge UI 4.0 (0.9 to 17.3)<br>Higher BMI (≥ 75th percentile)<br>OR for stress UI 1.8 (1.5 to 2.2)<br>OR for urge UI 1.5 (1.2 to 2.0)                                   | Funding: none declared.<br>*multivariate logistic regression analysis undertaken for variables found to be associated with UI risk on univariate analysis.<br>Smoking status also evaluated but not found to be associated with UI risk on univariate analysis. |
| Nygaard 1990 <sup>217</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Investigate prevalence of exercise and UI in women (where exercise = running, aerobics, tennis, walking, golf, cycling, racquetball, swimming, weight lifting) | 326             | F mean age 39 years (17–68). 47% some UI. 89% exercised at least once a week (current or past)<br>Conducted in USA   | Exercise habit   | No relationship found between UI and presence or absence of exercise habit, though only 11% were non-exercisers (the reference group)   | Funding: none declared.   |



| Study                  | Study type and EL         | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes       | Results   | Additional comments     |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---|-----------------|---|----------------|---|-------------------------|
| Bo 2001 <sup>218</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Determine prevalence of stress and urge UI in female elite athletes and age-matched controls; and assess possible association between UI and eating disorders   | 1146            | female elite athletes, who trained $\geq 8$ h/day, and age-matched controls aged 15–39 years<br>Conducted in Norway | Exercise habit | Prevalence of stress UI (41% elite athletes, 39% controls), and urge UI (16% vs 19%) was not significantly different<br><br>Difference in prevalence according to type of sport not significant for stress UI. Prevalence of urge UI higher in endurance sports (27.5%) vs technical (15.3%), weight class (16.1%), ball games (11.8%), or gravity sports (10%) $P < 0.05$<br><br>Prevalence of eating disorders (DSM-IV) 20% in athletes vs 9% controls. Urge UI prevalence higher in athletes with eating disorders vs athletes without (20% vs 16%, $P < 0.05$ ) | Funding: none declared. |
| Bo 1989 <sup>219</sup> | Cross-sectional<br>EL = 3 | Compare prevalence of stress UI in regular exercisers vs sedentary women (regular exercise = organised physical activity once/week; sedentary = not participating in organised physical activity once/week) | 205             | F mean age 23–26 years<br>Conducted in Norway   | Exercise       | Overall no significant difference in prevalence between regular exercisers vs sedentary women (26% vs 19%)<br><br>Higher prevalence of stress UI in regular exercisers group who exercised $> 3\times/week$ vs sedentary (31% vs 10%, $P = 0.02$ )  | Funding: none declared. |

*Bowel*

| Study                            | Study type and EL | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|---|--|
| Spence-Jones 1994 <sup>187</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | To investigate impact of straining at stool on urogynaecological function in later life | 73              | F mean aged 52–57 years with uterovaginal prolapse ( $n = 23$ , 10 of whom had 'minor' stress UI symptoms), and women with stress UI ( $n = 23$ ) with a control group (27 women being investigated for abnormal vaginal bleeding) | Straining at stool as a young adult (16–35 years)<br><br>Bowel frequency of less than twice a week as young adults | reported by significantly more women with prolapse or stress UI than the control group (61% and 30% vs 4%, $P < 0.001$ )<br><br>reported by significantly more women with prolapse vs control (48% vs 8%, $P < 0.001$ ) | Funding: Warburg Trust, and St Marks' Research Foundation. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes                                       | Results  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| McGrother 2006 <sup>14</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | To identify consistent and coherent general health and specific comorbidities leading to the onset of OAB and SUI in women in the general population | 12,570          | F aged 40 years or over drawn from list of 108 general practices in Leicestershire<br><br>Prevalence at baseline: 7.7% pure stress UI, 7.7% OAB, 12.7% mixed UI<br><br>Incidence at 1 year: 3.6% pure stress UI, 5.4% OAB, 4.5% mixed UI<br><br>(Leicestershire MRC study) | Risk of OAB at 1 year (multivariate analysis)* | Bowel urgency<br>OR 2.2 (95% CI 1.5 to 3.4),<br>$P < 0.01$ | Funding: Medical Research Council.<br><br>Information gained from postal questionnaires at baseline and after 1 year. Response rates 65% and 80%.<br><br>*only data relevant to lifestyle factors extracted (bowel). |

*Dietary factors (caffeine and fluid intake) (1 of 2 tables)*

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients                            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Bryant 2002 <sup>194</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 95 (91% women), 74 completed and analysed* | M/F mean age 57 years, symptoms of urgency, frequency and/or urge UI, routinely ingested > 100 mg caffeine/day<br><br>Exclusions: significant cognitive impairment, pregnancy, UTI | Caffeine-fading + bladder training (36) | Bladder training with no caffeine restriction ( $n = 38$ ) | 1 month             | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Urgency episodes/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Frequency/24 h (mean change) | -55 vs -26%,<br>$P = \text{NS}$<br><br>-61 vs -12%,<br>$P = 0.002$<br><br>-35 vs -23%,<br>$P = 0.037$ | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Caffeine-fading: reduce caffeine intake by 1 drink/day, until max. 100 mg/day reached; also review of caffeine history, urinary symptoms, time/vol./caffeine charts.<br><br>Bladder training: increasing voiding interval (no target stated); do not exceed 2 litre intake per 24 h; teaching urinary deferment techniques, ceasing 'just-in-time' voiding.<br><br>Caffeine intake fell by -58 vs -11%, $P < 0.0001$ .<br><br>*caffeine levels in those analysed vs withdrew checked – difference NS ( $P = 0.99$ ). |

| Study                    | Study type and EL       | No. of patients                                       | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                       | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Arya 2000 <sup>195</sup> | Case-control<br>EL = 2+ | 259   | Women, mean age, symptoms of UI presenting at tertiary centre for urodynamics<br>Cases: DO on provocative cystometry with MUCP > 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O ( <i>n</i> = 131)<br>Control: genuine stress UI (no unstable bladder contractions on cystometry) ( <i>n</i> = 128) | Exposure:<br>Caffeine intake; minimal (< 100 mg/day), moderate (100–400 mg/day), high (> 400 mg/day) | –  | –                   | Risk factors for detrusor overactivity | Age > 55 years: OR 1.7 (95% CI 1.03 to 2.9), <i>P</i> = 0.028<br>High vs minimal caffeine intake:* OR 2.4 (95% CI 1.1 to 6.5), <i>P</i> = 0.018<br>High vs moderate:** OR 1.3 (95% CI 0.8 to 2.4), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Moderate vs minimal caffeine intake * OR 1.5 (95% CI 0.1 to 7.2), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Current vs never smokers:** OR 1.9 (95% CI 1.0 to 3.8), <i>P</i> = 0.027 | Funding: none declared.<br>Women with detrusor overactivity had significantly higher mean age (56 vs 45 years), and more were current smokers (43% vs 23%), <i>P</i> = 0.04.<br>Mean caffeine intake 484 ± 123 mg/day vs 194 ± 84 mg/day, <i>P</i> = 0.02.<br>*multivariate analysis, adjusting for differences in age and weight.<br>**only univariate analysis reported. |
| Dowd 1996 <sup>203</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–          | 58 eligible, (32 analysed as had complete diary sets) | Women, mean age 70 years (52–89), UI for 6 months or more, independent in self-care   | Increased fluid intake of ≥ 500 ml but total intake not > 2400 ml/day                                | Maintained fluid intake ( <i>n</i> = 8)<br>Reduced fluid intake by 300 ml, | 5 weeks tx          | Leakage episodes (mean change)         | –0.1 vs +0.09 vs –0.4, <i>P</i> = NS from baseline in all grps  | Funding: none declared.<br>Adherence to fluid intake protocols was 'poor'.   |

| Study                           | Study type and EL         | No. of patients                                | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up            | Outcome measures                                       | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                 |                           |  |  | (n = 14)  | but total intake not < 1000 ml/day (n = 10)   | Follow-up at 3 months (n = 29) | Leakage episodes                                       | 22 reported overall decrease in episodes since participation in the study, 6 no change, 1 increase   |  |
|                                 |                           |  |  |   |   |                                | Frequency  | 11 reported decreased frequency<br>15 noted no change in voiding patterns  |  |
| Swithinbank 2005 <sup>204</sup> | Cross-over RCT<br>EL = 1– | 84 randomised, 69 (82%) completed and analysed | F mean age 55 years UD stress UI or idiopathic DO. No pts with stress UI had prior surgery<br><br>69 women, mean age 55 years completed the study, including 39 with USI and 30 with IDO<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, liver, cardiac, renal disease, and diabetes mellitus; treatment with antidepressants, anticholinergics, diuretics | Fluid manipulation for 3 weeks* (order of increasing or decreasing fluid intake randomised) | Fluid manipulation for 3 weeks* (order of increasing or decreasing fluid intake randomised) | 4 weeks                        | Leakage episodes /day (change in median from baseline) | After 1 week caffeine restriction:<br>SUI –0.8 (50%)<br>DO –0.3 (33%),<br>P = NS<br><br>After increasing fluid intake:<br>SUI –0.9 (56%)<br>DO +0.2 (22%)<br><br>After decreasing fluid intake:<br>SUI –1.1 (69%),<br>P = 0.006<br>DO –0.4 (44%),<br>P = 0.006 | Funding: none declared.<br>*1 week baseline, then caffeine restriction with normal fluid intake for 1 week; next 2 weeks, increased decaffeinated fluids to 3 litre daily or decreased decaffeinated fluids to 750 ml (order randomised).<br>[EL = 1–] Only completers analysed, results presented for total group not between groups based on order of randomisation.<br>QOL also assessed using shortened version of |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                      | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Frequency/day (change in median from baseline)        | After 1 week caffeine restriction:<br>SUI -0.2 (3%)<br>DO -0.1 (1%)<br>After increasing fluid intake:<br>SUI +1.1 (15%),<br><i>P</i> < 0.003<br>DO +1.8 (20%),<br><i>P</i> < 0.003<br>After decreasing fluid intake:<br>SUI -0.9 (13%),<br><i>P</i> < 0.003<br>DO -1.3 (14%),<br><i>P</i> < 0.003 | BFLUTS; no numerical data reported. It was reported that decreasing fluid intake showed sig. improvement in QOL in women with SUI and in those with DO. |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | 24 h pad test (change in median weight from baseline) | After 1 week caffeine restriction:<br>SUI -0.5 g (7%)<br>DO -0.3 g (5%)<br>After increasing fluid intake:<br>SUI +0.3 g (4%)<br>DO +6.2 g (105%)<br>After decreasing fluid intake:<br>SUI -0.7 g (9%)<br>DO -1.5 g (25%)  |   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|---|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Urgency episodes /day in IDO group only (change in median from baseline) | After 1 week caffeine restriction:<br>DO +0.2 (4%)<br>After increasing fluid intake:<br>DO +2.4 (46%),<br>$P < 0.003$<br>After decreasing fluid intake:<br>DO -0.9 (17%),<br>$P \leq 0.042$ |                     |

*Dietary factors (caffeine and fluid intake) (2 of 2 tables)*

| Study                         | Study type and EL                | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---|---|
| Wyman 1991 <sup>206</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3            | To investigate an association between fluid intake and voiding patterns over 1 week  | 126             | F $\geq$ 55 years with UI who were enrolled in a study of behaviour management (Fantl 1991, $n = 126$ ). <sup>205</sup><br>Urodynamic diagnosis: 29% DO, 71% stress UI | Correlation between fluid intake and urinary outcomes                        | $r = 0.38$ , $P = 0.0001$ diurnal frequency<br>$r = 0.22$ , $P = 0.02$ nocturnal frequency<br>$r = 0.34$ , $P = 0.0001$ leakage | Funding: National Institute for Aging, National Centre for Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health.<br>Mean fluid intake 1.7–1.8 litres/day in each diagnostic group.   |
| Creighton 1990 <sup>196</sup> | Before and after study<br>EL = 3 | An investigation of the urodynamic effects of 200 mg caffeine (twin-channel cystometry and uroflowmetry, 30 mins after intake) | 30              | 20 women with DO; symptoms exacerbated by caffeine containing drinks<br>10 asymptomatic women (controls)   | Pressure rise on filling (cmH <sub>2</sub> O) unclear whether mean or median | Cases:<br>With caffeine 17 (0–42)<br>without caffeine 11 (0–25),<br>$P < 0.03$<br>Controls:<br>2 (0.5)                          | Funding: none declared.<br>No sig. changes in other urodynamic parameters in either group.  |
| Tomlinson 1999 <sup>197</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3            | Evaluate relationship between caffeine intake and UI, during the initial 2–4 week self-monitoring phase of a behaviour         | 34              | F $\geq$ 55 years with UI ( $\geq$ 2 episodes/week)  | Caffeine intake/day*<br>Fluid intake/day<br>Urine loss/day                   | Fell: 900 to 480 ml (47%)<br>Increased: 1680 to 1870 (11%)<br>Fell: 23.4 g to 14.2 g (39%)                                      | Funding: National Institutes of Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health, Johnson and Johnson supplied 'products'.<br>*all median changes for women who were encouraged to reduce caffeine intake specifically.<br>change in caffeine intake not significantly |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes                          | Results   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
|                           |                       | management programme (one arm of a RCT <sup>199</sup> described in the behavioural management section) |                 |   | Daytime leakage episodes/day      | Fell: 2.33 to 1.0 (57%)   | associated with change in any outcome (standard linear regression analysis).       |
|                           |                       |  |                 |   | Voiding interval, h/daytime       | Fell: 2.26 to 2.18 (4%)   |  |
| James 1989 <sup>198</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate effects of chronic caffeine intake on UI in psychogeriatric patients with UI               | 14 (8 women)    | M/F, 64–89 years, psychogeriatric patients who underwent a 13-week programme of alternating caffeine intake or abstinence | Day leakage episodes (mean, SD)   | Caffeine intake*: 4.38 (1.57); 4.71 (1.29)<br>Caffeine free: 2.85 (1.16); 3.14 (1.17) | Funding: none declared.<br>*2 periods of caffeine intake, 2 caffeine-free periods. |
|                           |                       |  |                 |   | Night leakage episodes (mean, SD) | Caffeine intake*: 2.5 (0.34); 2.56 (0.27)<br>Caffeine free: 1.91 (0.25); 2.10 (0.23)  |  |

## Smoking

| Study                           | Study type and EL       | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                    | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Tampakoudis 1995 <sup>207</sup> | Case-control<br>EL = 2– | 160             | Cases ( $n = 80$ ): F mean age 47 years, UI, 63% smokers, 37% non-smokers; underwent urodynamics<br>Controls ( $n = 80$ ): F mean age 42 years, UI, 25% smokers, 75% non-smokers; underwent urodynamics | –            | –          | –                   | Smoking status (cases and controls) | Smokers: 63% cases vs 25% controls $P < 0.0005$ , OR 4.2 (95% CI 2.16 to 8.23)*<br>Non-smokers 37% vs 75%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Heavy smokers: (tar consumption 100–1500 g, nicotine consumption 15.84–240 g).<br>Light smokers (tar 3.6–14.1 g, nicotine 3.6–14.1 g) |
|                                 |                         |                 |   |              |            |                     | Prevalence UI in cases              | Smokers ( $n = 48$ ): 19 (40%) stress UI (10 heavy, 5 light, 4 stop start); 29 (60%) urge UI (18 heavy, 6 light, 5 stop start)<br>Non-smokers ( $n = 32$ ): 21 (66%) stress UI, 11 (33%) urge UI<br>$P < 0.025$ for urge UI in smokers vs non-smokers | Current stop start smokers: tar 0.1–3.4 g, nicotine 0.1–0.125 g).<br>*calculated from data.  |

| Weight                    |                       |  |   |  |   |                                     |  |   |  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
| Subak 2005 <sup>210</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-        | 48 randomised, 40 assessed at 3 months | Overweight and obese F experiencing at least 4 UI episodes per week<br>Median (with 25% to 75% interquartile range [IQR]) baseline age was 52 years (IQR 47–59), weight was 97 kg (IQR 87–106) and UI episodes were 21 weekly (IQR 11–33) | A 3-month weight reduction program*<br><i>n</i> = 24 randomised, 19 analysed | No intervention for 3 months (then received the same intervention)<br><i>n</i> = 24 randomised, 19 analysed | 3 months                            | Weight change kg (median, IQR)                           | -16 (9 to 20) vs 0% (-2 to 2), <i>P</i> < 0.0001  | Funding: Mount Zion Health Services, and University of California Committee on Research.<br>[EL = 1-] Only completers analysed.<br>*weight reduction programme = low calorie liquid diet (max. 800 kcal /day), encouraged to increase physical activity until exercising 60 min per day, and taught 'standard cognitive and behavioural skills' to assist in modifying eating and exercise habits. Pts met weekly in group sessions led by a nutritionist, exercise psychologist, or behaviour therapist and followed a structured protocol.<br>Following the weight reduction program the wait-list control group experienced a similar median reduction in weekly UI episodes (71%). |
|                           |                       |  |   |  |   |                                     | Change in weekly UI episodes and scores (median changes) | -60% (IQR 30% to 89%) vs -15% (IQR -9% to 25%)<br><i>P</i> < 0.0005 (mean 51% vs 5%)  |  |
|                           |                       |  |   |  |   |                                     | Quality of life (median change in scores)                | IIQ: -45 vs -2%, <i>P</i> = 0.01<br>UDI: -33 vs +3%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br>SF-36 physical component: -19 vs -1%, <i>P</i> = 0.003<br>SF-36 mental component: -5% vs 0, <i>P</i> = NS |  |
|                           |                       |  |   | All pts assessed beyond randomised phase                                     |   | 9 months (6 months after end of tx) | All outcomes above                                       | All sig. improved vs baseline   |  |
| Bump 1992 <sup>211</sup>  | Case-series<br>EL = 3 | 13                                     | F mean age 41 years (22–65), morbidly obese (> 45 kg over ideal body weight); mean pre-op weight 131.5 kg (100–153), mean BMI 49.4 kg/m <sup>2</sup> (38–62)<br>12 had bothersome UI symptoms; 2 urge, 3                                  | Gastric bypass surgery   | -   | Mean                                | Leakage episodes/week                                    | -12.5, <i>P</i> = 0.001 (93%) vs baseline   | Funding: none declared.<br>Mean weight after surgery: 88 kg (SD 17), <i>P</i> << 0.009. Mean BMI post-op 33 kg/m <sup>2</sup> .  |
|                           |                       |  |   |  |   | 14.5 months (range 11–24)           | Day and night-time frequency                             | No sig. change  |  |
|                           |                       |  |   |  |   |                                     | Self-reported cure                                       | 9/12 no bothersome symptoms, <i>P</i> < 0.04.<br>7/10 with stress UI and 8/9 urge UI cured  |  |



| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                   | Comparison | Length of follow-up                        | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|--|---|---|--|
|                            |                       |                 | stress, 7 mixed. Urodynamic diagnosis ( $n = 6$ ); 2 detrusor instability, 2 stress UI, 2 DO and stress UI   |  |            |  | Objective cure (urodynamics)  | 4/6   |  |
| Subak 2002 <sup>214</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 10              | F mean age 48 years, mean BMI $38.3 \pm 10.1$ kg/m <sup>2</sup> , enrolled in weight reduction programs (low calorie liquid or reduced calories solid diet; $\geq 4$ UI (mean $13 [\pm 10]$ ) leakage episodes/week. Type of UI; 6 urge, 1 stress, 3 mixed<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, urinary retention, drug tx for UI, planned UI surgery | Weight loss                                    | –          | 3 months (duration of weight loss program) | $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes/week<br><br>Leakage episodes/week       | 6/6 among women achieving weight loss of $\geq 5\%$ vs 1 of 4 women with $< 5\%$ weight loss ( $P < 0.03$ )<br><br>Mean change $-5$ ( $-40\%$ )<br>Median change $-6$ | Funding: American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists; Pharmacia and Upjohn Research Award.<br><br>8 of 10 lost weight. 6 lost $\geq 5\%$ of baseline weight. Mean weight loss was 15 kg (mean change in BMI $-5.3 \pm 6.2$ kg/m <sup>2</sup> ). |
| Deitel 1988 <sup>212</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 138             | Morbidly obese F (mean age 35 years [17–56]) who had lost $\geq 50\%$ of their excess weight following bariatric surgery   | Weight loss (bariatric surgery)                | –          | Between 2 and 5 years                      | Prevalence of stress UI<br><br>Mean weight after stabilisation of weight loss     | Fell from 61% to 12% after stabilisation of weight loss (between 2 and 5 years)<br><br>79 kg (SD 13) from a pre-operative mean weight of 124 kg (SD 23)               | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Aim of study was to evaluate gynaecologic-obstetric disorders after loss of massive excess weight   |
| Ahroni 2005 <sup>213</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 195 (83% F)     | M/F mean age 44 years who had undergone LAGB; to be considered for surgery patients had to have BMI $\geq 35$ , or have lower BMI with significant co-morbidities that were likely to  | Laparoscopic adjustable gastric banding (LAGB) | –          | 1 year                                     | Changes in weight (mean)<br><br>Stress UI (in 77% who completed 1 year interview) | BMI $-13.5$ kg/m <sup>2</sup><br>% excess body weight lost 45.7% ( $\pm 17.1$ )<br><br>19% at baseline<br>46% 'much better'<br>18% better<br>36% no change            | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Pts were seen for band adjustments as needed throughout the year.<br><br>Aim of study was to establish weight loss, change in co-morbidities (self-reported presence or absence of 12                                     |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|------------|---------------------|------------------|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | significantly improve by weight loss<br>Mean BMI was 46 (SD 8),<br>mean weight 127 kg |              |            |                     | Complications    | Rate 9.2%<br>1.5% slipped bands<br>2.1% port problems<br>4.1% temporary stoma occlusion<br>0.5% banding removed<br>0.5% ( <i>n</i> = 1) death (pneumonia 2 weeks after procedure) | conditions, 1 of which was stress UI); medication usage, and general health status after the LAGB procedure. |

*Physical exercise*

| Study                        | Study type and EL | Aim of study  | No. of patients                                       | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Nygaard 1997 <sup>215</sup>  | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | Investigate the prevalence of stress or urge UI in past participants in long-term high impact exercise (gymnastics or track and field) compared with low impact exercise (swimming) | 104   | F, past USA Olympians  | Prevalence of stress or urge UI according to prior participation in high or low-impact exercise | No significant differences:<br>Urge UI: 34% high impact vs 17% low<br>Stress UI: 41% vs 50%  | Funding: none declared.<br>BMI reported to be a risk for regular stress and urge UI.  |
| Eliasson 2005 <sup>216</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | To describe physical activity and urinary leakage before, during and after the first childbirth   | 725 enrolled, 665 (81%) answered both questionnaires* | F mean age 28 (17–43) in their first pregnancy.<br>Mean BMI 22.5 (range 16.6–41.3)<br><br>The physical activity/exercises were classified according to their impact on the pelvic floor, and the women were divided into three groups: high-impact exercise ( <i>n</i> = 327), low-impact exercise ( <i>n</i> = 84) and the inactive group ( <i>n</i> = 254) | Prevalence<br><br>Multivariate analysis of risk factors (type of exercise considered)           | 39% before pregnancy: 44% in high-impact group, 30% low-impact, and 35% in no activity grp<br>62% during pregnancy: 64% in high-impact group, 60% low-impact, and 63% in no activity grp<br>75% at 1 year post-partum<br><br>Pre-pregnancy high-impact activity<br>OR 1.4 (95% CI 1.0 to 2.0),<br><i>P</i> = 0.038 | Funding: Centre for healthcare sciences Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm.<br>*women answered one questionnaire during the 36th gestation week and another 1 year post-partum.<br>High-impact exercise = gymnastics, running, jumping, dancing, ball sports and strength training.<br>Low-impact = walking, bicycling, swimming, riding. |

## Physical therapies

## Pelvic floor muscle training for treatment of UI

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients                     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention          | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Bo 1999 <sup>226</sup><br>Bo 2000 <sup>939</sup><br>(QOL report of PFMT vs control grp only) | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 122<br>randomised,<br>107 analysed* | F mean age~47–52 years, stress UI, > 4 g leakage (pad test with standardised vol.)<br>Exclusions: other type of UI, involuntary detrusor contractions > 10 cm H <sub>2</sub> O on cystometry, abnormal bladder function (residual urine > 50 ml, maximal uroflow < 15 ml), previous surgery for stress UI | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 25) | Electrical stimulation (ES) ( <i>n</i> = 25)<br>Vaginal cones ( <i>n</i> = 27)<br>Control ( <i>n</i> = 30) | 6 months tx         | Pad test (provocative with standardised volume [200 ml]), mean change, g, (95% CI)<br>Objective cure (≤ 2 g leakage on pad test with standardised vol.)<br>Subjective assessment (5-point ordinal scale), % reporting<br>Subjective cure (UI 'unproblematic')<br>Leakage episodes /3 days (mean change [95% CI]) | –30.2 (–43.3, –16.9) vs<br>–7.4 (–20.9, +6.1) vs<br>–14.7 (–27.6, –1.8) vs<br>–12.7 (–27.2, +1.8)<br>[–78 vs –13 vs –30 vs –25%]<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.02 PFMT vs all grps<br>44 vs 28 vs 15% vs 7%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.02 (unclear which comparison <i>P</i> value relates to)<br>Continent/almost continent: 48 vs 12 vs 19% vs 3%<br>Improved: 44 vs 52 vs 44% vs 0%<br>Unchanged: 8 vs 28 vs 37% vs 87%<br>Worse 0 vs 8 vs 0% vs 10%<br>56 vs 12 vs 7% vs 3%,<br><i>P</i> < 0.001 PFMT vs other grps<br>–1.2 (–2.0, –0.4) vs<br>–0.7 (–1.5, +1.1) vs<br>+0.8 (–1.2, +2.8) vs<br>+0.3 (–0.5, +1.1)<br>[–60 vs –30 vs +30 vs +10%]<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.03 PFMT vs cones/control, <i>P</i> = 0.02 ES vs control | Funding: Norwegian Fund for Postgraduate studies in Physiotherapy, Norwegian Research Council.<br>Coloplast AS provided continence guard, Vitacon AS the electrical stimulators and cones.<br>*ITT results reported to be similar (no data) although ES vs control grp 'weaker' in when compared in this analysis.<br>Physio taught women re: anatomy and physiology of pelvic floor and lower urinary tract, and continence mechanisms. Correct PFM contraction taught, and assessed by vaginal palpation.<br>PFMT: 8–12 high intensity contractions 3×/day at home, additional training in grps 1×/week for 45 min with physio, in lying, standing, sitting, kneeling positions. Contraction held for 6–8 s, 3–4 fast contractions then added, rest 6 s. Body awareness, breathing, relaxation exercises, and strength training for abdominal, back |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | 24 h pad test (mean change, g)   | -6.6 (-12.1, -1.1) vs<br>-0.5 (-8.9, +7.9) vs<br>-22 (-55.7, +11.7) vs<br>-7.1 (-20.2, +6.0)<br>[-46 vs -2 vs -42 vs -17%]<br><i>P</i> = NS for all comparisons                               | and thigh muscles performed in grp sessions. Audiotape with verbal guidance for 12 max. contractions available for home training.  |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Leakage index (frequency of urine leakage during sneezing, coughing, laughing, walking, running, jumping, lifting on a 5-point scale: 5 always, 4 often, 3 sometimes, 2 seldom, 1 never) | -0.9 (-1.1, -0.7) vs<br>-0.2 (-0.4, 0) vs<br>-0.3 (-0.5, -0.1) vs<br>+0.1 (-0.1, +0.3)<br>[-32 vs -7 vs -10 vs +3%]<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.04 all active tx grps vs control, and PFMT vs ES or cones | ES: MS 106 twin device, 30 min/day biphasic intermittent current, 50 Hz frequency, pulse width 0.2 ms, 0–120 mA with individually adapted on-off cycles (on-time range 0.5–10 s, off-time 0–30 s). Physio observed ES in clinic once/month.<br>Cones: Mabella cones used 20 min/day, pts progressed through 3 weights (20, 40, 70 g) according to ability to retain cones. |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Social activity index (9 different social situations assessed on 10 cm VAS; 0 impossible, 10 no problem taking part)   | +0.6 (0.2, 1.0) vs<br>+0.6 (0.2, 1.0) vs<br>+0.1 (-0.3, +0.5) vs<br>-0.2 (-0.8, +0.4)<br>[+7 vs +7 vs +1 vs -2%]<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.02 all active tx grps vs control, and PFMT vs ES             | Control group offered use of Continence Guard device, proportion using this not stated.<br>Active tx grps met physio 1×/month for motivation, monitoring of PFM strength, and tx adjustment if necessary.  |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | PFM strength (mean change, cmH <sub>2</sub> O)   | +8.2 vs +3.8 vs +3.6 vs 'no sig., change' in control grp<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.03 PFMT vs all grps  | Physio evaluated PFM function during contraction. Muscle strength evaluated  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                           | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|
|                             |                   |  |   |  |  |   | Adverse effects   | 0 PFMT<br>2 (8%) ES (1 tenderness, and bleeding, 1 discomfort)<br>4 (15%) cones (1 abdominal pain, vaginitis, 1 bleeding).<br>32% ES and 52% cone groups reported motivation problems with stimulator/devices            | by balloon catheter connected to pressure transducer.<br>Withdrawals: 4 PFMT, 7 ES, 1 cones, 1 control.   |
|                             |                   |  |   |  |  |   | QOL (BFLUTS) [PFMT vs control only]   | Greater improvement in PFMT grp vs control in 4/5 parameters: interference with social life or physical activity, overall interference with life, unsatisfied if had to spend rest of life with symptoms as they are now |   |
| Miller 1998 <sup>227</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 27   | F mean age 69 years (60–84), mild-moderate stress UI, leakage ≥ 1/week and up to 5×/day, direct visualization of urine loss during cough<br><br>Exclusions: systemic neuromuscular disease, previous bladder surgery, active UTI, inability to contract PFM despite instruction and examination, POP beyond hymenal ring. | PFMT (with the Knack) ( <i>n</i> = 13) | Control ( <i>n</i> = 14)   | 1 week                                  | Leakage (standing paper-towel stress test; mean (SD) area (cm <sup>2</sup> ) measured after 3 consecutive coughs of given intensity<br><br>PFM strength (digital palpation scores, 0–21), mean (SD) | Medium cough:<br>0.4 (1.04) vs 21.2 (44.8)<br><br>Deep cough:<br>32.7 (33.9) vs 30.4 (44.2), <i>P</i> = 0.03<br><br>11.2 (4.3) vs 10.8 (4.9) at 1 week   | Funding: Public Health Service Grants.<br><br>PFMT: PFM physiology and contraction including the Knack (just before and during a hard cough), taught; checked by vaginal palpation.<br><br>Control group had no treatment initially, then underwent active tx for 1 week. |
| Henalla 1989 <sup>228</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 104 randomised, 100 analysed and followed up to 1 year | F age not stated, urodynamic stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: complicated history of UI e.g. history of   | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 26)                  | Electrical stimulation ( <i>n</i> = 25)<br><br>Topical oestrogen | 3 months tx, further 9 months follow-up | Cure (negative pad test) or improvement   | 65% vs 32% vs 12% vs 0 (3 months), <i>P</i> < 0.001 PFMT vs baseline<br><br>At 12 months: 54% vs 28% vs 12% vs 0   | Funding: none declared.<br><br>PFMT: pts checked own PFM contraction using index and middle fingers; 5×5 s contractions/hour.   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                             |                   |                 | fistula, > 1 previous surgical procedure for UI; major prolapse   |  | ( <i>n</i> = 24)<br>Control ( <i>n</i> = 25)  |                     | Unchanged symptoms<br>Pad weights<br>MUCP   | 35 vs 68 vs 87% vs 100% (3 months)<br>No numerical data. Sig. reduction reported in PFMT and ES grps, <i>P</i> < 0.02 vs baseline (3 months)<br>No numerical data. Sig. increase reported in oestrogen grps, <i>P</i> < 0.001 vs baseline (3 months)   | Seen weekly by physio to check progress.<br>ES: interferential current, 0–100 Hz freq according to pt's tolerance, 10 weekly sessions of 20 min at physio dept.<br>Topical oestrogen: conjugated equine oestrogens, 2 g via a vaginal applicator every night.<br>Control: no treatment.<br>Type of pad test not stated.  |
| Ghoniem 2005 <sup>229</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 201             | F 29–75 years (mean 51–54), urodynamic stress UI (18%) or positive cough stress test and normal micturition frequency of < 8 voids day (82%); ≥ 2 leakage episodes/day. 11% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: advanced POP, active or recurrent UTIs, continence surgery within 1 year, current | Duloxetine 80 mg + PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 52) | Duloxetine 80 mg ( <i>n</i> = 52)<br>PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 50)<br>Placebo (no active tx) ( <i>n</i> = 47) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes (median change from baseline)<br>I-QOL (mean change in score)<br>Patients Global Impression of Improvement (% reporting improvement) | –57 vs –57 vs –35 vs –29%<br>Responder rate (≥ 50% reduction in leakage episodes): 61 vs 57% vs 26% vs 25%<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.004 duloxetine ± PFMT vs PFMT alone or no active tx<br>+13.1 vs +8.3 vs +7.8 vs +4.8%<br><i>P</i> = 0.011 duloxetine + PFMT vs no active tx<br>71 vs 54 vs 65% vs 42%<br><i>P</i> = 0.005 duloxetine + PFMT vs no active tx | Funding: Eli Lilly and Company, and Boehringer Ingelheim.<br>Primary aim of study was to compare the effectiveness of duloxetine + PFMT vs control. The study used a double-dummy design.<br>PFM contraction checked at baseline.<br>PFMT: written instructions to perform 3×10 long and 2×10 rapid contractions 4 days/week (total 200 contractions/week), plus instructions to contract PFM with physical events |

| Study                                 | Study type and EL    | No. of patients                 | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
|                                       |                      |                                 | device or drug tx for UI, prior formal PFMT, prior hip fracture or replacement  |                                |   |   | Adverse effects (both duloxetine grps vs placebo [no duloxetine])  | Any 82% vs 69%<br>nausea 39% vs 5%<br>dizziness 18% vs 5%<br>dry mouth 18% vs 3%<br>constipation 14% vs 3%<br>insomnia 12% vs 1%<br>somnia 11% vs 1%<br>asthenia 6% vs 0%<br>( $P \leq 0.029$ duloxetine vs placebo for all effects)<br><br>Discontinuation for adverse effects by each grp:<br>31% vs 23% vs 2% vs 0   | known to cause leakage.<br>Placebo (sham) PFMT: predominant hip abductor contraction (legs crossed at ankles, knees and hips flexed), same number of contractions as PFMT grp.<br>Duloxetine daily dose taken as 40 mg twice daily.  |
| Burns 1993 <sup>230</sup>             | RCT<br>EL = 1+       | 135, 123 completed and analysed | F mean age 62 years, predominant stress UI, $\geq 3$ episodes/week, urodynamic stress (91%) or mixed (9%) UI, residual urine < 50 ml, peak urine flow > 15 ml/s | PFMT ( $n = 43$ )              | PFMT + biofeedback ( $n = 40$ )<br>Control ( $n = 39$ ) | 8 weeks tx, (follow-up at weeks 20–21 and 32–33; data not reported by tx group) | Leakage episodes (mean change)<br><br>Self-reported cure<br><br>Self-reported improvement<br><br>MUCP (mean change, cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br><br>PFM performance (mean change, $\mu V$ ) | 8 weeks: –54 vs –61 vs –6%, $P < 0.001$ active tx vs control<br><br>16 vs 23% vs 3%, $P < 0.005$ active tx vs control<br><br>50–99% improvement: 44 vs 45 vs 15 $P < 0.05$ active tx vs control<br>0–49% improvement: 40 vs 32% vs 82%<br><br>–3 vs 0 vs +11%<br><br>Quick: +3 vs +71% vs 3%, $P \leq 0.005$ PFMT + biofeedback vs other grps<br>Sustained: +6 vs 100% vs 11% | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Center for Nursing Research.<br>PFMT: initial instruction by 12 min video, 4×20 contractions increased to 200/day over 4 weeks. Leaflet also provided.<br>Further instruction available at weekly visits.<br>Biofeedback: vaginal probe attached to EMG and digital integrator. 3–10 s quick-sustained PFM contractions at biofeedback sessions once/week.<br>Control: no treatment for 8 weeks; after 2nd urodynamic evaluation, offered PFMT or PFMT + biofeedback. |
| Lagro-Janssen 1992 <sup>231,232</sup> | Quasi RCT<br>EL = 1– | 110 randomised $n$              | F mean age ~43 years (20–65), UI $\geq 2 \times$ month.   | Behaviour therapy ( $n = 54$ ) | Control (tx delayed by 3 months)                        | 3 months tx, follow-up at 3 months for  | Severity of UI (% dry or 'mild' UI at 3 months)  | Total grp: 57% vs 4%<br>$P$ value not stated  | Funding: 5 year follow-up; Dutch prevention fund.<br>Control and active grps   |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up                          | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|------------|--|---|--|--|
| Lagro-Janssen 1998 <sup>233</sup><br>(5 year follow-up of total grp) |                   |                 | Urodynamic assessment of UI (60% stress, 18% mixed, 16% urge; 33 from both grps had stress UI <sup>232</sup> )<br>Exclusions: previous UI surgery, neurological diseases, UTI |              | (n = 56)   | comparison, and at 1 year after treatment    | Leakage episodes (mean change at 3 months)<br>Subjective assessment at 3 months<br>Long-term effects (at month 12 active grp, month 15 'control' grp) | Total grp: -63 vs +9%, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br><i>Stress UI subgroup</i> : -72 vs +10%, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>Improved/dry 74% vs 3% no change 24% vs 94% deteriorated 2% vs 3%.<br><i>Stress UI subgroup</i> : improved/dry 85 vs 0 no change 15% vs 88% deteriorated 0% vs 12%.<br>In control grp after active tx: 74 vs 24% vs 2%<br>Improved/dry 67% both grps; no change 33% both grps, deterioration 0 both grps | received initial advice and instructions about protective aids e.g. incontinence pads. Control grp did not receive tx for first 3 months of trial but thereafter offered behaviour therapy.<br>Behaviour therapy: PFMT for stress UI, bladder training for urge UI, bladder training followed by PFMT for mixed UI. Initial PFMT instruction given by GP, written instructions then given for 5–10 sessions/day of 10 exercises to be done during normal daily activities. Contraction checked by vaginal palpation. Bladder training: emphasis on fixed voids; increasing voiding interval by 15 min, target 7 voids at an ordinary fluid intake. |
|  |                   |                 |   |              |            | 5 year follow-up of total grp <sup>233</sup> | Leakage episodes /week (mean differences between 1 and 5 years)   | +2.65 (95% CI 0.67 to 4.62), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br><i>Stress UI subgroup</i> : +2.06 (95% CI -0.28 to 4.39)   |  |
|  |                   |                 |   |              |            |  | Improvement (vs pre-tx)   | 69% reported improvement or dryness<br>22% no change<br>9% worse   | Results not presented according to type of UI in this publication, though results in women with PFMT treated with stress UI have been published  |
|  |                   |                 |   |              |            |  | Satisfaction  | 67% satisfied<br>13% not satisfied   |  |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                    | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Severity (dry/mild/moderate/severe) | 40% same category<br>45% moved into contiguous category<br>15% moved by 2/3 categories | separately. <sup>232</sup><br>5 year follow-up: Of the 88 pts, 14% had additional therapy, (2% oestrogens, 2% anticholinergics, 10% physio). 2 pts with exceptional changes in leakage episodes not included in analysis (+64 and +157 change). |

*Different pelvic floor muscle training regimens*

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients              | Patient characteristics                        | Intervention            | Comparison             | Length of follow-up       | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Bo 1990 <sup>234,235</sup>                                 | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 57 randomised, 52 analysed** | F mean age 45 years (24–62), genuine stress UI | Intensive PFMT (n = 23) | Standard PFMT (n = 29) | 6 months tx and follow-up | Self-reported cure  | 2/23 vs 0/29 (9% vs 0%)  | Funding: Foundation for Education and Research in Physical Therapy and the Research Council for Science and the humanities.  |
| Bo 1996 (5 year follow-up of intensive arm) <sup>240</sup> |                   |                              | Exclusions: DO or UTI                          |                         |                        |                           | Self-reported cure or improvement                             | 22/23 vs 19/29 (96% vs 66%)  | Mean duration of symptoms 8.5 years (2–27 in 'intensive' grp, vs 45.9 years (35–63) in 'standard' grp.   |
| Bo 2005 (15 year follow-up of both arms) <sup>241</sup>    |                   |                              |  |                         |                        |                           | Pad test (change in 90 s stress test)                         | –19.9 g ( $P < 0.01$ vs baseline [73%]) vs –7.3 g;   |  |
|  |                   |                              |  |                         |                        |                           | Leakage index (mean change)                                   | –1.1 vs –0.5, $P < 0.01$ (–37 vs –16%)<br>#leakage index: a 5 point ordinal scale covering leakage during physical activities. | Standard: physio gave individual instruction in pelvic anatomy and correct contractions (checked by vaginal palpation). Home PFMT with monthly clinic visit for biofeedback (perineometer). 8–12 |
|  |                   |                              |  |                         |                        |                           | PFM perineometry (mean value at 6 months, cmH <sub>2</sub> O) | 22.5 vs 15.3, $P < 0.01$   |  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention   | Comparison     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|       |                   |                 |                         |                |                |                     | Subjective assessment of leakage during walking, jumping, running, lifting (5 point ordinal scale) <sup>235</sup> | Sig. greater improvement in intensive grp in each situation vs standard grp*, $P < 0.05$  | strong contractions 3×/day. Intensive: as standard, plus 45 min exercise class to music 1× week for 6 months. Class included sets of 8–12 contractions with 6–8 s holds in standing, sitting, lying, kneeling positions. Also strength training for back, thigh, and abdominal muscles, relaxation training and body awareness. |
|       |                   |                 |                         |                |                |                     | Participation in 9 social situations (10 cm VAS, 0–10 impossible-no problem taking part) <sup>235</sup>           | Sig. greater improvement in intensive grp in each situation vs standard grp*, $P \leq 0.03$   |   |
|       |                   |                 |                         |                |                |                     | 5 year follow-up ('intensive' PFMT grp only) <sup>240</sup>   | 3/23 treated surgically<br>14/20 satisfied with tx, 15/20 no visible leakage during cough<br>PFM strength maintained<br>Increase in leakage index scores and pad test, $P < 0.05$   | *At baseline, more women in intensive grp were participating in sports or fitness activities.<br>**reasons for exclusion, all from intensive grp: 2 could not attend classes, 1 attended < 50% of classes, 2 other health problems.   |
|       |                   |                 |                         | $n = 21$ of 23 | $n = 26$ of 29 | 15 years            | All outcomes ( $P = NS$ for all)  | Outcomes: severity index, leakage index, pad usage, problems with bladder emptying (14% vs 19%), interference of UI on everyday life (none 38% vs 54%), urge UI (14% vs 38%), satisfaction (satisfied or almost 81% vs 73%) | Response rate at 15 years 91%<br>No contact made between 5 year follow-up and 15 year follow-up.<br>PFMT > 1/week undertaken by 38% vs 19%.   |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients                     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison                                    | Length of follow-up                    | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Glazener 2001 <sup>236</sup><br>Glazener 2005 <sup>237</sup><br>provides 6 year follow-up data | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 747 randomised                      | F mean age 29 years, UI 3 months postnatally (stress 52%, urge 15%, mixed 31%), | PFMT and bladder training (n = 371) | Control ('standard' postnatal care) (n = 376) | Tx and follow-up 1 year after delivery | Prevalence of UI  | 60% vs 69%<br>absolute difference 9.1% (95% CI 1.0 to 17.3), P = 0.037   | Funding: Wellbeing (grant sponsored by Glaxo Wellcome), and Health Research Council New Zealand.   |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | UI ≥ once/week  | 19.7 vs 31.8%,<br>absolute difference 12.1% (95% CI 4.7 to 19.6), P = 0.002  | Individualised PFMT: instruction re pelvic floor anatomy and muscle contraction regimens, then programme of 8–10 sessions/day, target 80–100 contractions. Nurse assessment and advice months 5, 7, 9, |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | Severity (0–10 ordinal scale; no problem-can't think of anything worse) (n = 142 and 142) | Mean scores: 2.8 vs 3.6, absolute difference 0.8 (95% CI 0.22 to 1.36), P = 0.007                                  | postpartum. Women with frequency or urgency also had bladder training (to increasing voiding interval, plus advice to avoid caffeinated drinks) months 7, 9.   |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | Pad usage   | Any pad use; difference between grps: 7.5 (95% CI 0.9 to 14.3)<br>Mean no. pad changes: 0.15 (95% CI 0.04 to 0.26) |  |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | General wellbeing (very well, n = 276 and 244)  | 47.1 vs 45.1%<br>absolute difference 2.0 (95% CI –6.5 to 10.6)   | Control: standard postnatal management which could include information on PFM exercises, and women could seek medical advice.  |
|  |                   | 516 (69%)<br>followed up to 6 years |   | n = 263                             | n = 253                                       | 6 years after delivery                 | Prevalence of UI  | 76% vs 79%<br>absolute difference –3.0 (95% CI –10.2 to 4.1), P = NS   | At 6 years, parity unchanged in 54%. 39% had 1 more birth, 5% had 2, 1% had 3.   |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | UI ≥ once/week  | 38% vs 39%<br>absolute difference –1.1 (95% CI –9.5 to 7.3), P = NS  |  |
|  |                   |                                     |   |                                     |   |  | Severity (0–100 mm VAS; no problem-can't think of anything worse)                         | Mean (SD): 35.3 (25.1) vs 31.4 (23.8),<br>absolute difference 3.9 (95% CI –1.0 to 8.8), P = NS                     |  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics                                       | Intervention  | Comparison               | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| Wilson 1998 <sup>238</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 230 randomised, 145 (63%) analysed at 1 year, 89 (39%) at 22–44 months | F UI 3 months postpartum (57% stress UI, 26% mixed, 15% urge) | Intensive PFMT:<br>PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 19)<br>Cones ( <i>n</i> = 21)<br>PFMT + cones ( <i>n</i> = 14) | Control ( <i>n</i> = 91) | 1 year post-partum       | Prevalence UI  | 47 vs 48 vs 57% vs 76% ( <i>P</i> = 0.003 for intensive grp combined [50%] vs control)<br><i>P</i> = NS between PFMT vs cones grps  | Funding: Health Research Council New Zealand.<br>[EL = 1–] 52% vs 22% withdrew; only completers analysed.<br>Intensive grp: instruction by physio 4× at hospital, ~3, 4, 6, 9 months after delivery. PFMT; 8–10 sessions/day, fast and slow contractions, target 80–100 contractions. Perineometer used to teach awareness of PFM contraction, and to record strength. Cones: 9 cones in each set, increasing in weight from 20 to 100 g, retained for 15 min 2×/day.<br>Control: standard PFMT taught by physios (antenatally, class instruction on pelvic floor anatomy and exercises; postnatally, daily instruction from second postnatal day or tape on weekends).<br>Mean no. daily contractions performed 16.9 (13.3–20.6) intensive grp vs 14.8 (12.2–17.4) control grp. |
|                            |                   |  |   |   |                          |                          | Pad test (g) results at 1 year (test done at home, duration of test unclear) | 2.1 (–0.3, 4.5) vs 0.6 (0.1, 1.1) vs 0.5 (0.1, 0.9) vs 2.6 (0.1, 5.1)<br>Change in intensive vs control groups: –70 vs +138%; endpoint results 1.1 vs 2.6 g; <i>P</i> = NS between grps |  |
|                            |                   |  |   |   |                          |                          | Perineometry (cmH <sub>2</sub> O)  | No sig. differences between grps in maximum or sustained values at 1 year   |  |
|                            |                   |  |   |   |                          | 24–44 months post-partum | Prevalence UI  | 58% intensive grp combined vs 54% control, <i>P</i> = NS  |  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention         | Comparison                | Length of follow-up                              | Outcome measures                     | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Janssen 2001 <sup>242</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 530 randomised (414 completed; ITT analysis used) | F (mean age ~48 years) with stress (60%), urge (8%), or mixed (32%) UI. Duration of UI > 5 years in ~48%<br><br>Exclusions: neurological causes, pelvic tumour/infection, severe vaginal prolapse    | Group PFMT (n = 404) | Individual PFMT (n = 126) | 1 year (3 months tx, further 9 months follow-up) | Leakage (mean change from baseline)  | Episodes/week: -8.2 (15) vs -7.4 (14.3), <i>P</i> < 0.001 vs baseline (-57 vs -47%)<br><br>Nocturnal loss/month -14.7 (20) vs -15.5 (18.2), <i>P</i> < 0.01 vs baseline (-72 vs -88%) | Funding: Ziekenfondsraad.<br>Grp PFMT had 9× 2 h sessions, 8–10 pts per grp.<br>Individual PFMT had 11× 30 min sessions.<br>The same PFMT was taught; 5×/day at home, increasing in number and duration each time. Later aim was to exercise twice daily during 'waiting' moments.<br>Not reported whether assessment of PFM contraction undertaken at baseline. |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | Severity of incontinence             | 14% vs 22% dry<br>44% vs 42% mild<br>37% vs 29% moderate<br>5% vs 7% severe, <i>P</i> = NS  |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | Self-perceived change of urine loss  | 78% vs 85% improved vs baseline   | 5% had prior bladder training and 52% prior PFMT.  |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | Compliance                           | Proportions reporting exercising during and after tx period not sig. different between grps   | No sig. differences between grps in any outcome.<br>No sig. differences between those who withdrew and those who completed study.  |
| Demain 2001 <sup>243</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 44 randomised, 39 analysed                        | F ≥ 18 years (range 18–75); duration of symptoms range 1–540 months<br><br>Exclusions: pregnancy, pelvic surgery < 3 months, history of pelvic malignancy, UTI, previous physio for UI (< 12 months) | Group PFMT (n = 20)  | Individual PFMT (n = 19)  | 12–14 weeks                                      | Pad test (loss, g)*                  | Median change in grp vs individual; -1.7 vs -1.2, <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: West Midlands NHS Exec Research Initiative Small Projects Scheme.   |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | IIQ score (range 0–100)*             | Median change -14.3 vs -7.1, <i>P</i> = NS  | Pelvic floor contraction taught using digital vaginal examination. All underwent bladder training (delayed voiding) and a standardised PFE programme (initially 5 slow, 5 fast contractions, 10×/day, repeated to fatigue).  |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | VAS score (100 mm)*                  | Mean change -18.7 vs -15.4, <i>P</i> = NS   |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | Symptom Severity Index score (0–20)* | Median change -3 vs -1, <i>P</i> = NS   |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |                      |                           |  | Max. frequency/day*                  | Mean (SD) 3.2 (2.5) vs 3.0 (2.2), <i>P</i> = NS   |  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---|----------------------|---|---|---|
|                            |                   |  |   |  |   |                      | Mean frequency/day* (SD)  | 2.0 (1.7) vs 2.5 (1.9), <i>P</i> = NS                   | Group PFMT: 4–12 women, 3×1 h sessions. Individual PFMT: 1× 45 min appointment. ICS standardised pad test used. Study conducted in community physio unit (UK). No baseline data therefore unable to report % change. Authors comment that there were 'some minor differences in outcome measurements between the two arms at baseline but there were considered small and unlikely to confound interpretation of outcomes'. |
|                            |                   |  |   |  |   |                      | Leakage episodes/week*  | Median change -4.5 vs -4.0, <i>P</i> = NS               |   |
| Ewings 2005 <sup>239</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 234 (190 [81%] of whom returned questionnaire) | F at 'relatively high-risk' of developing UI; scored at least 9 on Sandwell incontinence following childbirth risk assessment tool (SIFCRAT) and/or had already experienced incontinence<br><br>Recruited from those giving birth at Taunton and Somerset Hospital over 19 week period from Nov 1991 to March 2002<br><br>38% vs 36% were primiparous; 65% vs 62% had UI before and/or during current pregnancy | One-to-one instruction on PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 117; 90 followed up)<br><br>[114 received one-to-one; 21 attended 1st grp class, 5 attended 2nd) | Standard care* ( <i>n</i> = 117; 100 followed up) | 6 months post-partum | BFLUTS questionnaire; specifically the q whether the woman experiences any loss of urine during coughing, sneezing, or exercising | 60% vs 47% (RR 1.28, 95% CI 0.98 to 1.67) <i>P</i> = NS | Funding: NHS RandD Project Grant Scheme. RCT nested within a cohort study of risk factors for UI in pregnant women. *verbal promotion of PF exercises, with a leaflet of explanation.<br><br>One-to-one grp had instruction on pelvic floor function and exercises from a physio while still in hospital, and invited to attend PF exercise class on 2 occasions, 2 and 4 months after delivery.                            |

## PFMT and drug treatment

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                      | Comparison                                 | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Ishiko 2001 <sup>244</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 73<br>randomised,<br>66 analysed    | Postmenopausal F (54–75 years), stress UI   | PFMT +<br>estriol<br>1 mg/day<br>( <i>n</i> = 32) | PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 34)                   | 2 years tx          | Cure rate (zero score on 15 point UI questionnaire [Gaudenz 1979])  | 78% vs 68%, <i>P</i> < 0.001   | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT 15 mins/day, videotape given.<br>7 withdrew (6 from choice, 1 hepatic adverse event; data not given by treatment group).  |
| Millard 2004 <sup>245</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 480<br>randomised<br>(75%<br>women) | M/F mean age 53 years (18–90), with frequency (≥ 8 voids/24 h) urgency and urge UI (≥ 1 episode/24 h) for ≥ 6 months<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, 'significant' postvoid residual volume, neuropathy, glaucoma, UTI, positive urine cytology, use of anticholinergic tx past 2 weeks | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. + PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 227) | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d.<br>( <i>n</i> = 253) | 24 weeks tx         | Urge UI episodes/24 h<br>Frequency/24 h<br>Urgency episodes/24 h<br>Volume voided (mean, ml)<br>Self-reported improvement<br>Adverse effects* | -64 vs -70%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>-23 vs -27%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>-79 vs -83%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>+18% vs 15%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>82% vs 86%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Dry mouth 30% (both grps)<br>headache 6%<br>constipation 5%<br>nausea 3%<br>dry eyes 3%<br>dizziness 2% | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>PFMT: 10 s contraction, 10 s rest; 50 contractions/day, incr. to 75.<br>3.3% had tolterodine dose reduced to 1 mg b.d.<br>Pts not permitted to undertake bladder training or other exercise programmes.<br>All changes in outcomes sig. from baseline in both grps.<br>*other than dry mouth, only overall incidence reported. |

## Weighted vaginal cones

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures            | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Arvonen 2001 <sup>246</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 40<br>randomised,<br>37 completed<br>and analysed | F aged 25–65, stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: cysto/rectocele, prolapse, UTI, 'altered vaginal tissue', medication affecting | Weighted vaginal cones ('balls')<br>( <i>n</i> = 18) | PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 19) | 4 months            | Stress pad test (g leakage) | Sig. greater reduction in median for vaginal cones vs PFMT: from 30 to 1 (range 0–100) vs 10 to 5 (range 0–90)* <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>Cure ( <i>n</i> ) 9 vs 5 (50% vs 26%) | Funding: Ipex Medical AB.<br>[EL = 1–] analysis for completers only. *G leakage in balls grp 2–170 vs 3–80 in PFMT grp at baseline<br>Both grps undertook training at home, with 3 clinic visits. Ability to |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                    | Comparison    | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                       | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                           |                   |                 | the urinary tract or kidneys   |                                 |               |                     | Muscle strength (vaginal palpation, 0–5 ordinal scale) | No sig. change in either grp, no sig. difference between grps                           | contract PFM checked at baseline. Vaginal balls: 50 and 65 g weights used for 2 months, then 80 and 100 g. Maximal standing contractions with higher weight, 10 contractions 2×/day. Submaximal contractions with lower weight, 15 min 1×/day.   |
|                           |                   |                 |  |                                 |               |                     | Subjective assessment                                  | Cure 22% vs 0% improved 39% vs 58% unchanged 28% vs 32% worse 11% vs 11%                | PFMT: 20 maximal contractions 2×/day; 15 submaximal 1×/day.  |
| Cammu 1998 <sup>247</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 60              | F mean age 56 years, genuine stress UI (mean ~14 leakage episodes/week)<br><br>Exclusions: genital prolapse, in the post-partum period, DO, outflow obstruction, intrinsic urethral sphincter deficiency | Weighted vaginal cones (n = 30) | PFMT (n = 30) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)                    | -36 vs -61%, <i>P</i> = NS between groups   | Funding: none declared.<br>Ability to contract PFM checked at baseline. Perineometer used to teach contraction at clinic visits.<br>WVC: seen every 2 weeks. Set of 5 (20–70 g); start with heaviest able to retain, and hold for 15 min 2×/day during daily routine. Increase weight when comfortable with the last weight. |
|                           |                   |                 |  |                                 |               |                     | Subjective improvement (100 mm VAS)                    | Severity: 44% vs 45%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Psychological distress 43% vs 61%, <i>P</i> = NS |  |
|                           |                   |                 |  |                                 |               |                     | Subjective cure or improvement                         | 57% vs 53%, <i>P</i> = NS   | PFMT: weekly 30 min private training session with a physio. Individually tailored training schedule and the Knack.   |
|                           |                   |                 |  |                                 |               |                     | Cure (negative stress test)                            | 40% vs 40%, <i>P</i> = NS   | 14 withdrew from WVC grp at 1st follow-up visit, reasons: unpleasant feeling (5), time consuming (3), unable to introduce cone (2), interference with menstrual cycle (2), muscle fatigue (2). Withdrawals remained in cone grp but received PFMT (ITT analysis).  |



| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients                           | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                               | Comparison                                 | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Laycock 1993 <sup>248</sup><br>(2 RCT reports) | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 46 randomised (40 completed and analysed) | F mean age ~40 years, urodynamic stress UI<br>Exclusions: previous physio for stress UI, pregnancy, neurological dysfunction, pace-maker, pelvic malignancy (past or present) | PFMT + cones<br>( <i>n</i> = 17)           | Electrical stimulation<br>( <i>n</i> = 23) | 6 weeks PFMT, unclear for ES<br>2 years follow-up of completers ( <i>n</i> = 19 responded, 15 ES, 4 PFMT + cones)* | Subjective assessment                               | Cure 12% vs 4%<br>Improved 29% vs 57%<br>No change 53% vs 39%<br>(*2 years: 30% of ES grp maintained cure/improvement, no data for PFMT + cone grp) | Funding: Action Research. Nomeq supplied electrical stimulation equipment.<br>ES: interferential therapy via Endomed 433, bipolar electrode, mean 10 tx sessions, first 15 min, subsequent 30 min (10 min each of 1 Hz, 10–40 Hz [sweep], 40 Hz), frequency not stated. Pts agreed not to practice PFM exercises.<br>PFMT: physio gave individual instruction following digital palpation of pelvic floor; 5 max. voluntary contractions every h during the day; cones supplied at 2nd visit; exercised with 'appropriate' cone for 10 min 2×/day for 6 weeks.<br>[EL = 1–] analysis for completers only. Unclear duration of ES tx. |
|  |                   |   |   |  |  |  | Pad test (provocative)                              | Cure 18% vs 4%<br>Improved 41% vs 39%<br>No change 29% vs 35%<br>Worse 6% vs 9%<br><i>P</i> = 0.003 for changes in both grps vs baseline            |  |
|  |                   |   |   |  |  |  | PFM strength (digital palpation, 0–5 ordinal scale) | Increased in ES grp vs baseline <i>P</i> = 0.0035   |  |
|  |                   |   |   |  |  |  | Frequency of wetting or voiding                     | Improvements in both grps vs baseline<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.02, no sig. difference between grps   |  |
|  |                   | 30 randomised (26 completed)              | F mean age 45 years (16–66)   | Electrical stimulation (ES, <i>n</i> = 15) | Sham ES ( <i>n</i> = 11)                   | Duration of tx unclear (10 tx sessions)<br>follow-up of ES grp after 16 months*                                    | Subjective assessment                               | Cure 0<br>Improved 33% vs 27%<br>No change 60% vs 18%<br>Worse 7% vs 55%<br>(*20% sustained improvement at 16 months)                               | Funding: Action Research. Nomeq supplied electrical stimulation equipment.<br>ES: interferential therapy via Endomed 433, bipolar electrode, mean 10 tx sessions, first 15 min, subsequent 30 min (10 min each of 1 Hz, 10–40 Hz [sweep], 40 Hz), frequency not stated. Pts agreed not to practice PFM exercises.<br>Sham ES: no current applied (device modified by supplier).<br>PFM assessed by perineometry before and after tx.   |
|  |                   |   |   |  |  |  | Pad test (provocative)                              | Cure 13 vs 0<br>Improved 60% vs 46%<br>No change 7% vs 1%<br>Worse 7% vs 36%<br>(overall reduction 66% vs 28%, <i>P</i> = 0.009)                    |  |
|  |                   |   |   |  |  |  | PFM strength (mmHg)                                 | +5.4 ( <i>P</i> = 0.02 vs baseline) vs +0.9   |  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                               | Comparison                                    | Length of follow-up               | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                             |                   |  |   |  |   |                                   | Frequency of wetting or voiding  | no sig. difference in wetting in either grp voiding: -2 ( $P = 0.004$ vs baseline) vs -1   |  |
| Laycock 2001 <sup>249</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 101  | F 20-64 years, stress UI (mean ~2 leakage episodes/day)<br>Exclusions: medication affecting the urinary tract, on HRT for < 3 months, neurological conditions, moderate/severe urge UI or prolapse, UTI | Weighted vaginal cones ( $n = 41$ )        | Biofeedback ( $n = 40$ )<br>PFMT ( $n = 20$ ) | 3 months tx                       | Leakage episodes/day (mean change)<br><br>PFM muscle strength (cmH <sub>2</sub> O, mean change)<br><br>KHQ (mean change) | -48 vs -27 vs -73%,<br>$P = NS$ between grps<br><br>+56 vs +63 vs +38%,<br>$P = NS$<br><br>+22 vs +21 vs +36%,<br>$P = NS$   | Funding: SSL-International (UK) and Cardio Design (Australia).<br>Clinic visits 6× during the study.<br>WVC: instruction to retain cone for 2 min whilst walking around, and when coughing/jumping. When both manoeuvres repeated 10×, further weights added (throughout tx period). Used 10 min/day. Written instructions provided. Weights available not stated.<br>PFMT: individualised programme developed after digital assessment; 10 min/day. Written instructions given.<br>BF: perineometry (PFX), vaginal probe, individualised programme developed after digital assessment; 10 min/day.<br>73% vs 55% vs 80% completed the study.<br>[EL = 1-] No baseline data other than for outcomes measured, unclear whether ITT analysis used. |
| Olah 1990 <sup>250</sup>    | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 69 randomised, 60 received tx 54 completed 4 weeks tx (69 analysed as randomised); | F 24-73 years, stress UI<br>Exclusions: PFMT within 6 months  | Weighted vaginal cones + PFMT ( $n = 33$ ) | Electrical stimulation +PFMT ( $n = 36$ )     | 4 weeks tx, follow-up to 6 months | Subjective assessment  | Cure: 12% vs 11% (4 weeks), 30% vs 33% (6 months)<br>Improvement: 45% vs 64% (4 weeks), 21% vs 42% (6 months)<br>Unchanged: 12% vs 8% (4 weeks), 3% vs 3% (6 months) | Funding: none declared.<br>All pts given PFMT (no details).<br>WVC: physio supervision 1×/week. 9 cones of 20-100 g weight; pts asked to train PFM while retaining heaviest cone possible, 2×/day for 15 min; increase weight when able to retain current cone.<br>ES: interferential therapy at clinic  |

| Study                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients         | Patient characteristics                    | Intervention                      | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                         |                   | 47 assessed at 6 months |  |                                   |  |                     | 1 h pad test (mean change, g)   | -49 vs -68% (4 weeks)<br>-90 vs -70% (6 months)   | 3×/week for 15 min; 4 electrodes (2 abdomen, 2 thighs), 0–100 Hz, intensity according to tolerability.<br>9 excluded after randomisation, at initial assessment, because: vagina too narrow for cones (7), discomfort (1 ES), irregular bleeding prevented use (1 WVC).   |
|                         |                   |                         |  |                                   |  |                     | Mean weight of cone held  | Passively: 44 ± 23 g vs 44 ± 26 g (4 weeks), 36 ± 25 g vs 37 ± 25 g (6 months)<br>Actively: 65 ± 24 g vs 56 ± 27 g (4 weeks), 54 ± 33 g vs 52 ± 27 g (6 months) |   |
| Seo 2004 <sup>251</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 120                     | Women with stress UI, mean 42.7–44.5 years | Vaginal cone (with PFMT) (n = 60) | Functional electrical stimulation biofeedback (n = 60) | 6 weeks             | Pad test (units unclear, mean change)<br>MUCP (mmH <sub>2</sub> O, mean change)<br>Maximal vaginal pressure (mmHg, mean change)<br>Duration of PFM contraction (s, mean change) | -2.8 vs -2.2* (-43% vs 39%), P = NS<br>+16.0 vs +14.4* (26% vs 23%), P = NS<br>+4.2 vs +15.9* (18% vs 89%), P = NS<br>+3.8 vs +5.3* (69% vs 109%) P = NS        | Funding: none declared.<br>Cones: dumbbell shaped, weight 150 gram. PFMT consisted of 5 s contraction, 10 s relaxation, cycle repeated 3–5 times for at least 5 min, ≥ once daily.<br>FESB grp: 2× 20 min sessions/week, alternating FES and biofeedback. FES applies simultaneous electrical stimulation of 35 Hz and 50 Hz for 24 s, cycle repeated every 20 min. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                      | Comparison               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |                          |                     | Subjective measures of UI (Daytime freq, episodes and qty leakage, difficulty exercising, sex life, daily life, avoiding places, personal relationships, QOL) | 88% vs 92% 'improved' from baseline<br>Scores for all parameters fell in both grps; no sig. differences between grps in improvements in any parameter  |   |
| Pieber 1995 <sup>252</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 46              | Women pre-menopausal (mean age 43 years), grade 1–2 stress UI<br>Exclusions: grade 3 stress UI, previous continence surgery, pelvic relaxation > grade 2, DO | Weighted vaginal cones + PTMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 21) | PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 25) | 12 weeks tx         | Subjective assessment (all pts)<br><br>Urodynamics ( <i>n</i> = 27, who attended urodynamics follow-up)   | Cure 5 (24%) vs 3 (12%)<br>Improved 6 (29%) vs 9 (36%)<br>No between-grp analysis reported<br><br>No sig. difference between groups in any parameter (MUCP, pressure transmission ratio; all values increased) | Funding: none declared.<br>Ability to contract PFM checked by vaginal palpation at baseline.<br>WVC: set of 5 (20–70 g); start with heaviest able to retain, and hold for 15 min/day during daily routine.<br>Increase weight when comfortable with the last weight.<br>PFMT: physio instructed 'correct' PFMT and lifting techniques. Target 100 contractions/day, and the Knack. Individual exercise plan developed for each patient.<br>Pts visited physios every 2–4 weeks. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Comparison                      | Length of follow-up            | Outcome measures      | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| Delneri 2000 <sup>253</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 20              | Women mean age 50 years (29–81), genuine stress UI<br>Exclusions: DO, inversion of perineal command, absent pubococcygeal contraction, neurological disease | Weighted vaginal cones (n = 10) | Electrical stimulation (n = 10) | 4 weeks tx (cones), ES 16 days | UPP, MUCP<br>Pad test | No significant differences between groups reported (end of tx values) | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] No baseline data for outcomes measured, and limited reporting of methods. 2 from cone grp refused urodynamic follow-up.<br>WVC: set of 5 (20–70 g); women taught exercises with cones in place, training with heaviest cone able to retain 20–25 min/day<br>ES: 12 sessions; 15 min at 20 Hz, 15 at 50 Hz; 4 s pulse, 8 s rest.<br>PFM and subjective assessment (VAS) also conducted but methods and units not reported |

*PFMT with biofeedback*

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                | Comparison    | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Berghmans 1996 <sup>254</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 40              | Women, aged 18–70 years, urodynamic stress UI (mild-moderate [grade 1–2])<br>Exclusions: pronounced lesions of pudendal nerve, neurogenic bladder, urological or gynaecological surgery, pacemaker | PFMT + biofeedback (n = 20) | PFMT (n = 20) | 4 weeks tx          | 48 h pad test (mean change, g)<br><br>Cured/improved/worse (n)<br><br>Leakage episodes/week | –57 vs –54%,<br>P = NS<br><br>3/14/3 vs 5/14/1<br><br>No numerical data | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: anatomy and function of pelvic floor, vaginal palpation every week, 12 'treatment sessions' 3×/week in standing, crawling, side position, 25–35 min; home practice 3×/day. Duration of contractions 3–30 s, repeated 10–30 times. PFMT combined with coughing, climbing stairs, lifting, jumping, completed the program.<br>Biofeedback: vaginal probe attached to portable EMG. Contract-relax period, number of cycles, and tx time varied for treatments 1–12; sensitivity and threshold individualised to pts.<br>4 pts in biofeedback grp vs 0 had previous tx with medication and /or physical therapies |

| Study                         | Study type and EL          | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                | Comparison    | Length of follow-up               | Outcome measures  | Effect size                                      | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Castleden 1984 <sup>255</sup> | RCT, cross-over<br>EL = 1- | 19                          | Women, mean age 55 years (23-85), stress UI   | PFMT + biofeedback (n = 19) | PFMT (n = 19) | 4 weeks tx (2x2 week periods)     | VAS score at 4 weeks (scale not described)  | +23.9 (0, +79) vs +6.7 (-32, +26)                | Funding: Kingsdown medical supplied perineometer.<br>PFMT: 4-5 contractions every hour and interrupted micturition. Perineometer with vaginal catheter used at least 1x/day.<br>[EL = 1-] Limited information, especially re units for results.<br>No baseline data therefore unable to report % changes for outcomes.   |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Perineometer readings at 4 weeks (units not given)  | +2.0 (-3, +6) vs +1.5 (-1, +6)                   |  |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Change in symptoms (n)  | Cure 14/19; worse 1/19 at 4 weeks                |  |
| Glavind 1996 <sup>256</sup>   | RCT<br>EL = 1+             | 40 randomised, 34 completed | Women, mean age, genuine stress UI<br>Exclusions: DO, previous UI surgery                     | PFMT + biofeedback (n = 19) | PFMT (n = 15) | 4 weeks tx, follow-up at 3 months | 1 h pad test  | -88.4% (95% CI -78%, -94%) vs -54% (-2.1%, -78%) | Funding: none declared.<br>Pts ability to contract PFM assessed by digital palpation.<br>PFMT: 2-3 individual instruction; held contractions for 5-10 s, in supine, sitting, standing positions. Home exercise daily at least 3x/day and as often as possible.<br>Biofeedback: Dantec 21L20, 4 sessions 1x/week, vaginal electrode and rectal catheter.          |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Objective cure (unclear whether measured by pad test)   | 58% vs 20%, P = NS                               |  |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Subjective assessment   | Cure: 26% vs 0%<br>Improvement 42% vs 29%        |  |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Acceptability of tx   | 75% vs 52%                                       |  |
| Sherman 1997 <sup>257</sup>   | RCT<br>EL = 1+             | 39                          | Women (active female duty soldiers), mean age 33 years, urodynamic UI (77% stress; 23% mixed) | PFMT + biofeedback (n = 23) | PFMT (n = 16) | 8 weeks tx                        | Subjective assessment of time between voids, degree of urgency, ability to stop urine stream, activity level, volume per void, severity | No sig. differences in changes between grps      | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: initial educational session, exercises 10-10 contract-rest cycle x5, home practice 20 min 2x/day. Pts put on bladder training schedules and taught urge control to use 'when applicable'.<br>Pelvic examination at baseline to assess pelvic support and muscle tone.<br>Biofeedback: J&J Biofeedback system (EMG), vaginal and |
|                               |                            |                             |   |                             |               |                                   | Leakage episodes /day (mean change)   | -61 vs -67%, P = NS                              |  |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison                              | Length of follow-up                      | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | Voids/night   | -60 vs -79%,<br><i>P</i> = NS  | abdominal electrodes.<br>Biofeedback home trainers given to people during the first week of tx.   |
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | Urodynamic parameters   | No sig. differences between grps in changes in bladder capacity, MUCP, detrusor contraction pressure | Withdrawals: 1 BF grp, 5 PFMT grp: 'no difference' between those who withdrew vs continued, or in pad test results at 1st assessment.   |
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | PFM maximal muscle contraction  | No sig. difference between grps  |   |
| Shepherd 1983 <sup>258</sup>                      | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 22   | Women, mean age 48 years, urodynamic stress UI  | PFMT + biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 11) | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 11)                   | 6 weeks treatment, follow-up at 18 weeks | Self-reported cure  | 8/11 vs 3/11 (73% vs 27%)  | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: weekly clinic visits, home exercise program. No further information.   |
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | Self-reported cure or improvement                                       | 10/11 vs 6/11 (91% vs 55%)   | Biofeedback: intravaginal exercises connected to visual biofeedback.<br>[EL = 1-] Insufficient information regarding the interventions.   |
| Aukee 2002 <sup>259</sup> and 2004 <sup>260</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 35 randomise d* (31 attended 1 year follow-up) at 1 year | Women, mean ~51 years (21-70), with urodynamic stress UI; no previous surgery for UI; abdominal leak point pressure > 90<br>Exclusions: genital prolapse beyond hymen, pregnancy, severe concomitant diseases | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 15)               | PFMT + EMG biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 15) | 3 months tx, 1 year follow-up            | PFM activity, $\mu$ V (supine and standing) at 3 months                 | Increases in both grps from baseline, <i>P</i> < 0.001, PFMT + EMG vs PFMT <i>P</i> = 0.024          | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: 5 sessions (weeks 0, 1, 4, 8-12), and practised at home (20 min/day 5x/week). Mean no. training days at home was 56.2 (range 21-87).   |
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | 24 h pad test at 3 months (adjusted for differences in baseline values) | -18.1 g vs -17.3 g from baseline, <i>P</i> = NS  | Home biofeedback grp given FemiScan device, containing a training programme and sound processor for verbal instructions. Mean no. training days at home was 68 (range 9-130); mean 47.5 days (range 6-93) without the device. |
|   |                   |  |   |                                     |   |  | Leakage index# at 3 months (adjusted)                                   | -2.1 vs -8.8 from baseline, <i>P</i> = NS  |   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention          | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                               | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
|                              |                   |                                    |   |                       |   |   | Adverse effects at 3 months                             | 3 vs 2 pts reported pain while training.<br>2 pts from PFMT + EMG grp did not use EMG (found vaginal probe uncomfortable).                                  | After 3 month tx period, pts advised to continue PFMT on own initiative.<br>#leakage index contains 13 types of physical exertions that trigger UI in women with SUI (1 never, 5 always), measured on ordinal scale of 1–5.  |
|                              |                   |                                    |   |                       |   |   | % had surgery for UI at 1 year                          | PFMT vs PFMT + EMG:<br>9/19 vs 5/16,<br>(47% vs 31%)<br><i>P</i> = NS   | *Discrepancy in pt numbers between Aukee 2002 (first 30 pts) and 2004 (final number, 35).  |
| Pages 2001 <sup>261</sup>    | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 51<br>randomised<br>40<br>analysed | Women, mean age 51 years (27–80), mild-moderate SUI<br>Exclusions: significant medical illness; drugs influencing bladder control and functioning | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 27) | PFMT + biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 13)   | 3 months (1 month tx, 2 further months follow-up) | Frequency   | From baseline (no between grp comparisons):<br>Daytime reduced in PFMT grp; night reduced in both grps, <i>P</i> < 0.01                                     | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] 11 (46%) from biofeedback grp excluded after randomisation owing to concurrent illness or decision to withdraw.<br>Physical therapy consisted of group therapy 5×/week for 60 min, plus initial educational session about PFM and incontinence. Also encouraged to do ~100 contractions at home/day.<br>BF grp had introductory session then individual therapy for 15 min 5×/week (Gemini 2000 TM apparatus).<br>*PFM contraction assessed by investigator, and by speculum and manometric measurements. |
|                              |                   |                                    |   |                       |   |   | Cure (no incontinence)                                  | 69% vs 62%  |  |
|                              |                   |                                    |   |                       |   |   | PFM contraction*  | Both grps increased strength of voluntary contraction and cough-induced contraction, and improvement in closure of introitus, <i>P</i> < 0.05 from baseline |  |
|                              |                   |                                    |   |                       |   |   | Adverse effects   | None  |  |
| Sung 2000 <sup>262,263</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 90                                 | Women ≥ 18 years, stress UI   | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 30) | PFMT + electrical stimulation biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 30)<br>Control (no tx, | 6 weeks   | Leakage episodes (mean [SD] whether in no per day/week) | –0.2 (0.5) vs –1.0 (1.2) vs 0 (0.7), [–37 vs –9% vs 0%]<br><i>P</i> < 0.001 ES grp vs others  | Funding: Hallym Academy of Science (Korea).<br>[EL = 1–]; unclear whether randomisation refers to patient selection into the study, or   |



| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     | <i>n</i> = 30)        |                     | Quantity of leakage (units and method of measurement not stated) | -0.2 (0.4) vs -0.7 (0.8) vs 0 (0.4), [-9 vs -28% vs 0%]<br><i>P</i> < 0.001 ES grp vs others   | allocation of treatment.<br>PFMT: Physio instruction, home training following instructions on videotape.                |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | BFLUTS   | No between-grp comparisons.<br>Improvements in ES grp in difficulties in daily lives, fluid restriction, physical activities, personal relations, <i>P</i> < 0.001 vs baseline | Electrical stimulation given alternately with biofeedback (Elite compact device): 2×20 min/week; ES 24 s, 35 and 50 Hz. |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | Peak PFM pressure (perineometer, mean [SD] change, mmHg)         | +1.0 (2.4) vs +6.2 (4.9) vs -4.5 (6.2), [+3 vs +18 vs -12%] <i>P</i> < 0.001 active grps vs control  |   |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | PFM duration of contraction (s), mean change (SD)                | +0.6 (0.6) vs +0.7 (1.2) vs -0.1 (0.6), [40 vs 44 vs -6%] <i>P</i> < 0.001 ES grp vs others  |   |
| Morkved 2002 <sup>264</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 103 randomised, 94 analysed | Women (mean age ~47), urodynamic stress UI (24 also had urge UI)<br><br>Exclusions: involuntary detrusor contractions, residual urine > 50 ml, previous surgery for stress UI, UTI, use of | PFMT + Biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 53) | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 50) | 6 months            | Objective cure*  | 58% vs 46%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: Norwegian industrial and regional development fund,  |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | Subjective cure  | 40% vs 30%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Norwegian national insurance administration, Trondheim regional hospital.   |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | Cure (48 h pad test)   | 65% vs 57%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   | PFMT individualised (1/week 4 months, every 2 weeks 2 months). Home training; 10 high intensity contractions/day.       |
|                             |                   |                             |  |                                     |                       |                     | Mean PFM strength, cmH <sub>2</sub> O (vaginal balloon catheter) | At 6 months 12.3 (95% CI 9.5 to 15.1) vs 11.1 (8.1, 14.1), <i>P</i> = NS   | BF using BF-106 device,   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients               | Patient characteristics   | Intervention          | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                           |                   |                               | concomitant txs, other diseases, neurological or psychiatric disease  |                       |  |                     | Mean Social activity index score <sup>#</sup>   | At 6 months 0.4 (95% CI -0.1 to 0.6) vs 0.3 (0.0, 0.5), <i>P</i> = NS  | vaginal probe, individualised for each pt.<br>*≤ 2 g leakage on provocative pad test with standardised bladder volume 300 ml saline.<br><sup>#</sup> 9 social settings, scale 0–10 impossible-possible to participate.  |
| Wang 2004 <sup>265</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 120 randomised, 103 completed | Women 16–75 years, OAB > 6 months, frequency ≥ 8×/day, urge UI ≥ 1×/day, no other conservative tx<br><br>Exclusions: pregnancy, concurrent medical conditions, genital prolapse > stage II, residual urine > 100 ml | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 40) | Biofeedback+PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 38)<br>Electrical stimulation ( <i>n</i> = 42) | 12 weeks            | Self-reported improvement or cure of urge UI<br>Self-reported cure of urge UI<br>PFM parameters (mean change)*<br><br>QOL (King's Health Q), mean changes (SD) in total score | 38 vs 50% vs 51%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>30 vs 38% vs 40%<br>Power: -2 vs -2.5 vs 0<br>Time of fast contraction: -5.8 vs -6.2 vs -3.0<br>Vaginal pressure: -36.0 vs -38.4 vs -8.9<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.012 for all comparisons of PFMT or BF +PFMT vs ES<br>50.3 ± 171.4 vs 185.9 ± 176.6 vs 180.1 ± 176.0, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.004 for PFMT vs other groups | Funding: National Science Council.<br>PFM strength measured by 1 finger palpation (Oxford grading method), and vaginal pressured measured using balloon probe.<br>PFMT; at home, PERFECT scheme, 3×/day.<br>ES: Intravaginal electrode, biphasic pulsed current, freq 10 Hz, pulse width 400 μs, 10 s on, 5 s off, intensity 20–63 mA or 40–72 mA, 20 mins/session, twice/week.<br>Duration of compliance with home programme; median 14.5 (0–44) days PFMT, 8.5 (0–44) days BF+PFMT.<br>Baseline differences in gravidity, parity and menopausal status (BF+PFMT vs ES); leakage episodes/day 0.86 PFMT vs 0.92 BF+PFMT vs 2.09 ES.<br>*Power using Oxford grading system (0–5), vaginal pressure using balloon probe. |
| Aksac 2003 <sup>266</sup> | RCT               | 50                            | Postmenopausal women taking HRT,  | PFMT + biofeedback    | PFMT + palpation ( <i>n</i> = 20)  | 8 weeks             | 1 h pad tests   | -94% vs -89% vs +3%  | Funding: none declared.<br>BF: Myomed-932 device  |

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                               | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                          | EL = 1+           |                 | urodynamic stress UI   | ( <i>n</i> = 20)  | Control (HRT only<br><i>n</i> = 10)                |                     | Perineometry (mean change, cmH <sub>2</sub> O) | +30.9 vs +17.2 vs +1.3 (162 vs 85% vs 7%)<br>(actual values 50 ± 11.5 PFMT+BF vs 37.5 ± 8.7 PFMT + palpation, <i>P</i> < 0.001) | vaginal probe in EMG pressure mode; 20 min, 40 cycles of 10 s activity and 20 s relaxation, 3×/week.<br>Digital palpation: 5 s contraction, 10 s relaxation, 10×, 3×/day.<br>HRT: estradiol 2 mg + norethisterone 1 mg/day.  |
|                          |                   |                 |  |   |  |                     | PFM strength digital palpation†                | +1.6 vs +1.3 vs 0   | †scale 0 to 5 where 0 = no contraction, 1 = minimal  |
|                          |                   |                 |  |   |  |                     | Incontinence frequency* (change in mean score) | +1.3 vs +1.2 vs +0.3  | lasting < 1 s, 2 = weak contractions lasting 1–3 s, 3 = fingers of therapist elevated, contraction lasts 4–6 s, and can be repeated 3×, 4 = as 3 but contraction lasts 7–9 s, 5 = as 4 but lasts ≥ 9 s and pt able to repeat 4×.<br>*Scale of 1–4, 1 = once/day, 2 > 1/week, 3 < 1/week, 4 = 1/month.<br>(All parameters improved from baseline in both PFMT grps, and vs control grp <i>P</i> < 0.001. No sig. changes in control grp). |
| Wong 2001 <sup>267</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 38              | Women, 30–62 years, urodynamic stress UI<br>Exclusions: 2nd/3rd degree uterine prolapse, previous failure of PFMT, previous surgery for UI, neurological pathology | PFMT + biofeedback (PF and abdominal muscles)<br>( <i>n</i> = 19) | PFMT +biofeedback (PF muscles)<br>( <i>n</i> = 19) | 4 weeks             | Leakage episodes/week                          | –2.0 vs –5.0, (57% vs 55%)<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: 4× 30 min sessions 2×/week, fast and slow contractions.   |
|                          |                   |                 |  |   |  |                     | Pad test (mean change, g)                      | –8.6 vs +13.9, (69% vs 153%)<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Biofeedback: PRS9300 device.<br>For PFMT + biofeedback (PF and abdominal muscles) group, 1 vaginal probe and 1 attached to abdominal wall; PF muscles group had vaginal probe only).   |
|                          |                   |                 |  |   |  |                     | PFM strength (mean change, cmH <sub>2</sub> O) | +5.4 vs +8.8, (47% vs 68%)<br><i>P</i> = NS   |  |
|                          |                   |                 |  |   |  |                     | PFM endurance (mean change, s)                 | +1.3 vs +0.9, (26% vs 16%)<br><i>P</i> = NS   |  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size                                     | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | IIQ-7            | -4.8 vs -14.3,<br>(25% vs 50%)<br>$P \leq 0.04$ |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | UDI-6            | -8.0 vs -33.3,<br>(22% vs 67%)<br>$P \leq 0.04$ |                     |

*Electrical stimulation therapy vs sham*

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Sand 1995 <sup>268</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 52<br>randomised,<br>44 completed | Women mean age 53 years, urodynamic stress UI, no current UI tx<br><br>Exclusions: DO, ISD, pacemaker, prior PFM stimulation, pelvic implanted devices, UTI, vaginal infections, urinary retention, genital prolapse to introitus | Electrical stimulation (ES) ( $n = 35$ ) | Sham ES ( $n = 17$ ) | 15 weeks            | Leakage (pad test), mean change<br><br>Leakage episodes (diaries), mean change<br><br>QOL (SF-36)<br><br>Self-reported improvement (10 point VAS)<br><br>PFM strength (mmHg), mean change<br><br>Adverse effects | -30 g vs +2.3 g,<br>$P = 0.005$<br><br>Per 24 h: -1.2 vs +0.8, $P = 0.04$<br>Per week: -4.1 vs +6.9, $P = 0.009$<br><br>No sig. difference between grps in changes in scores<br><br>Greater improvement in leakage and stress UI scores in ES grp, $P \leq 0.02$ vs sham<br><br>+4.6 vs -1.1,<br>$P = 0.02$<br><br>Vaginal irritation 14% vs 12%<br>pain 9% vs 6% | Funding: none declared.<br>ES using Innova device; 2-channel stimulation. Pulse duration 0.3 ms, current range 0–100 mA; max. tolerated current used. Sham device had max. output of 1 mA.<br>Device used 2×/day, target 30 min, for 12 weeks.<br>29 (56%) women postmenopausal (17 ES grp, 12 sham), taking HRT or had 'adequate' oestrogen levels. 24 (46%) had previously undergone PFMT.<br>2/7 withdrawals in ES grp owing to vaginal irritation. 1 withdrawal in sham grp. |
| Yamanishi 2000 <sup>269</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 68 (57% women)                    | M/F mean age 70 years (35–87), urge UI<br><br>Exclusions: previous drug tx or PFMT or surgery for UI, POP in women  | Electrical stimulation (ES) ( $n = 37$ ) | Sham ES ( $n = 31$ ) | 4 weeks             | Freq/volume chart<br><br>Cure (freq/vol. chart and cystometry)   | No numerical data.<br>Reductions in nocturia and leakage episodes greater in ES grp, $P \leq 0.03$<br><br>22% vs 4%, $P = 0.03$   | Funding: none declared.<br>ES used square waves with pulse width of 1 ms, freq 10 Hz, max. current 60 mA, 2×/week; vaginal electrode (women). Sham device had no stimulus output.<br>* > 50% reduction in UI frequency or > 50 ml increase in cystometric  |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|----------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Improvement*  | 81% vs 32%,<br>$P = 0.0001$  | capacity<br>Scale used to measure QOL not reported.   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Cystometry  | Bladder capacity at 1st desire to void and max. cystometric capacity incr. in ES vs reduction in sham, $P \leq 0.03$ |   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Adverse effects   | ES: 1 (3%) vaginal pain, 1 faecal incontinence; sham: 2 'disagreeable feeling'                                       |   |
| Luber 1997 <sup>270</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 54 randomised, 44 completed | Women, mean age 54 years, urodynamic stress UI, chose not to have PFMT<br><br>Exclusions: POP $\geq$ grade II, DO, PVR urine > 100 ml, vaginal intraepithelial neoplasia, UTI, ISD | Electrical stimulation (ES) ( $n = 26$ ) | Sham ES ( $n = 28$ ) | 12 weeks            | Subjective improvement or cure*                               | 25% vs 29%, $P = NS$   | Funding: Kaiser Research Foundation.<br>ES: 2x 15 min sessions/day, using Hollister, Evanston IL device. Pulse width 2 ms, freq 50 Hz, 10–100 mA.   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Objective cure#   | 16% vs 13%, $P = NS$   | In sham grp, wiring from stimulator to vaginal probe covertly discontinuous.  |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Valsalva LPP, cmH <sub>2</sub> O (mean change)                | +7.0 vs -4.0, $P = NS$   | *score 3–5 on 1–5 VAS of improvement.   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | PVR volume (cm <sup>3</sup> ) mean change                     | +5.0 vs -2.0, $P = NS$   | #negative urodynamic stress test with full bladder.   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Cystometogram max. volume (cm <sup>3</sup> ) mean change      | +49.0 vs +23.0, $P = NS$   |   |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | UI episodes/24 h, mean change                                 | -0.4 vs -0.3, $P = NS$   |   |
| Jeyaseelan 2000 <sup>271</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 27 randomised, 24 analysed  | Women, Urodynamic stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: neurological conditions, previous ES for UI, prolapse, pregnancy, pacemakers, cardiomyopathy, UTI, pelvic floor surgery < 6 months  | Electrical stimulation (ES) ( $n = 13$ ) | Sham ES ( $n = 14$ ) | 8 weeks             | PFM strength (perineometry, cmH <sub>2</sub> O), mean change  | +88 vs +25%, $P = NS$  | Funding: Manchester University Medical Bequest Fund.<br>ES: by PS1 device, 1 h/day; background low freq (to target slow twitch fibres) and intermediate freq. (to target fast twitch fibres). Sham: 1x250 ms impulse every minute for 60 min. |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | PFM endurance (perineometry, cmH <sub>2</sub> O), mean change | +73% vs -6%,<br>$P = NS$   | 3 withdrew as tx 'too demanding' (2 ES, 1 sham).  |
|                                |                   |                             |  |  |                      |                     | Pad weight (g, median, range)                                 | + 0.5 (-33, +71) vs +0.1 (-15, +61),<br>$P = NS$   |   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison               | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Leakage (median no/week, range)                 | 0 (-5, +4) vs -2 (-4, 0), <i>P</i> = NS                                    |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | IIQ   | -0.3 vs -11%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | UDI   | -31 vs +9%, <i>P</i> = 0.01  |   |
| Brubaker 1997 <sup>272</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 121             | Women aged ≥ 25 years (mean ~57), stress UI (50%), DO (23%), mixed UI (27%)<br>Exclusions: ≤ 3 leakage episodes/week, UTI, inadequate genitourinary oestrogen, PVR > 100 ml, implanted electrical device, GU surgery ≤ 6 months, medication change ≤ 3 months   | Transvaginal electrical stimulation (ES) ( <i>n</i> = 61) | Sham ES ( <i>n</i> = 60) | 10 weeks (8 weeks tx) | Subjective improvement (not defined)            | 35% vs 17%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.027  | Funding: none declared. InCare provided device free.<br>ES: by InCare Microgyn II device; freq 20 Hz, 2–4 s work-rest cycle, pulse width 0.1 ms, 0–100 mA.<br>Sham grp used same device; 1 wire disconnected so no current supplied.<br>QOL reported; measured using 41-point scale modified from cancer-specific tool.<br>Frequency of UI and no. of accidents reported at 6 week only, not at endpoint. |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Urodynamic diagnosis of DO                      | -50% ( <i>P</i> = 0.0004 vs baseline) vs -6% ( <i>P</i> = NS vs baseline). |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Urodynamic diagnosis of stress UI               | No sig. change reported (no numerical data)                                |   |
| Barroso 2004 <sup>273</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 36              | Women, mean age 55 years; stress, mixed or urge UI<br>Exclusions: 1st degree prolapse, intrinsic sphincter deficiency, pacemaker, pregnancy, postmenopausal climacteric phase, UTI, GU surgery < 6 months, previous ES of PFM, drugs affecting voiding function | Transvaginal electrical stimulation (ES) ( <i>n</i> = 24) | Sham ES ( <i>n</i> = 12) | 12 weeks              | Maximum bladder capacity (mean change [SD], ml) | +96.4 (87.2) vs +27.5 (60.2), <i>P</i> = 0.02                              | Funding: two government funds (FAPERGS, FIPE).<br>ES: freq 20–50 Hz (20 for urge/mixed, 50 for stress), pulse width 300 μs, asymmetric biphasic pulses, intensity 0–100 mA, 5–5 s work-rest cycle; used 2×20 mins/day.<br>Sham applied no current.<br>*leakage episodes higher in ES grp at baseline (4.1 vs 3.0, <i>P</i> = 0.03).<br>All results reported as mean change (SD).                          |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | First desire to void (ml)                       | +23.7 (38.0) vs -1.5 (38.9), <i>P</i> = NS                                 |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Frequency/24 h                                  | -3.5 (2.4) vs -1.3 (1.9), <i>P</i> = 0.01                                  |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | No. nocturnal voids/24 h                        | -1.0 (1.3) vs -0.5 (1.0), <i>P</i> = NS                                    |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Leakage episodes/24 h*                          | -2.8 (1.8) vs -0.0 (1.1), <i>P</i> < 0.001                                 |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |   |                          |                       | Episodes of voiding urgency                     | -4.2 (2.6) vs -0.5 (1.2), <i>P</i> < 0.001                                 |   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Berghmans 2002 <sup>275</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 68              | Women > 18 years (range 25–80) with Detrusor Activity Index (DAI) $\geq$ 0.5 (mean 0.85 [SD 0.16])<br><br>Exclusions: mechanical intravesical obstruction, urinary calculus, repetitive UTI, colpitis, pacemaker, pregnancy/lactation, physical therapies in last 3 months, drugs for UI in past 4 weeks, neurogenic UI | Electrical stimulation (clinic and home, $n = 17$ )<br><br>Lower urinary tract exercises (LUTE, $n = 18$ ) | LUTE + clinic ES ( $n = 19$ )<br><br>Control (no tx, $n = 14$ ) | 9–<br>11 weeks      | Change in detrusor activity index (DAI) scores<br><br>Adverse effects<br><br>Change in no. UI accidents (medians)<br><br>Perineometer readings (PFM strength), medians        | ES $-0.28$ (SD 0.33), $P < 0.032$ vs control<br>LUTE $-0.22$ (0.32)<br>LUTE + ES $-0.02$ (0.26)<br>control $-0.06$ (0.19)<br><br>none<br><br>OR 30.00 (95% CI 1.04 to 862.60)<br><br>OR 0.37 (95% CI 0.03 to 4.62) | Funding: none declared.<br><br>LUTE programme consisted of: info about LUT function; bladder retraining (urgency, increasing voiding interval), PFMT, toilet behaviour. 9 training sessions, 1/week.<br><br>ES; EMG, vaginal via plug mounted electrodes, to max. 100 mA. 200 ms pulses (4–10 Hz).<br><br>Study underpowered (target 80 pts). [EL = 1–] After randomisation, computer error meant 12 were excluded owing to not meeting DAI inclusion criteria, probably compromising the randomisation and balancing of groups. No significant differences reported between groups in baseline characteristics, though numerical data show differences in number of hysterectomies, nocturia, and duration of UI. |
| Amaro 2005 <sup>274</sup>     | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 40              | F mean age ~48 (40–79) with mixed UI but predominant urge UI<br><br>None had prior PFMT, bladder training, of antimuscarinic therapy  | Electrical stimulation, 3 $\times$ 20 min per week ( $n = 20$ )  | Sham electrical stimulation ( $n = 20$ )                        | 7 weeks tx          | Urge UI prevalence<br><br>Frequency /24 h (change; unclear whether change in mean)<br><br>PFM strength (perineometry, cmH <sub>2</sub> O); change in mean<br><br>Satisfaction | 15% vs 32% $P = NS$<br><br>$-4.5$ vs $-2.5$ , $P = NS$<br><br>$+14.2$ vs $+4$<br><br>80% vs 65%, $P = NS$  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Groups said to similar at baseline, but limited data presented<br><br>ES = Dualpex Uro 996. at 4 Hz, 2–4 s work-rest cycle and a 100 ms pulse width. Amplitude 0–100 mA, according to pt discomfort on feedback.<br><br>Control grp used same type of wires.  |

## Electrical stimulation and PFMT

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Comparison                                | Length of follow-up                              | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| Hahn 1991 <sup>276</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 20                          | Women, mean age 47 years (34–64), genuine stress UI, consecutively referred for surgery, offered conservative tx while awaiting operation<br>Exclusions: DO   | PFMT*<br>(n = 10)              | Electrical stimulation*<br>(n = 10)       | 6 months tx*<br>follow-up at 4 years<br>(n = 19) | Cure (pad test)<br><br>Self-reported assessment   | 1/10 vs 4/10<br><br>Cured 1 vs 1<br>Insignificant symptoms 5 vs 4<br>Improved 4 vs 3<br>Unchanged 0 vs 2   | Funding: Neurologiskt Handikappades Riksförbundet, and LIC Hygien.<br>PFMT: instruction in pelvic floor anatomy and physiology, submaximal 2–2 s contraction-relax cycle, maximal 5–5 s cycle, 5–10×; endurance training, and during maneuvers that trigger stress UI. Pts self-monitored by vaginal palpation, physio checked PFM strength at every visit (1×/week for 4 weeks then monthly for 5 months).<br>ES: Contrelle device, vaginal electrode, intermittent stimulation with alternating pulses at a repetition frequency of 10, 20, 50 Hz. Used 6–8 h overnight.<br>*women not cured at 6 months with the first tx were offered the other tx (13 women had both txs). |
|                           |                   |                             |   |                                |   | 4 year follow-up                                 |   | 5 had Burch colposuspension (4 owing to inadequate effect of conservative tx, 1 symptom recurrence)<br>4 further improved, 8 unchanged, 2 symptom recurrence |   |
| Smith 1996 <sup>277</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 57 randomised*, 56 analysed | Women aged 24–82 years, urodynamic stress UI (32%), or DO (68%)<br>Exclusions: type 3 stress UI, pregnancy, history of prolonged urinary retention, vaginal vault prolapse, diminished sensory perception, pacemaker, mixed UI as major component | PFMT (n = 9, stress UI)        | Electrical stimulation (n = 9, stress UI) | 4 months tx                                      | Cure/improvement/failure (n)<br>Objective improvement (≥ 50% reduction in no. pads/leakage episodes)<br>Adverse effects | 1/3/5 vs 2/4/3,<br>P = NS<br>44% vs 66%,<br>P = NS<br>2 (22%) vaginal irritation with ES   | Funding: none declared.<br>*Randomisation based on type of UI.<br>PFMT: initial instruction on correct contraction, provided with written information; repeated exercise 60×/day, increasing hold to 10 s, repeated 4–5×.<br>ES: stimulator used 2 programmes simultaneously at 12.5 and 50 Hz. Stress UI pts started with 5 s contraction time (3–15), duty cycle 1–2, increasing time from 15, 30, 35–60 min/day; amplitude 5–10 mA, increasing to max. 80 mA. For pts with DO, same protocol used but amplitude did not exceed 25 mA.  |
|                           |                   |                             |   | Proprantheline 7.5 mg to 45 mg | Electrical stimulation (n = 18, DO)       | 4 months tx                                      | Cure/improvement/failure (n)  | 3/7/10 vs 4/9/5,<br>P = NS   |   |



| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
|                              |                   |                            |   | b.d./t.d.s.<br>(n = 20, DO) |  |   | Objective improvement (≥ 50% reduction in no. pads/leakage episodes, and ≤ 10 fewer voids /24 h)  | 50% vs 72%,<br>P = NS  |  |
| Hofbauer 1990 <sup>278</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 43                         | Women, mean age 58, genuine stress UI   | PFMT<br>(n = 11)            | Electrical stimulation<br>(n = 11)<br>PFMT + ES<br>(n = 11)<br>Sham ES<br>(n = 10) | 6 weeks tx, follow-up 6 months after tx | Self-reported cure<br>Self-reported cure or improvement<br>Urodynamics  | 6/11 (55%) vs 1/11 (9%) vs 3/11 vs 0/10<br>7/11 vs 3/11 vs 7/11 vs 0/10<br>'no significant changes'<br>no numerical data | Funding: none declared.<br>PFMT: included PFMT, abdominal and hip exercises, 2×/week for 20 min with therapist. Home exercise daily.<br>ES: 3×/week for 10 min, for 6 weeks. Lumbar and vaginal electrodes, output increased to noticeable contraction and pt added voluntary effort.<br>Sham ES: as ES, but current so low 'no effect possible'.<br>[EL = 1–] No baseline data (translation).   |
| Spruijt 2003 <sup>279</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 37 randomised, 35 analysed | Women ≥ 65 years with UI (17% stress, 17% urge, 66% mixed), leakage > 10 ml /24 h<br>Exclusions: persistent/recurrent UTI, bladder pathology/dysfunction owing to other conditions, incontinence tx in past 6 months, genital prolapse to/beyond introitus, pacemaker | PFMT<br>(n = 11)            | Electrical stimulation<br>(n = 24)   | 8 weeks                                 | Subjective assessment*<br>Objective improvement (48 h pad test)<br>Improvement in PFM strength (perineometry)<br>DO removed (4 h ambulant urodynamics) (n = 25) | 45% vs 46%,<br>P = NS<br>36% vs 29%,<br>P = NS<br>44% vs 71%,<br>P = NS<br>29% vs 22%,<br>P = NS                         | Funding: grant from Praeventiefonds, Den Haag, Netherlands.<br>Electrical stimulation using Urogyn 8900; biphasic current pulses, 1 ms duration, frequency 50 Hz (stress UI) or 20 Hz (urge UI); intensity increased from 0–100 mA according to tolerability. Maximal electrical stimulation applied for 30 min 3×/week. 3 women had tx at home, others at outpatient clinic.<br>For PFMT, verbal instruction given according to Dutch GP guidelines.<br>*lower PRAFAB score (PRAFAB = protection, amount, frequency, adjustment, body image). |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Knight 1998 <sup>280</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 70 randomised, 57 completed 6 months, 51 completed 12 months | Women aged 24–68 years, urodynamic stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, unstable bladder, unable to perform PFM contraction, pregnancy, breast-feeding, pelvic malignancy, pacemaker, neurological condition, diabetes | PFMT + biofeedback + low intensity ES at home ( <i>n</i> = 19)<br><br>PFMT + biofeedback + maximal intensity ES at clinic ( <i>n</i> = 20) | PFMT + biofeedback ( <i>n</i> = 18)                                    | 6 months tx, follow-up at 12 months* | Self-reported cure or greatly improved (points 4–5 on 1–5 scale)  | 47 vs 80% vs 56% (6 months)<br>44 vs 85% vs 67% (12 months)<br><i>P</i> ≤ 0.04 home vs clinic at 6 and 12 months | Funding: Action Research.<br>PFM assessment carried out at initial consultation. PFMT: individual instruction and programme, up to 6×/day (contractions held for up to 10 s, 4 s rest, up to 10 fast contractions) for 6 months, then 1×/day for further 6 months *(so continued PFMT at lower frequency from months 6–12).<br>Biofeedback by air-filled vaginal probe, used for 1 of 6 daily PFMT sessions.<br>Home ES: DMI Ltd, vaginal electrode, battery-operated unit. 10 Hz, occasional 35 Hz bursts, pulse width 200 μs, 5–5 s on-off.<br>In clinic ES: VSI Neen Healthcare, mains-operated; 16×30 sessions at 35 Hz, pulse width 250 μs.<br>[EL = 1–] Analysis for completers only. Smoking and prior pelvic surgery sig. higher in clinic grp at baseline (smoking: 25% vs 16% home ES, vs 0 control; Pelvic surgery 45% vs 12% control grp). |
|                            |                   |  |   |  |  |                                      | Pad test (median change, g)   | –77 vs –91 vs –91% (6 months)<br>–98 vs –100 vs –100% (12 months)<br><i>P</i> = NS between grps                  |  |
|                            |                   |  |   |  |  |                                      | Objective cure (dry or < 2 g urine loss on pad test)  | 53 vs 80% vs 72% (6 months)<br>81 vs 84% vs 73% (12 months)  |  |
|                            |                   |  |   |  |  |                                      | PFM strength (max. squeeze pressure [cmH <sub>2</sub> O], median change)                                      | 33 vs 64% vs 41% (6 months)<br>47 vs 44% vs 53% (12 months)  |  |
| Lo 2003 <sup>281</sup>     | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 24   | Women ≥ 20 years, stress or urge UI<br><br>Exclusions: UI of other cause, altered mental state, severe disability requiring full assistance for daily living  | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 12)  | Electrical stimulation (Interferential therapy) +PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 12) | 4 weeks                              | Pad test (1 h), change in median value (no units)<br>PFM strength, change in median value<br>Leakage episodes | –2.50 vs –4.50, <i>P</i> = NS<br>+2.38 vs +1.20, <i>P</i> = NS<br>+0.30 vs –1.46, <i>P</i> = 0.006               | Funding: none declared.<br>Baseline pad test mean (SD): 94.1 (16.4) in ES + PFMT grp vs 5.58 (7.73) in PFMT grp; medians 6.0 vs 3.5.<br>Treatment undertaken in hospital, supervised by physio; 3×/week.<br>PFMT: 10 sets ×5 contractions, repeated to 100 contractions. Strength measured   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                  | Comparison                     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |                   |                            |   |   |                                |                     | Nocturia                           | -0.20 vs -0.64, <i>P</i> = NS                            | by perineometry, units not stated. Electrical stimulation + PFMT: 50 contractions, ES for 15–30 min (Nemectrodyne 5 stimulator, 4-pole position method), further 50 contractions. ES freq range 0–100 Hz based on tolerability.   |
| Blowman 1991 <sup>282</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 14 randomised, 13 analysed | Women (age 33–68 years), genuine SUI without significant prolapse; max. bladder vols > 500 ml, no detrusor contraction on lying or standing | Electrical stimulation + PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 7) | Sham ES + PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 7) | 6 weeks             | Change in frequency/week (medians) | OR 1.33 (95% CI 0.33 to 43–38)                           | Funding: none declared. [EL = 1–]: outcomes not set out a priori. Conflicting numerical data in text and tables; unclear if randomisation used (only mentioned in summary). Perineometry used to assess PFM strength and for biofeedback. PFMT 4×/day at home, reinforced at fortnightly visits to clinic. ES used 60 mins/day (NT4 stimulator), freq 10 Hz, pulse width 80 μs for 4 weeks, then 35 Hz, 15 min/day for 2 weeks. |
|                             |                   |                            |   |   |                                |                     | Change in leakage episodes/week    | OR 30 (1.04, 863)<br>Median change from 5 to 0 vs 6 to 6 |   |

## TENS therapy – RCT

| Study                      | Study type and EL          | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison                          | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Soomro 2001 <sup>283</sup> | RCT, cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 43 (70% women)  | Men and women, mean age 50 ± 15 years, idiopathic DO (frequency, urgency and urge UI) unclear whether all had urge UI | TENS (n = 43) | Oxybutynin 2.5–5 mg t.d.s. (n = 43) | 2×6 weeks tx, 2 weeks washout | Functional capacity* (mean change)<br>Urodynamics (change in volume)<br>Frequency/day<br>SF-36<br>Bristol Urinary Symptom questionnaire<br>Self-reported change<br>Adverse effects | + 21% vs + 24%, <i>P</i> < 0.0004 vs baseline<br>Residual vol.: –13 vs +30% first desire to void +10 vs +80%<br>Vol. At instability –6 vs +76%, <i>P</i> not reported<br>–2 vs –2, <i>P</i> < 0.003 vs baseline<br>No sig. change in any parameter from baseline<br>Sig. improvements in both grps in day- and night-frequency, and dissatisfaction with spending rest of life with current symptoms, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.04<br>16% vs 20% better<br>53% vs 50% no better<br>24% vs 25% worse<br>Dry mouth 6% vs 87%<br>blurred vision 6% vs 53%<br>dry skin 6% vs 30%<br>skin irritation 28% vs 26%.<br>Difficulty with instructions and machine (TENS only); 11%, 13% | Funding: none declared.<br>Dual-channel TENS machines used, pads applied to perianal region (S2 to S3 dermatome), amplitude controlled to provide tickling sensation, freq 20 Hz, pulse width 0.2 ms on continuous mode. Used up to 6 h/day.<br>85% of oxybutynin grp took 5 mg t.d.s.<br>*assessed by calculating the mean volume for all samples over 1 week. |

## TENS therapy – case series

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Hasan 1996 <sup>285</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 71 (41 [58%] women); subjective assessment, in 59 completers (83%) | M/F aged 19–82 years (mean 48) with idiopathic DO refractory to other treatments (antimuscarinic drugs in 59, simple bladder over distension in 57). Symptoms of frequency, urgency, urge UI, and enuresis | TENS was applied for 3 weeks via electrodes placed bilaterally over the perianal region (S2-S3 dermatomes) at a frequency of 50 Hz, pulse width 200 µs, and at an amplitude that produced a tickling sensation | Mean 3 weeks tx (2–4) | Bladder diary variables (mean change)   | daytime frequency –25%, from 12 (SD 7) to 9 (SD 5)<br>nocturia –50% from 3 (SD 2) to 2 (SD 2)<br>urge UI ( $n = 45$ ; –40% from 5 [SD 5] to 3 [SD 3] episodes/day)<br>enuresis ( $n = 27$ ; –67% from 3 [SD 2] to 1 [SD 1] episodes/week) | Funding: Northern Counties Kidney Research, and Northern Regional Health Authority (UK).<br>A further investigation into the urodynamic effects of TENS (possibly a single session) over the suprapubic region and posterior tibial nerve was undertaken in 36 patients (17 men, 19 women). No significant changes in urodynamic parameters were seen during TENS applied via these areas. |
|                           |                       |  |  |  |                       | Urgency   | moderate to severe in 92% at baseline, which changed to mild-moderate in 53% and with 14% reporting 'significant' improvement after tx  |  |
|                           |                       |  |  |  |                       | Urodynamics (conducted in the 59 completers, and compared with the findings from no stimulation and stimulation at T12 ('placebo' stimulation). | Significant improvements in total bladder capacity, voided volume, and in number and frequency of unstable contractions with TENS vs no stimulation or placebo stimulation  |  |
|                           |                       |  |  |  |                       | Adverse effects   | 31% local skin reactions, which resolved on replacing the standard electrode pads with hypo-allergic pads   |  |
| Walsh 1999 <sup>284</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32 (31 F); 25 F (78%) completed tx                                 | M/F mean age 47 years, range 18–81, with refractory irritative voiding dysfunction; daytime frequency 11.3, nocturia 2.6<br>Of the 25 completers, 2 had DO, 23 sensory urge                                | TENS was applied bilaterally to the S3 dermatomes using a  | 1 week                | Day time frequency (change from baseline)<br>Nocturia   | 76% reported improvement, 4% worsening<br>56% reported improvement<br>episodes changed by –31%  | Funding: none declared.<br>Symptoms returned to pre-treatment levels in all patients within 6 months.<br>13% purchased TENS machine at 6 month telephone follow-up; the  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures           | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
|       |                   |                 |                         | current of 10 Hz, 200 ms pulse width in continuous mode for 12 h for 1 week |                     | Urgency<br>Adverse effects | 60% reported improvement; 16% worsening<br>1 case of skin excoriation at electrode site | remainder had ongoing equally severe symptoms as prior to TENS tx. |

*Posterior tibial nerve stimulation – controlled trials*

| Study                         | Study type and EL                                    | No. patients    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|---|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Karademir 2005 <sup>286</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–<br>[EL = 3 w.r.t. PTNS effectiveness] | 43 (38 [88%] F) | M/F mean age 42 years (21–69) with OAB and DO. Mean frequency ~11/day<br>None had prior tx for UI | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation (using SANS)*<br>60 min stimulation once/week for 8 weeks<br><i>n</i> = 21 | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation (using SANS)* + oxybutynin 5 mg daily<br>60 min stimulation once/week for 8 weeks<br><i>n</i> = 22 | 8 weeks tx          | Frequency<br>Urgency<br>Urge UI<br>Adverse effects | % change: –37 vs –44%<br>Response**<br>complete 29% vs 27%<br>partial 43% vs 55%<br>none 29% vs 18% <i>P</i> = NS<br>% change: –46 vs –61%<br>Response**<br>complete 19% vs 32%<br>partial 48% vs 45%<br>none 33% vs 23% <i>P</i> = NS<br>% change: –37 vs –44%<br>Response**<br>complete 14% vs 14%<br>partial 5% vs 5%<br>none 5% vs 0% <i>P</i> = NS<br>Oxybutynin grp:<br>32% dry mouth<br>5% ( <i>n</i> = 1) blurred vision<br>PTNS: 5% haematoma<br>5% local tenderness lasting 1 week | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] No details of randomisation, no consideration of whether grps equivalent at baseline.<br>*34G needle inserted 3–4 cm superior and medial to left medial malleolus % connected to SANS (200 µs pulse width, 20 Hz, amplitude 0.5–10 mA). Correct stimulation confirmed by dorsal flexion of big toe and/or plantar flexion of toes 2 to 5.<br>**response: complete if > 70% improvement in symptoms, partial if 35–70% improvement, < 35% no response. |

## Posterior tibial nerve stimulation – case series

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. patients    | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Vandoninck 2003 <sup>287</sup>  | Case series       | 90 (67 [74%] F) | M/F median age 51 years (19–82) with OAB syndrome. 75% had UI, and 59% DO                                    | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation*              | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes /24 h ( <i>n</i> = 60)          | Mean change (range): –3 (–19 to +7), <i>P</i> < 0.01  | Funding: Cystomedix Inc. Multicentre study (5 sites); Netherlands and Italy.  |
| Associated references (probably earlier reports of some of same pts): | EL = 3            |                 | Exclusions: UD stress UI   | 30 minute stimulation once/week for 12 weeks     |                     | Frequency/24 h ( <i>n</i> = 80)                  | Success (> 50% reduction) rate 56%<br>Mean change (range): –3 (–18 to +12), <i>P</i> < 0.001  | *using 34 G needle placed 3–4 cm above the medial malleolus; intensity 0–10 mA, frequency 20 Hz, pulse width 200 µs.            |
| van Balken 2001 <sup>288</sup>  |                   |                 |  |  |                     | Leakage severity**                               | Mean change (range): –1 (–3 to +1), <i>P</i> < 0.001  | **1 = some drops, 2 = small amount, 3 = severe urine loss needing change of clothing.   |
| Vandoninck 2003 <sup>289</sup>  |                   |                 |  |  |                     | Mean voided volume                               | Mean change (range): +27 (–96 to +200), <i>P</i> < 0.001  | Urodynamic findings reported but for 46 pts only.   |
|   |                   |                 |  |  |                     | QOL (mean score change, range)                   | I-QOL: +10 (–31 to +88), <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>SF-36: +4 (–42 to +56), <i>P</i> < 0.001   |   |
|   |                   |                 |  |  |                     | Adverse effects                                  | Not considered in main report<br>In Vandoninck 2003 <sup>289</sup> (report of 35 pts), ‘transient pain at stimulation site; diarrhoea, cramps, headache, lower back pain reported (no numerical data) |   |
| Klingler 2000 <sup>290</sup>  | Case series       | 15 (11 F)       | M/F aged 40–92 with urgency-frequency syndrome (frequency > 8/day, ± nocturia > 2). All had DO               | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation (using SANS)* | 3 weeks tx          | Response   | 67% ( <i>n</i> = 10) cure or partial response**<br>33% no response  | Funding: none declared.   |
|   | EL = 3            |                 | 20% had evidence of interstitial cystitis on investigations, and 7% ( <i>n</i> = 1) had neurological disease | 30 min stimulations 4×/week for 3 weeks          |                     | Leakage episodes (mean change/day in responders) | –1.7 (41%)  | *a 34 gauge needle inserted approx 4 cm posterior to tibia at a 30° angle towards the ankle, and connected to a SANS device.    |
|   |                   |                 | All had prior conservative treatment   |  |                     | Pad usage (in responders)                        | –2.9 (69%)  | Stimulation: 0.5–10 mA, fixed pulse width 200 µs, freq 20 Hz.   |
|   |                   |                 |  |  |                     | Urodynamic outcomes ( <i>n</i> = 13)             | No sig. change in PVR, bladder compliance, cough LPP, UPP<br>DO on longer present in 9, ‘improved’ in 1   | ‘proper’ stimulation identified by great toe flexion and/or plantar flexion of digits 2 to 5. Stimulation contd for 30 min.     |
|   |                   |                 |  |  |                     |  | Sig. increases in: mean bladder capacity, mean bladder volumes at first sensation and at normal desire to void  | After 3 weeks tx, further tx was individualised; symptoms recurred in 2 pts who were treated with 4 stimulations within a week, |

| Study                               | Study type and EL     | No. patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|
|                                     |                       |                                     |   |  |                       | Adverse effects   | $n = 1$ minor haematoma at puncture site  | followed by once/week.<br>**cure: frequency $\leq 8$ , nocturia $\leq 2$ , pad test 0–1 g, and DO asymptomatic<br>Partial response: req 8–10, nocturia $> 2$ , pad test 2–10 g, DO improved and subjectively “cured”.<br>No response: freq $> 10$ , nocturia $> 2$ , pad $> 10$ g, DO unchanged, subjectively unchanged.   |
| Govier 2001 <sup>291</sup>          | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 53 (90% F)<br>47 (89%) completed tx | M/F mean age 57 years (24–80) with refractory OAB (frequency $\geq 10$ /day and/or $\geq 3$ at night), who had failed conservative treatment<br><br>Exclusions: active UTI, neurogenic DO   | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation (using SANS)*<br><br>30 min stimulations 1x/week for 12 weeks | 12 weeks              | Frequency (mean change/24 h; $n = 48$ )<br><br>Urge UI episodes/day<br><br>Pelvic pain                        | Day: $-25\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br>Night $-21\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br><br>$-35\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br><br>$-30\%$ , $P < 0.05$   | Funding: none declared; 2 of 5 authors declared financial and/or other relationship with pharmaceutical co’s.<br>Multicentre study (5 sites).<br>*A 34 gauge needle inserted 3–4 cm posterior to tibia and connected to a SANS device.<br>Stimulation: 0–10 mA, fixed pulse width 200 $\mu$ s, freq 20 Hz.<br>‘proper’ stimulation confirmed by great toe flexion. Stimulation contd for 30 min. |
| Congregado Ruiz 2004 <sup>292</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 51                                  | F mean age 55 years (18–74), not responded to conservative tx (antimuscarinics)<br><br>26 (51%) frequency-urgency, 43% urge UI, 6% interstitial cystitis.<br>Baseline day frequency 9.2, night 2.9; day voided vol. 138 ml, night 184 ml; | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation*<br><br>30 min stimulations once/week for 10 weeks            | Mean 21 months (6–36) | Frequency (mean change/24 h)<br><br>Voided vol. (mean change/24 h)<br><br>Leakage episodes (mean change/24 h) | Day: $-27\%$ , $P < 0.001$<br>Night $-52\%$ , $P < 0.001$<br><br>Day: $+59\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br>Night $+28\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br><br>Day: $-62\%$ , $P < 0.05$<br>Night $-71\%$ , $P < 0.05$ | Funding: None declared.<br>Retrospective analysis of cases.<br>*A 22 gauge needle inserted 5 cm above medial tibial malleolus.<br>Pulses 0–10 mA.<br>Change in % with hypogastric pain also reported as an outcome; –66%.  |



| Study                           | Study type and EL     | No. patients                              | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|
|                                 |                       |   | leakage episodes 2.1 day, 0.7 night<br>Urodynamic findings: 26% DO, 25% normal, 4% underactive bladder, 33% hypersensitive bladder. No UD done in 8%  |  |  | Adverse effects  | Not specifically considered, but reported that "no infections, mechanism failures, or pain have been detected when using the technique"  |   |
| van der Pal 2006 <sup>293</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 30 (26 [87%] F)<br>29 completed follow-up | M/F mean age 51 years (20–72) urge UI refractory to conservative tx (drugs: antimuscarinics, oestrogens, alpha-blockers, 105rethra105n105n105); ≥ 3 leakage episodes/24 h (mean 8); frequency 13, nocturia 2.2, mean voided vol. 128, pad usage 3.9<br>43% had prior surgery  | Posterior tibial nerve stimulation*<br>30 min stimulations<br>3×/week for 4 weeks                          | 4 weeks tx   | Bladder diary (mean change with 95% CI)<br><br>QOL<br><br>Adverse effects                          | Frequency –1.2 (–2.7 to 0.1), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Nocturia –0.8 (–1.3 to –0.2), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>Leakage episodes –4.1 (–6.2 to –2.0), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>Mean voided vol. +51.8 (17 to 86.5), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>Pad usage: –1.3 (–2.3 to –0.4), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br><br>I-QOL: +19% score change, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>SF-36: sig. improvement in 5 of 8 domains<br><br>'minor bleeding or temporary painful/numb feeling at the insertion site or under sole of foot were rare' | Funding: CystoMedix Inc.<br>*PTNS: pulse width 200 μs, frequency 20 Hz, intensity 0–10 mA; increased until flexion of big toe and/or fanning of other toes.<br>For ongoing stimulation, current set according to tolerability (mean 3.2 mA, range 1–6.5). |
| van der Pal 2006 <sup>294</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 11 (6 F)                                  | As van der Pal 2006 <sup>293</sup><br>M/F mean age 51 years (33–66) with OAB refractory to conservative treatment<br>All previously treated successfully with PTNS (≥ 50% fewer leakage episodes and/or ≥ 50% lower frequency), and had continued tx as outpatients or at home<br>Maintenance treatment had been used for mean 13 months (range 1–36) | PTNS tx withheld for 6 weeks then re-introduced for 4 weeks*<br>30 min stimulations<br>3×/week for 4 weeks | At 6 weeks after no tx<br><br>At weeks 4 after re-introducing tx | ≥ 50% increase in leakage episodes and/or ≥ 50% increase in frequency<br><br>Subjective assessment | 7 pts (64%)<br><br>11 reported deterioration of symptoms<br><br>9 pts (82%)  | Funding: CystoMedix Inc.<br>*PTNS: adjustable intensity from 0 to 10 mA (mean 3.8), pulse width 200 μs, frequency 20 Hz.  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures      | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |              | All stopped maintenance tx for 6 weeks, then re-treated as outpatients |              |                     | Subjective assessment | 8 of 11 improved and wished to continue tx   |                     |
|       |                   |              |  |              |                     | Other symptoms        | Sig. improvement in:<br>nocturia (-80%)<br>voided volume (+75%)<br>severity (scale 0-3; -54%)<br>I-QOL scores (+31%) |                     |

*Magnetic therapy – RCTs*

| Study                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                     | Comparison                            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| But 2003 <sup>295</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 55              | Women, mean age 56 years (range 34–78), UI (17% stress, 42% urge, 40% mixed)<br>Exclusions: pregnancy, physical or mental disability, pacemakers, bladder infection, urolithiasis, recent drug tx (antimuscarinics, beta-blockers, diuretics) | Magnetic stimulation<br>(n = 30) | Sham magnetic stimulation<br>(n = 22) | 8 weeks             | Leakage episodes (day), mean change<br>Nocturia<br>PFM strength (units not stated)<br>Pad weight (g, mean change)<br>Self-reported improvement in UI symptoms<br>Adverse effects | -0.6 vs -0.2<br>(P = NS*)<br>-0.6 vs -0.7<br>(P = NS*)<br>Power of contraction (change in % of max.): + 3.9<br>(P = 0.007*) vs + 2.5<br>(P = NS*)<br>Duration of contraction (s, change): +0.5<br>(P = 0.04*) vs 0<br>(P = NS*)<br>-2.7 (P = 0.01*) vs -2.3 (P = NS*)<br>56% vs 26%<br>(P = 0.0001 between grps) | Funding: none declared.<br>Magnetic stimulation: continuous via Pulsegen device, pulse freq 10 Hz.<br>Device inserted into small pocket of specially designed underwear.<br>*P values for each group vs baseline.<br>No between-group comparisons reported for these parameters. |

| Study                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Comparison                                    | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|---|
| But 2005 <sup>296</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 39              | Women, mean age 39 years (28–70), with mainly urgency related incontinence and occasional stress induced urine loss<br><br>Baseline leakage episodes not stated; frequency was 9 vs 8.2, nocturia 2.6 vs 1.8, pad use 3.9 vs 3.3<br><br>Exclusions: pregnancy, physical or mental disability, pacemakers, bladder infection, urolithiasis, recent drug tx (antimuscarinics, beta-blockers, diuretics) | Magnetic stimulation<br>( <i>n</i> = 23) | Sham magnetic stimulation<br>( <i>n</i> = 16) | 8 weeks             | Success (from 0 to 100% on VAS [≡ no UI])<br><br>Frequency* (change/24 h)<br><br>Nocturia* (change/24 h)<br><br>Pad usage*<br><br>Adverse effects | 42% vs 23%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.02<br><br>(No improvement in 22% vs 56%)<br><br>–2.3 (26%) vs –0.6 (7%)<br><br>–1.2 (46%) vs +0.1 (6%)<br><br>–1.7 (44%) vs –0.5 (15%)<br><br>none | Funding: Ministry for education, science and sport (Slovenia).<br>[EL = 1–] no details of randomisation, no consideration of whether groups comparable at baseline in outcome measures.<br><br>Magnetic stimulation: continuous via Pulsegen device, pulse freq 18.5 Hz. Device inserted into small pocket of specially designed underwear.<br><br>* <i>P</i> ≤ 0.007 for magnetic grp vs baseline; <i>P</i> = NS for all changes from baseline in control grp. No between-group comparisons reported for these parameters.<br><br>First sensation to void, bladder capacity, and UCP also reported – data not reproduced here. |

*Magnetic therapy – case series*

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Galloway 1999 <sup>297</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 83; 64 have completed tx | Women, mean age 55 years (35–83), stress UI (11% mixed)<br><br>Exclusions: pregnancy, physical or mental disability, pacemakers, bladder infection, urolithiasis, recent drug tx (antimuscarinics, beta-blockers, diuretics) | Magnetic stimulation<br>( <i>n</i> = 30) | 6 weeks tx          | Continence status ( <i>n</i> = 50 evaluated)<br><br>Leakage episodes/day<br><br>Pad weight on 'dynamic pad test' (g, mean change) | 34% dry<br>32% not using more than 1 pad per day<br>34% using > 1 pad per day<br><br>–1.6 (48%),<br><i>P</i> = 0.001<br><br>–5 g (25%),<br><i>P</i> = 0.001 | Funding: Neotonus Inc.<br>Magnetic stimulation: 2×20 min sessions per week in a special chair (Neocontrol system). Pulses of current 275 μs; 10 min low-frequency stimulation (5 Hz) followed by rest for 1–5 min, and 10 min at 50 Hz.<br><br>* <i>P</i> values for each group vs baseline. No between-group comparisons reported for these parameters.<br>Adverse effects not considered. |
| Chandi 2004 <sup>298</sup>   | Case series           | 24                       | F mean age 50 years (35–68) with urge or mixed UI (50% had each). Median frequency   | Magnetic stimulation built into a        | 8 weeks tx          | Frequency (change in median; unclear whether per day)   | –5, <i>P</i> < 0.001 vs baseline  | Funding: none declared.<br>Device = Neocontrol, pulses 275 μs, 10 Hz for 2×10 mins for urge UI, and   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size                                      | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|       | EL = 3            |                 | 12 (5–22), median 24 h pad test weight 67 g (10–313), and median subjective score (VAS 0–6) of 5 (3–6)<br>Exclusions: radiotherapy, neurological disease, pacemaker, arrhythmia, or metal implants | chair;<br>2×/week for<br>8 weeks |                     | Pad weight (change in median score; pad test used unclear)<br>Satisfaction (change in median subjective score) | –36 g, $P < 0.05$ vs baseline<br>–2, $P < 0.001$ | 10 Hz for 10 min then 50 Hz for 10 min for mixed UI.<br>Adverse effects not considered<br>Criteria for success and cure given in methods but results not quoted.<br>14 (58%) were 'improved'; 3 were dry. |

### Behavioural therapies

#### Bladder training vs control

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients                  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                       | Comparison                              | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Jarvis 1980 <sup>305</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 60                               | Women 27–79 years, UI owing to idiopathic DO diagnosed by pressure-flow studies. (100% had urge UI, frequency and urgency, 68% urge and stress UI)<br>Cystoscopy and urethral dilatation performed to exclude local disease | Bladder training (hospital inpatient) ( $n = 30$ ) | Control (home environment) ( $n = 30$ ) | 6 month follow-up (duration of tx unclear)                                     | % continent<br>% symptom-free<br>Change in % reporting symptom                     | 90% vs 23%<br>83% vs 23%<br>Daytime leakage episodes: –83 vs –23%<br>Nocturnal leakage episodes: –89 vs –20%<br>Urgency: –87 vs –23%<br>Urge UI: –90 vs –23%<br>Stress UI: –86 vs –20% | Funding: none declared.<br>Bladder training: explain rationale, pt instructed to pass urine at specific intervals during the day (~1.5 h, and no earlier) [frequency of nocturia ignored]; intervals increased by 0.5 h daily until 4 hourly void achieved. Pts asked to keep fluid balance chart, and introduced to someone successfully treated with the bladder training.<br>Control: advised should be able to hold urine for 4 h, be continent, and allowed home.<br>No between-group analysis. |
| Fantl 1991 <sup>205</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 131 randomised, 123 completed tx | Women $\geq 55$ years (mean ~68), community-dwelling, capable of independent or assisted toileting, $\geq 1$ UI episode/week, urodynamically categorised as urthral   | Bladder training ( $n = 60$ )                      | Control ( $n = 63$ )                    | 6 week tx (then all offered bladder training; follow-up to 6 months for grp as | Leakage episodes/week (change at 6 weeks)<br>Urine loss (pad test, g, mean change) | None: 12% vs 3%<br>$\geq 50\%$ reduction: 75% vs 24% ( $P < 0.001$ BT grp vs baseline)<br>Increase in: 8% vs 43%<br>–54 vs +21% ( $P$ value not given)                                 | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Center on Nursing Research.<br>Bladder training: education, emphasising neurological control of lower urinary tract function, and scheduled voiding (every 30 or 60 min according to pt's baseline,   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | sphincter incompetence (72%), or DO ± sphincteric incompetence (28%)<br>19% had previous surgery for UI; 36% previous medical tx for UI<br>Exclusions: uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, UTI, urinary obstruction, diverticulum, fistula, reversible cause of UI, permanent indwelling catheter |              |            | a whole)*           | Daytime UI episodes/week (mean change)<br>Nocturnal UI episodes/week (mean change)<br>QOL (IIQ) (mean change) ( <i>n</i> = 82)<br>6 month results (mean change between 6 month and end of 6-week tx period)* | -19 vs -3% ( <i>P</i> value not given)<br>-44 vs -11% ( <i>P</i> value not given)<br>-55 vs -2% ( <i>P</i> value not given)<br>Leakage episodes +2/week<br>Urine loss +5 g<br>Daytime UI episodes /week (+2)<br>Nocturnal UI episodes/week (+1) | increased by 30 min/week if reduced no. UI episodes; target 2.5–3 h voiding interval.) Six-weekly clinic visits. No fluid modifications used.<br>Control: returned to clinic at 6 weeks, without further intervention or clinic contact. All underwent bladder training after initial 6-week period.<br>Sig. difference at baseline in duration of symptoms (13 ± 11 years BT vs 8 ± 10 years control, <i>P</i> < 0.05) and use of oestrogen supplementation (37% vs 21%, <i>P</i> < 0.05).<br>*6 months follow-up; data available for total group only (bladder training and control grps subsequently given bladder training). |

*Antimuscarinic drugs compared with bladder training*

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                       | Comparison                              | Length of follow-up                                      | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Colombo 1995 <sup>306</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 81 randomised, 75 analysed | Women, mean age ~48 years (24–65), socially embarrassing urge UI: and 1 of the following on cystometry: DO (36%), low-compliance bladder (23%), sensory bladder (41%)<br>Exclusions: stable bladder at cystometry, neurologic disease, detrusor hyperreflexia, | Bladder training* ( <i>n</i> = 37) | Oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s. ( <i>n</i> = 38) | 6 weeks tx, 6 months follow-up of women cured at 6 weeks | Self-reported cure<br>Resolution of diurnal frequency<br>Resolution of nocturia<br>Volume (ml) at first desire to void (% change) | 73% vs 74% at 6 weeks<br>% relapsed at 6 months: 1/27 vs 12/28<br>20/29 (69%) vs 18/32 (56%)<br>11/18 (61%) vs 3/11 (27%)<br>+33% vs +49%, <i>P</i> = 0.001 vs baseline both grps | Funding: none declared.<br>All postmenopausal women ( <i>n</i> = 36 [44%] took 1.25 mg conjugated equine oestrogen /day for 4 weeks before baseline evaluation.<br>*Bladder training: 6 weeks education – maximum interval between micturitions identified, pts encouraged to hold their urine until this interval plus 30 min. Thereafter interval progressively increased by 30 min every 4 or 5 days; to target voiding interval 3–4 h. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                       | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
|                            |                   |                 | age > 65 years, coexisting stress UI, genital prolapse, PVR<br>urine > 50 ml, previous gynaecology/urogynaecology operations, prior drug tx for urge UI, urethral diverticula, fistulas, urinary tract neoplasia, bacterial or interstitial cystitis, bladder stones, previous pelvic radiotherapy |  |   |   | Volume (ml) at very strong desire to void (% change)            | +21 vs +29%, $P = 0.0002$ vs baseline both groups  | Oxybutynin dose halved in 18 (47%) owing to side effects; dry mouth ( $n = 15$ ), constipation ( $n = 6$ ), nausea ( $n = 5$ ), dizziness ( $n = 2$ ), reduced visual acuity ( $n = 1$ ), tachycardia ( $n = 1$ ).<br><br>6 withdrew; 4 oxy (3 dry mouth, 1 glaucoma); 2 bladder training (tx time-consuming). |
| Jarvis 1981 <sup>307</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 50              | Women, mean age ~47 years (17–78), UI owing to detrusor instability (100% had urge UI, 72% stress UI)<br><br>Exclusions: neurological abnormalities, diabetes mellitus, UTI, drugs known to affect lower urinary tract function  | Bladder training (hospital inpatient) ( $n = 25$ ) | Flavoxate 200 mg t.d.s. + Imipramine 25 mg t.d.s. (out-patients) ( $n = 25$ ) | 4 weeks tx (unclear whether the results are those at 4 weeks) | % continent<br>% symptom-free<br>Change in % reporting symptoms | 84% vs 56%, $P < 0.05$<br>76% vs 48%, $P < 0.05$<br>Daytime leakage episodes: -76 vs -52%<br>Nocturnal leakage episodes: -81 vs -32%<br>Urgency: -84 vs -56%<br>Urge UI: -84 vs -56%<br>Stress UI: -95 vs -71% | Funding: none declared.<br><br>No details of bladder training given in published report.<br><br>No statistical between-group comparisons other than for proportions continent, and symptom-free.   |
|                            |                   |                 |  |  |   |   | Adverse effects   | 0 vs 14 (56%) (20% withdrew owing to adverse effects): 8 dizziness, 6 headache, 6 dry mouth, 4 nausea, 2 drowsiness, 1 vomiting  |  |

*Antimuscarinic drugs plus bladder training*

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics                               | Intervention                     | Comparison                 | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Szonyi 1995 <sup>308</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 60 (93% women) randomised, | M/F ambulant and independent, 72–98 years (mean 82.2) | Oxybutynin (2.5 mg b.d. to 5 mg) | Placebo + bladder training | 6 weeks tx          | Daytime frequency, difference in median change* | difference not given – only CI (95% CI -27.0, -6.0) $P = 0.003$ | Funding: Smith & Nephew pharmaceuticals supplied oxybutynin and placebo |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                        | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                          | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                             |                   | 57 analysed                            | SD 6.1); symptoms of urinary frequency, urgency and urge UI; DO diagnosed by water cystometry. (20/24 oxy vs 22/28 placebo incontinent during baseline)<br>Exclusions: UTI, severe hepatic or renal disease, glaucoma, uncontrolled diabetes           | t.d.s.) + bladder training (n = 30)                     | (n = 30)                            |                     | Nocturia, difference in median change*<br>Daytime incontinence episodes, difference in median change*<br>Nocturnal enuresis, difference in median change*<br>Self-reported benefit (yes/no)<br>Self-reported change# (n)<br>Adverse effects | -6.0 (95% CI -5.0, +7.0)<br>-9.5 (95% CI -11.0, +3.0)<br>-1.0 (95% CI -3.0, +2.0)<br>22/28 (79%) vs 16/29 (55%), P = NS<br>No change 7 vs 14<br>marginal improvement 3 vs 4<br>significant improvement 14 vs 8<br>cure 4 vs 3<br>Dry mouth 93% vs 86%<br>blurred vision 50% vs 59%<br>heartburn 57% vs 45%<br>constipation 50% vs 45%<br>dry skin 50% vs 59%; P not reported | tablets.<br>Bladder training: instruction to delay micturition as long as possible when experienced the need to pass urine. Aim: to reduce frequency.<br>Median doses taken were 5 mg/day oxybutynin (also modal dose), 10 mg placebo, P = NS.<br>*difference between last 2 weeks of tx period and 2-week run-in period before tx.<br>#4-point ordinal scale. |
| Wiseman 1991 <sup>309</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 37 (88% women) randomised, 34 analysed | M/F mean age 80 years (70–89), urinary frequency and urge UI caused by DO (confirmed by cystometry); mobile and able to toilet independently<br>Exclusions: UTI past 4 weeks, bladder neck prolapse in women, severe liver/renal disease, uncontrolled | Terodiline (25 mg at night) + bladder training (n = 19) | Placebo + bladder training (n = 18) | 6 weeks tx          | Frequency /day (median difference between grps)<br>Leakage episodes /day (median differences between grps)  | Per 24 h: -0.2 (95% CI -1.1 to 1.2)<br>Daytime: 0.05 (95% CI -1.0 to 1.1)<br>Night-time: -0.15 (95% CI -0.6 to 0.4)<br>Per 24 h: 0 (95% CI -0.6 to 1.2)<br>Daytime: 0.15 (95% CI -0.5 to 1.1)<br>Night-time: 0 (95% CI -0.2 to 0.3)  | Funding: Kabi, UK.<br>Bladder training: instruction at beginning and every 2 weeks by home visit; delay bladder emptying by as long as possible whenever experienced the need to void.   |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                       | Comparison                          | Length of follow-up                            | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
|                                |                   |  | diabetes mellitus, glaucoma, other contraindications to antimuscarinic tx   |  |                                     |  | Self-reported improvement   | 56% vs 44% (12% difference, 95% CI 44%, –22%)   |   |
|                                |                   |  |   |  |                                     |  | Adverse effects   | 2 reports terodiline grp (1 oesophagitis, 1 dry mouth)  |   |
| Castleden 1986 <sup>310</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 34 randomised (28 women), 33 completed | M/F, aged 30–91, incontinence, 'unstable bladder'.  | Bladder training + imipramine* (n = 19)            | Bladder training + placebo (n = 14) | Duration of tx unclear, follow-up to 11 months | Cure  | 14/19 (74%) vs 6/14 (43%), P = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>Bladder training: voiding at 0.5 or 1 hourly intervals initially, increased by 0.5 h after dry for 48 h, to target voiding interval of 4 h. fluids allowed to 1500 ml, pts encouraged not to restrict fluids.<br>*imipramine starting dose 25 mg for 1 week, increased to 50 mg, then increased by 25 mg every month depending on benefit and side effects.<br>Mean dose taken 54 mg (range 25–100). |
|                                |                   |  |   |  |                                     |  | Urodynamics (mean values, time point unclear)                             | No sig. difference between grps in any outcome:<br>Initial residual vol. (22.6 vs 40.3 ml)<br>Volume capacity (265.3 vs 311.7 ml)<br>Pressure capacity (52.8 vs 49.9 cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br>Urethral capacity (52 vs 45.1 cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br>Volume post incontinence (163.9 vs 160.8 ml) |   |
|                                |                   |  |   |  |                                     |  | Adverse effects   | 'frequent complaints' of dry mouth and constipation on imipramine; 1 confusion on imipramine 25 mg; 1 'feeling ill' on imipramine. No adverse effects in placebo grp  | At baseline, sig. more pts in the placebo grp were wet day and night (no numerical data, and no other baseline data).   |
| Mattiasson 2003 <sup>311</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 501 (75% women)                        | M/F, median age 63 years (19–86), symptoms of urinary frequency (≥ 8 voids/day), urgency, with/without urge UI (61% with)<br>Exclusions: contraindications to antimuscarinic therapy, electrical stimulation or | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. + bladder training (n = 244) | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. (n = 257)     | 24 weeks tx                                    | Frequency/24 h (median change [IQR])                                      | –33% (–42, 21) vs –25% (–39, –13), P < 0.001  | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>Bladder training: instruction to attempt to increase time between voids, target 5–6 voids/24 h; maintain same fluid intake; tips on concentrating on other tasks when experiencing desire to void, deep breathing.<br>Tolterodine dose could be  |
|                                |                   |  |   |  |                                     |  | Leakage episodes/24 h (n = 301, with UI at baseline, median change [IQR]) | –87% (–100, –20) vs –81% (–100, –42), P = NS  |   |
|                                |                   |  |   |  |                                     |  | Volume voided/void (median change [IQR], ml)                              | +31.5% (13, 56) vs +20% (3, 45), P < 0.001  |   |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--------------|------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | bladder training past 3 months, indwelling catheter, ISC, use of antimuscarinics or concomitant tx for OAB |              |            |                     | Urgency episodes/24 h   | -38% (-77, 14) vs -38% (-69, -8), <i>P</i> = NS   | reduced to 1 mg b.d. weeks 1-2 if adverse effects occurred. 90% maintained dose at 2 mg b.d.   |
|       |                   |                 |  |              |            |                     | Pt perception (6-point rating scale, 0-5, no- to many severe- problems) | 67% vs 62% 'minor'.<br>76% vs 71% improved*<br>3% vs 5% deteriorated*<br><i>P</i> = NS all comparisons  | *improvement; reduction of $\geq 1$ point in score; deterioration; increase of $\geq 1$ point. |
|       |                   |                 |  |              |            |                     | Adverse effects   | % reporting $\geq 1$ : 65% vs 69%<br><br>Dry mouth 31% vs 35%<br>headache 6% vs 8%<br>constipation 3% vs 5%<br><br>20 (4%) pts reported 25 serious adverse events (2 in 1 pt; chest and abdominal pain considered drug related) |  |

*Bladder training vs PFMT*

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                      | Comparison                                      | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                          | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Yoon 2003 <sup>312</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 50 randomised, 44 analysed | Parous F 33-55 years. Urine loss $\geq 1$ g /30 min pad test, $\geq 14$ voids in 48 h prior to evaluation<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, previous surgery for UI, current drug tx for UI | Bladder training ( <i>n</i> = 19) | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 13)<br>No tx ( <i>n</i> = 12) | 8 weeks             | PFM contraction index* (mean change)      | +7.3 vs +8.1 vs -0.5 <i>P</i> < 0.01 vs baseline BT and PFMT grps                                 | Funding: None declared. Bladder training: voiding interval increased weekly. PFMT: 30 contractions daily, with EMG feedback weekly. PFM strength measured by perineometry. *index is average pressure (mmHg) multiplied by duration (s). Eight pts from each grp withdrew. |
|                          |                   |                            |   |                                   |   |                     | Leakage, 30 min pad test (mean change, g) | -0.8 vs -7.2 vs +0.7, <i>P</i> = NS vs baseline   |  |
|                          |                   |                            |   |                                   |   |                     | Frequency of voiding (mean change)        | Day: -6.9 vs -0.8 vs +1.1<br>Night: -1.8 vs +0.1 vs +0.1<br><i>P</i> < 0.01 vs baseline in BT grp |  |
|                          |                   |                            |   |                                   |   |                     | Voided volume (mean change, ml)           | +93 vs +27 vs -9, <i>P</i> < 0.01 vs baseline in BT grp   | No between-grp comparisons reported.   |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                         | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Wyman 1998 <sup>313</sup><br>(cystometry<br>Elser 1999 <sup>940</sup> ) | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 204             | Community dwelling women $\geq$ 45 years (mean 61), ambulatory, mentally intact, toilet independently, UI > once/week, urodynamic diagnosis of stress UI or DO $\pm$ stress UI (stress UI [71%], urge UI [14%], stress and urge [15%]). Palpable PFM contraction a criterion for study entry<br><br>Exclusions: reversible UI causes, uncontrolled metabolic conditions, PVR > 100 ml, UTI, genitourinary fistula, indwelling catheterisation, inability to contract PFM on digital examination | Bladder training<br>( <i>n</i> = 68) | Biofeedback-assisted PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 69)<br><br>Bladder training + biofeedback-assisted PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 67) | 3 months tx, follow-up at 6 months | Leakage episodes/week (mean reduction)<br><br>Cure<br><br>$\geq$ 50% reduction in leakage episodes<br><br>No change/increase in leakage episodes<br><br>IIQ-revised* (mean reduction from baseline score)<br><br>UDI (mean reduction from baseline score) | -27 vs -43 vs -54% (3 months), <i>P</i> = 0.004 for combination vs other grps<br><br>-31 vs -44 vs -46% (6 months), <i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>18 vs 13% vs 31% (3 months)<br>16 vs 20% vs 27% (6 months)<br><i>P</i> = 0.05 for combination vs other grps at 3 months; <i>P</i> = NS between grps at 6 months<br><br>51 vs 56% vs 70% (3 months)<br>46 vs 56% vs 59% (6 months)<br><i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>28 vs 23% vs 13% (3 months)<br>31 vs 26% vs 17% (6 months)<br><i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>-24 vs -25 vs -47% (3 months)<br>-30 vs -22 vs -29% (6 months)<br><i>P</i> = NS between grps*<br><br>-27 vs -24 vs -46% (3 months)<br>-28 vs -28 vs -38% (6 months)<br><i>P</i> = NS between grps | Funding: National Institute of Aging/National Institutes of Health.<br><br>Bladder training: progressive voiding schedule, tailored to pt during weeks 1–6, starting with 30–60 min voids, increasing by 30 min each week is possible; unchanged weeks 7–12.<br><br>PFMT: graded home exercise programme with audiotapes, plus 4 office biofeedback sessions (visual [balloon] and verbal); 5 fast, 10 sustained contractions, 12 s relaxation 2 $\times$ /day, increasing to 50 daily contractions during week 3. PFM contraction also taught for urge and stress inhibition.<br><br>Combination grp started with bladder training with PFMT added during week 3.<br><br>After 3-month tx period, women encouraged to continue with tx as assigned.<br><br>*at 3 months, women with urge $\pm$ stress UI in the combination therapy reported sig. lower scores vs PFMT group. |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Pt perception of improvement   | <p>Much better: 38 vs 30% vs 52% (3 months, <math>P = 0.011</math> combination tx vs other grps), 35 vs 37% vs 53% (6 months)</p> <p>Somewhat better: 27 vs 46% vs 38% (3 months), 27 vs 33% vs 22% (6 months)</p> <p>No change: 30 vs 21% vs 7% (3 months), 32 vs 25% vs 21% (6 months)</p> <p>Worse/much worse: 5 vs 3% vs 3% (3 months), 7 vs 5% vs 4% (6 months)</p> <p><math>P = NS</math> between grps</p> |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Treatment satisfaction   | <p>Very: 64 vs 73% vs 82% (3 months), 60 vs 66% vs 78% (6 months)</p> <p>Slightly: 9 vs 16% vs 11% (3 months), 18 vs 17% vs 10% (6 months)</p> <p>Neutral: 21 vs 10% vs 5% (3 months), 13 vs 16% vs 9% (6 months)</p> <p>Dissatisfied/very dissatisfied: 6 vs 2% vs 2% (3 months), 8 vs 2% vs 3%</p> <p><math>P = NS</math> between grps</p>   |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Cystometry ( $n = 181$ ; 73% genuine stress UI, 13% DO, 14% GSI + DO) <sup>940</sup> | No sig. between-grp differences in first sensation to void, max. cystometric capacity, MUCP, UCP, mean/max. pressure transmission ratio, straining urethral axis   |                     |

## Multicomponent behavioural therapy studies

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                  | Comparison       | Length of follow-up               | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Dougherty 2002 <sup>199</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 218 randomised. 178 completed $\geq 1$ follow-ups. 147 followed up to 6 months, 111 (51%) to 12 months, 65 (30%) to 18 months, 46 (21%) to 24 months | F $\geq 55$ years (mean 68), community-dwelling, involuntary urine loss $\geq 2$ $\times$ /week of $\geq 1$ g/24 h; stress (16%), urge (16%), or mixed (68%) incontinence<br>Exclusions: bladder cancer, kidney disease, indwelling urinary catheter, residual urine $\geq 100$ ml, caregiver needed but unavailable | Behaviour management (n = 94) | Control (n = 84) | 6 months tx, follow-up to 2 years | Pad test (mean change in leakage/24 h, g)<br>Leakage episodes /24 h (mean change)<br>Frequency /24 h (mean change)<br>Voiding interval (mean change h)<br>Quality of life (IIQ, mean score)* | 6 months: -17 vs -10<br>P = 0.01<br>2 years: -34 vs + 84,<br>P = 0.01<br>6 months: -2.1 vs -1.0,<br>P $\leq$ 0.02<br>2 years: -2.1 vs -0.5,<br>P $\leq$ 0.02<br>6 months: -0.9 vs -0.8,<br>P = NS<br>2 years: -0.4 vs +0.7,<br>P = NS<br>6 months: +0.2 vs +0.2<br>P = NS<br>2 years: 0 vs -0.1,<br>P = NS<br>6 months: 38.9 vs 44.7<br>P $\leq$ 0.05<br>2 years: 35.1 vs 42.1,<br>P $\leq$ 0.05 | Funding: National Institute of Nursing Research, National Institutes of Health.<br>Behaviour grp: 3 sequential phases, according to pt response and goals – the maximum programme was; 2–4 weeks self-monitoring, 6–8 weeks bladder training, 12 weeks PFMT with biofeedback (no. of training sessions unclear). Self-monitoring used if: mean $\geq 2$ caffeinated drinks/day; average daily fluid intake < 1500 ml or > 4000 ml; fluid intake after 6 pm and nocturia $\geq$ twice/night; daytime voiding interval > 4 h; constipation. Bladder training protocol: scheduled voiding, aiming to increase interval by 30 min each week, target 2.5–3 h between voids. PFMT: 15 repetitions/day increased by 15 repetitions every 3 weeks to 45 |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
|   |                   |  |  |   |  |                     | Subjective report of urine loss severity (7 pt ordinal scale; 1 = worst bladder control, 7 = best)                      | 6 mth score: 5.88 vs 4.66<br>$P \leq 0.05$<br>2 years: 5.65 vs 4.91<br>$P \leq 0.05$   | contractions/day, 3×/week for 12 weeks, with EMG (sensors applied perianally and abdominally).<br>No mention of whether ability to contract PFM assessed at baseline.<br>Control: received feedback on information obtained at the baseline visit, which did not constitute or promote tx.<br>*range of possible scores 29–116, lower scores indicate higher QOL.<br>10% vs 2% behaviour vs control grps taking medication for UI; 23% vs 35% using diuretics; 52% vs 64% previous gynae surgery; 40% vs 18% taking HRT; 17% vs 13% current smokers ( $P = NS$ for all comparisons). |
| Burgio 1998 <sup>314,315</sup><br>Goode 2002 (report of urodynamic findings) <sup>317</sup><br>Johnson 2005 <sup>316</sup> also related (see below) | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 197 randomised, 190 analysed, 169 completed 8-weeks tx | F, community-dwelling, mean age 67.7 years (55–92), urge UI 2×/week for ≥ 3 months, and urodynamic evidence (49% urge UI, 51% mixed UI)<br><br>Exclusions: continual leakage, PVR urine vol. > 200 ml, uterine prolapse past introitus, impaired mental status, narrow-angle | Biofeedback-assisted behavioural treatment (BT), $n = 65$ | Oxybutynin 2.5 mg to 5 mg t.d.s. ( $n = 67$ )<br>Placebo t.d.s. ( $n = 65$ ) | 8 weeks             | Leakage episodes/week (mean change, SD)<br><br>Pt description of progress<br><br>Pt satisfaction (somewhat or complete) | –81% (25) vs –69% (37) vs –39% (80); $P = 0.04$ for BT vs oxy, $P < 0.001$ BT vs plac, $P = 0.009$ oxy vs plac<br><br>Better or much better: 100 vs 82% vs 66%, $P < 0.001$ BT vs oxy/plac<br>About same/worse: 0 vs 18% vs 34%<br><br>100 vs 89% vs 62%, $P < 0.001$ BT vs oxy/plac | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health.<br>Behavioural grp: sequential phases; biofeedback-(anorectal)- assisted PFMT, 15 exercises 3×/day, max. 10 s each (2 weeks); urge strategies (2 weeks); repeat biofeedback PFMT if not had ≥ 50% reduction in frequency of accidents (2 weeks); review and reinforcement (2 weeks). Ability to contract PFM checked at first visit by anorectal biofeedback.   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                             |                   |                                   | glaucoma, unstable angina, decompensated heart failure, malignant arrhythmias  |   |  |                     | Adverse effects  | Dry mouth: 35 vs 97% vs 55% ( $P < 0.001$ for oxy vs BT/plac)<br>Inability to void: 6 vs 22% vs 3% ( $P = 0.002$ for oxy vs BT or plac)<br>Constipation: 22 vs 39% vs 37%, $P = NS$<br>Blurred vision: 10 vs 15% vs 10%, $P = NS$<br>Confusion: 6 vs 8 vs 11%, $P = NS$ | In BT grp, 74% received a single session of biofeedback; other 26% had second anorectal biofeedback or combined bladder-sphincter biofeedback.<br>Daily dose of oxybutynin taken: 2.5 mg (8%), 5 mg (19%), 7.5 mg (24%), 10 mg (17.9%), 15 mg (27%).<br>Overall, 32% had urethrocele, 71% cystocele, 47% rectocele.<br>*pts who underwent pre- and post-treatment urodynamics less likely to have atrophic mucosa (35% vs 50%, $P < 0.04$ ). |
|                             |                   |                                   |  |   |  |                     | Urodynamic findings<br>( $n = 105$ ; 33 BT, 35 oxy, 37 plac)*<br>Mean change in volume, ml | First desire to void: +18.8 vs +44.4 vs +8.9<br>Strong desire to void: +40.5 vs +69.9 vs +7.8, $P = 0.013$ oxy vs plac<br>Bladder capacity: +17.3 vs +68.9 vs -6.0, $P \leq 0.02$ oxy vs other grps   |  |
| Johnson 2005 <sup>316</sup> |                   | 131 (66%) of 197 who had nocturia | As for Burgio 1998 <sup>314,315</sup><br>secondary analysis of pts who had nocturia at baseline (at least one episode of nocturia per night; mean 1.9 in each grp) | Biofeedback-assisted behavioural treatment (BT), $n = 47$ | Oxybutynin 2.5 mg to 5 mg t.d.s. ( $n = 46$ )<br>Placebo t.d.s. ( $n = 38$ ) | 8 weeks             | Nocturia (change from baseline)  | Mean (SD): -0.5 (0.6) vs -0.2 (0.5) vs +0.1 (0.7)<br>Median reduction: 0.5 vs 0.3 vs 0*<br>Pts with 50% less nocturia than baseline: 23 vs 9% vs 3%, $P = 0.03$   | Funding: same as Burgio 1998<br>Reported that there were not sig. differences in baseline characteristics between the population with or without nocturia.<br>* $P < 0.001$ behavioural vs placebo; $P = 0.007$ oxy vs placebo; $P = 0.02$ behavioural vs drug tx.   |

| Study  | Study type and EL   | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Burgio 2000 <sup>325</sup><br>(extension study of Burgio 1998 <sup>314,315</sup> ) | Cohort<br>[EL = 2+] | As Burgio 1998 <sup>314,315</sup> | As Burgio 1998 <sup>314,315</sup><br>Women who completed 8 weeks biofeedback-assisted behavioural treatment or oxybutynin who were not completely dry or not completely satisfied with the outcome were offered the alternative tx in addition to their initial tx.* Some from the oxy group crossed over to BT. Placebo recipients were offered either active tx | BT + oxybutynin (n = 8)                                | Oxybutynin 2.5 mg to 5 mg t.d.s. + BT (n = 27)<br>Oxy crossed over to BT (n = 19)<br>Placebo crossed over to BT (n = 34)<br>Placebo crossed over to drug (n = 10) | 8 weeks             | Leakage episodes/week (change in mean from week 8 to week 16)   | BT + oxy (n = 8) from -58 to -89%, P = 0.034<br>Oxy + BT (n = 27) from -73 to -84%, P = 0.001<br>Oxy crossed over to BT (n = 19) from -59 to -77%, P = NS<br>Placebo crossed over to BT (n = 34) from -23 to -64%, P = 0.002<br>Placebo crossed over to drug (n = 10) from -45 to -77%, P = 0.012                   |  |
| Burgio 2002 <sup>318</sup>   | RCT<br>EL = 1++     | 222 randomised, 195 completed     | F, community-dwelling, mean age 65 years, urge UI 2x/week for ≥ 3 months, and urodynamic evidence (68% urge UI, 32% mixed UI)<br>Exclusions: continual leakage, PVR urine vol. > 150 ml, uterine prolapse past introitus, impaired mental status, decompensated heart failure   | Biofeedback-assisted behavioural training (BT), n = 73 | Behavioural training with feedback from vaginal palpation (n = 74)<br>Self-help (n = 75)  | 8 weeks             | Leakage episodes /week (mean, SD)<br>Patient perceptions of tx* | -63% (43) vs -69% (33), vs -59% (39), P = NS between grps<br>Bio- and verbal- feedback grps better than self-help grp in: description of, and satisfaction with progress, restriction of activities P ≤ 0.05.<br>Verbal feedback also better than self-help in accidents are smaller, comfortable with tx, P ≤ 0.01 | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health.<br>Biofeedback assisted behavioural grp: biofeedback (anorectal balloon probe) –assisted PFMT, 15 exercises 3x/day, max. 10 s each (2 weeks); urge strategies (2 weeks); repeat biofeedback PFMT if not had ≥ 50% reduction in frequency of accidents (2 weeks); review and reinforcement (2 weeks).<br>The 'control' behavioural treatment differed in method of biofeedback (palpation not anorectal).<br>Ability to contract PFM checked at first visit by anorectal biofeedback.<br>Self-help: written instructions of the 8 week behavioural programme.<br>*8 aspects: pt description of |
|  |                     |                                   |   |  |   |                     | Pt description of progress (better or much better)              | 96 vs 98% vs 86%  |  |
|  |                     |                                   |   |  |   |                     | Satisfaction (somewhat or complete)                             | 98 vs 100% vs 95%   |  |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                           |                   |  |   |  |   |                     | IIQ   | Improvement in 4 of 4 domains in all grps, $P < 0.001$ vs baseline   | progress, having fewer accidents, accidents are smaller, able to wear less protection, comfortable enough   |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |   |                     | SF-36   | Improvement in 5 of 8 domains in all grps, $P < 0.05$ vs baseline  | with tx to continue indefinitely, satisfaction with progress, incontinence restricting activities, feeling disturbed about incontinence.  |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |   |                     | Bladder capacity, mean change ( $n = 30, 35, 42$ )                  | +48 ml vs +63 ml, vs +37 ml, $P = 0.001$ vs baseline, $P = NS$ between grps  |   |
| Goode 2003 <sup>319</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 200 randomised, 155 completed (attrition greater in self-help grp [19% vs 12% vs 37%, $P = 0.001$ ]) | F, community-dwelling women, > 40 years (mean 56), predominant stress UI, 2x/week for $\geq 3$ months, and urodynamic evidence (34% stress UI, 66% mixed UI)<br>Exclusions: continual leakage, PVR urine vol. > 150 ml, uterine prolapse past introitus, MMSE score < 24, decompensated heart failure, HbA1C $\geq 9$ | Biofeedback-assisted behavioural training (BT), $n = 66$ | Behavioural training with electrical stimulation ( $n = 67$ )<br>Self-help ( $n = 67$ ) | 8 weeks             | Leakage episodes /week (mean, SD)<br><br>Patient perceptions of tx* | -69% (32) vs -72% (33), vs -53% (43), $P = 0.005$ vs baseline, $P \leq 0.02$ for BT grps vs self-help<br><br>Differences between grps in % much better and completely satisfied, but not in other parameters. Much better: 57 vs 77% vs 30% ( $P \leq 0.05$ BT+ES vs other grps and BT vs self-help)<br>(better or much better: 96 vs 96% vs 80%)<br>Completely satisfied: 66 vs 81% vs 50%, $P = 0.002$ BT+ES vs self-help<br>(somewhat or completely satisfied 98 vs 98% vs 88%) | Funding: National Institutes of Health.<br>Biofeedback assisted behavioural grp: biofeedback (anorectal balloon probe) –assisted PFMT, 15 exercises 3x/day, 2–4 s contractions (visit 1, week 1); stress strategies; the 'knack', managing urgency (visit 2, week 3); review and reinforcement, adjustment of home exercise regimen, repeat biofeedback PFMT if not had $\geq 50\%$ reduction in frequency of accidents (visits 2–4, weeks 2, 4, 6). The behavioural training with electrical stimulation group had the same tx plus ES (Hollister InCare, vaginal probe, biphasic pulses, freq 20 Hz, pulse width 1 ms, current up to 100 mA depending on tolerability). ES used 15 min on alternate days. Ability to contract PFM checked at first visit by anorectal biofeedback.<br>Self-help: written instructions of the 8 week behavioural programme.<br>*7 aspects: pt description of progress, having fewer accidents, |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |   |                     | IIQ   | Improvement in 4 of 4 domains in all grps, $P < 0.001$ vs baseline   |   |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |   |                     | SF-36   | No sig. changes in any grp   |   |



| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients                 | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                   | Comparison                                      | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                                |                   |                                 |  |  |   |                     | Bladder capacity, mean change ( $n = 30, 36, 16$ )                | -3 ml vs +43 ml, vs +29 ml, $P = 0.01$ vs baseline, $P = NS$ between grps                   | accidents are smaller, able to wear less protection, comfortable enough with tx to continue indefinitely, satisfaction with progress, incontinence restricting activities.  |
|                                |                   |                                 |  |  |   |                     | Adverse effects   | Vaginal irritation in 6% BT + ES grp  |   |
| Subak 2002 <sup>320</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 152 randomised, 123 analysed    | F $\geq 55$ years (mean ~69), community dwelling, capable of independent toileting; $\geq 1$ UI episode/week over 6 months (24% stress, 38% urge, 37% mixed)<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, urinary obstruction, overflow, or functional incontinence | Bladder training ( $n = 66$ )                  | Control* ( $n = 57$ )                           | 6 weeks             | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)                               | -4.4 vs -2.2, $P = 0.001$   | Funding: Kaiser Foundation Research Institute.<br><br>BT: 6x 20 min group sessions on bladder training, once/week. Initial session 45 min, with anatomy of urinary tract, normal voiding, UI symptoms and causes. Individualised voiding schedules developed. PFMT (verbal and written instruction) given. Voiding intervals increased by 30 min every week to target voiding frequency every 2.5/3 h. No fluid modifications used.<br><br>No mention of whether ability to contract PFM checked.<br><br>*control grp received no instruction but kept diaries for 6 weeks; after 6 weeks, this grp given behaviour therapy. 12 week and 6 months results also given in trial report, but only for total group. |
|                                |                   |                                 |  |  |   |                     | Frequency/week (mean change)                                      | Day: -1.3 vs +0.8<br>Night: +0.9 vs -0.2<br>$P = NS$ both comparisons                       |   |
|                                |                   |                                 |  |  |   |                     | Pt perception of helpfulness of programme (at 6 months, all pts)* | 33% great deal of help, 26% moderately helpful, 29% slightly, 12% not at all                |   |
| McFall 2000 <sup>321,322</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 145 randomised, 108 competed tx | F $\geq 65$ years, UI $\geq 3$ months, living independently (77% had symptoms of stress UI, 74% symptoms of urge UI)<br><br>Exclusions: severe uterine prolapse, haematuria,   | Behavioural therapy ( $n = 72$ ; data from 49) | Control (usual care) ( $n = 73$ ; data from 59) | 10 weeks            | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)                               | -2.9 vs -0.6, $P = 0.004$<br>Day: -4.1 vs -1.2, $P = 0.02$<br>Night: +1.8 vs -0.3, $P = NS$ | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Behavioural therapy: 5x small grp sessions every 2 weeks: information and training in; skill-building in relation to bladder training (coping, problem-solving), managing urgency, performing PFM exercises. (no further details of PFMT).   |
|                                |                   |                                 |  |  |   |                     | % with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes                  | 61% vs 38%, $P = 0.03$  |   |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients              | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                       | Comparison        | Length of follow-up                                       | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|--|
|   |                   |                              | diverticulum, fistula, unresolved or recurring UTI, PVR > 100 ml blood glucose > 5.6 mmol/l, cognitive impairment   |                                    |                   |   | QOL (SF-36)# (physical function, mental health, vitality, health perception, impact subscales) | No sig. effect or difference reported for either grp in any subscale.   |  |
| McDowell 1999 <sup>323</sup><br>Engberg 2002 <sup>324</sup><br>although described as one RCT, <sup>941</sup> these studies are effectively 2 separate RCTs, with tx given dependent on cognitive status | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 105 (91% women); 93 analysed | Cognitively intact homebound M/F (MMSE ≥ 24), mean age 77 years, UI > 2/week for > 3 months<br>Exclusions: severe pelvic prolapse, PVR > 100 ml, unable to toilet independently | Biofeedback-assisted PFMT (n = 48) | Control* (n = 45) | 8 weeks (*after which grps crossed over to active tx arm) | Leakage episodes/day   | Mean change -61% vs +48%, P = 0.004<br>Median change -75% vs -6%, P < 0.001   | Funding: National Institute for Nursing research grant.<br>Biofeedback (EMG) assisted PFMT: biofeedback used to teach correct PFM contraction; repeated up to 4 times during tx, depending on progress; PFMT 3 sessions of 10–15 exercises /day, 1 standing, 1 sitting, 1 lying down. Following PFMT, urge or stress strategies used (in 81% and 42% respectively), with bladder training if voiding > once/2 h.<br>Control: nurses visited pts socially every 1–2 weeks. No discussion of UI.<br>After 8 week study, control grp offered active tx for 8 weeks. 85 in total completed active tx protocol, -74% change in leakage episodes/day vs baseline, P < 0.001. |
|   |                   | 19 (68% women)               | Cognitively impaired homebound M/F (MMSE < 24), mean age 83 years, UI > 2/week for > 3 months, had full time caregiver<br>Exclusions:   | Prompted voiding (n = 9)*          | Control (n = 10)  | 8 weeks   | Leakage episodes (mean change)<br>% wet (mean change)  | Per 24 h: -47 vs -27%, P = NS<br>daytime: -50 vs -37%, P = NS<br>Day: -43 vs -35%, P = NS<br>Day and night: -41 vs -23%, P = NS | Prompted voiding: nurses visited pt and carer every week, caregiver instructed to check if pt wished to void every 2 h, then check if wet; praise correct 'response', encourage to toilet at 2 h. Prompted voiding time adjusted to pt if they self-initiated toileting. No intervention at night. Caffeine  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                | Effect size                                | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|       |                   |                 | PVR > 100 ml (ultrasound) |              |            |                     | Self-initiated toileting (mean change $\pm$ SD) | +3.1 $\pm$ 4.8 vs +1.9 $\pm$ 2.1, $P = NS$ | eliminated from diet.<br>Control: nurses visited pts socially every 1–2 weeks. No toileting information or support given.<br>Prompted voiding: at baseline, control had sig. more day and night-time UI episodes ( $P = 0.04$ ), and sig. greater % of day and night voids were incontinent, $P = 0.02$ .<br>ITT results shown. After 8 week study, control grp offered prompted voiding for 8 weeks. 15 in total completed prompted voiding protocol, –22% change in daytime leakage episodes vs baseline. |

Prompted voiding RCTs

| Study                  | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                  | Comparison           | Length of follow-up                     | Outcome measures                  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Hu 1989 <sup>327</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 143 randomised, 133 completed tx, 113 completed follow-up | F, $\geq$ 65 years (mean 85), nursing home residents, UI during daytime (mean 2/day), able to recognise own name; required assistance with activities of daily living, 13% ambulatory, mean MMSE score 13. Mean residual vol. ~100 ml, mean bladder capacity ~285 ml | Prompted voiding ( $n = 72$ ) | Control ( $n = 71$ ) | 13 weeks tx, further 22 weeks follow-up | Wet episodes/day (mean change, %) | –0.6 (26%) vs –0.2 (8%) $P < 0.05$ (13 weeks)<br>–0.5 vs –0.1 (35 weeks), $P$ value not given | Funding: National Institute on Aging. National Center for Nursing Research.<br>Behaviour programme delivered by nursing assistants; hourly prompted voiding, assisted pt to the toilet, praised successful toileting, special attention if pt dry on scheduled check. Pts encouraged to inform assistant if needed to toilet in between prompted voids.<br>Implemented 14 h/day (7 am to |
|                        |                   |   |  |                               |                      |   | $n$ with 100% improvement         | 1 (1.5%) vs 0 (13 weeks)  |  |
|                        |                   |   |  |                               |                      |   | $n$ with $\geq$ 50% improvement   | 25 (38%) vs 10 (15%) (13 weeks)   |  |
|                        |                   |   |  |                               |                      |   | $n$ with no improvement           | 16 (25%) vs 24 (35%) (13 weeks)   |  |

| Study                            | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention              | Comparison                                | Length of follow-up                       | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
|                                  |                   |                 | Urodynamic categories: normal cystometrogram $\pm$ urgency) 41%; DO with urge 15%; DO without urge 23%, stress UI 16%, overflow incontinence 5%.  |                           |   |   | Self-initiated requests (mean change)  | +1.5 vs +0.5 (13 weeks)<br>+0.7 vs +0.5 (35 weeks) [values estimated from graph] | 9 pm), 7 days /week.<br>Control grp received usual continence care (prompted voiding not enforced).<br>Wet checks done hourly. Change from baseline to last month of tx period reported. |
| Schnelle 1983 <sup>328</sup>     | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 21 (71% women)  | M/F, nursing home residents, mean age ~82 years (48–96), not physically capable of independent toileting, 95% had diagnosis of 'organic brain syndrome' or senile dementia  | Prompted voiding (n = 11) | Control (n = 10)                          | 3 weeks tx                                | % checks wet (mean change)<br>Requests for toileting assistance (mean change, n/day)                       | -15 vs +0.4%<br>+1.7 vs -0.1   | Funding: none declared.<br>Hourly wet checks and prompted voiding from 7 am to 7 pm, social reinforcement if dry.<br>Control group; had wet checks only.                                 |
| Schnelle 1989 <sup>326,329</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 126 (75% women) | M/F, nursing home residents, mean age 82 years, UI $\geq 2\times$ in 5 day period, mean MMSE score 8; 89% unable to stand unassisted; 20% totally dependent. Urodynamic diagnosis: 25% normal CMG, 31% DO, 12% high residual (> 100 ml), 12% stress UI, 10% mixed UI, 10% unknown | Prompted voiding (n = 63) | No prompted voiding (usual care) (n = 63) | 10 days at 4 sites,<br>20 days at 1 sites | % checks wet<br>% appropriate toileting (toileting into receptacle /total continent and incontinent voids) | -41% vs 0%<br>+300% vs 0   | Funding: none declared.<br>Hourly prompted voiding from 7 am to 7 pm. Those who responded to hourly prompted voiding moved to 2 hourly; social reinforcement if dry.                     |
| Schnelle 2002 <sup>330</sup>     | RCT               | 190 randomised  | Nursing home M/F residents, mean age  | Functional incidental     | Control (usual care)                      | 32 weeks                                  | UI (% checks wet, mean change)   | -14% vs +1% (P < 0.01 FIT grp vs baseline)                                       | Funding: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Aging.   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients                               | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size                                       | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|---|--|--|------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|       | EL = 1+           | (84% female), 148 completed 32 week follow-up | ~87 years, UI, free of catheter, able to follow one step instruction, MMSE score ~13; 60–63% ambulatory<br>Exclusions: requiring post-acute skilled care; terminally ill | training (FIT), including 2 h prompted voiding<br>(n = 94) | (n = 96)   |                     | Urine toileting ratio (no. times toilet or toilet substitute used/total no. voids; mean change) | +44 vs –4% ( <i>P</i> < 0.01 FIT grp vs baseline) | FIT: care processes designed to increase activity and functional ability and integrated with incontinence care; implemented every 2 h 5 days/week from ~8 am to 4.30 pm; residents prompted to toilet and changed if wet, encouraged to walk (max. 10 min), or wheel chairs if immobile and repeat sit-to-stands up to 8×. All given upper body resistance training (arm curls/raises) once/day. Fluids offered before and after each care episode.<br><br>Wetness check every hour from 8 am to 4 pm (2 days during baseline and last week of tx). Other outcomes measured; distance walked/wheeled, standing time, faecal incontinence. |

*Timed voiding RCTs*

| Study                       | Study type and EL      | No. of patients                          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison          | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                               | Effect size                                     | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Colling 1992 <sup>332</sup> | Cluster RCT<br>EL = 1– | 113 randomised (82% women), 88 completed | Nursing home M/F residents ≥ 65 years, ≥ 3 UI episodes/week in last 2 weeks, able to state name or place of residence, toilet with assistance of 1 person only. 73% urge UI, 27% | Individualised scheduled toileting ('pattern urge-response toileting')<br>(n = 63) | Control<br>(n = 50) | 36 weeks (12 weeks baseline, 12 weeks tx, 12 weeks follow-up) | Leakage episodes/day (mean change vs baseline) | –0.9 vs 0 (24 weeks)<br>–0.3 vs +0.7 (36 weeks) | Funding: Facilities reimbursed for staff time in the project.<br><br>Cluster RCT because nursing home staff carried out the toileting programme. NH staff given 4 h educational programme (causes and consequences of UI, info re the programme). Project staff provided |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---------------------|---|---|--|
|                             |                   |  | mixed UI. Urodynamic residual vol. means 79 and 86 ml; vol. at strong desire to void means 243 and 235 ml  |   |  |                     | Volume voided   | No numerical data. No sig. difference between grps at any time point (as shown by CI on graph)  | encouragement to nursing staff throughout the programme to comply with the toileting schedule.<br>Toileting schedule: toilet within 30 min prior to an individual's mean time of voiding, as captured during 12 week baseline using electronic data logger.<br>Withdrawals; 12 vs 13 active vs control grps.<br>Although a cluster RCT, findings reported for individuals not by nursing home. |
| Tobin 1986 <sup>333</sup>   | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 278 (83% women)                          | M/F, residential home residents, mean age 82 years, 78% had 'chronic brain failure' (score of ≤ 6 on 10-point mental status questionnaire), 93% women and 97% men had UI owing to unstable bladder contractions (overall 74% had unstable bladder, 19% unstable bladder and stress UI; 3% stress UI alone, 4% 'other') | Timed voiding for unstable bladder + propantheline 15 mg + flavoxate 200 mg q.d.s.; and PFMT for females with stress UI ( <i>n</i> = 174) | No advice (usual care) ( <i>n</i> = 104) | 8 weeks             | Daytime leakage episodes (% reporting improvement)<br>Night-time leakage episodes (% reporting improvement)<br>Pad test (% showing improvement) | 40/102 (39%) vs 26/89 (29%), <i>P</i> = NS (remainder unchanged)<br>39/95 (41%) vs 18/79 (23%), <i>P</i> = 0.016 (remainder unchanged)<br>16/65 (25%) vs 11/45 (24%), <i>P</i> = NS<br>43% vs 44% unchanged<br>32% vs 31% worse | Funding: none declared.<br>Timed voiding: 2 hourly voiding. [EL = 1-] it is unclear how many offered PFMT, or what training entailed. Also, antibiotics were given for UTI, and ethinylestradiol 30 µg/day for 3 weeks for women with atrophic vaginitis (number not stated).  |
| Jirovec 2001 <sup>334</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 118 (69% women) randomised, 74 completed | M/F mean age 80 years, memory-impaired, having caregiver support at home. 60% some symptoms of urgency, 18% positive stress test, PVR (bladder scan) mean  | Individualised scheduled toileting with 3×2 month visits ( <i>n</i> = 38) or 1×6 month visit* ( <i>n</i> = 39)                            | Control ( <i>n</i> = 41)                 | 6 months            | % with reduced leakage episodes/day   | 28/44 (64%), <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline vs 15/30 (50%)<br>no between-grp comparisons   | Funding: National Institute of Nursing Research.<br>Individualised training programme; scheduled toileting according to voiding pattern (most ~2 h), education re fluid intake (consistent, minimum 6× 8 oz glasses/day);  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention                                   | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                   | Effect size               | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--|------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
|       |                   |                 | 64 ml                   | [results from both grps combined; 44 analysed] |            |                     | Leakage episodes/day (mean change) | -0.06 (14%) vs -0.02 (4%) | monthly phone calls, advice on environment (Obstacles to urine control), visits every 2 or 6 months (*group originally randomised to 3× 2-month or 1× 6-month visit – because incontinence similar in both grps, results were combined).<br>Control grp: given monthly visits and paid \$25.<br>Withdrawals; 33 vs 11 active vs control grps. |

## Drug therapies

### Antimuscarinic drugs

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison                | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Haab 2004 <sup>341</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 561 (85% women) | M/F, aged 19–88 years (mean ~57), OAB* for ≥ 6 months; urge UI (median 16–17 episodes/week), frequency ≥ 8 voids/24 h (median 10), urgency ≥ 1/day (median 7–8) capable of independent toileting<br><br>Exclusions; contraindications to antimuscarinics, stress UI (> 1 episode/week), clinically significant bladder outlet obstruction and/or PVR vol. > 200 ml, genitourinary conditions | Darifenacin ER 15 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 115)<br>Darifenacin ER 7.5 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 229)<br>Darifenacin ER 3.75 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 53) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 164) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (median change)<br><br>Frequency /day (median change)<br><br>Urgency /day (median change)<br><br>Severity of urgency on 100 mm VAS (median change) | -73 vs -68 vs -59 vs -56%<br><br><i>P</i> = 0.017 dar 15 mg vs placebo; <i>P</i> = 0.01 dar 7.5 mg vs plac<br><br>-15 vs -16 vs -14 vs -8%<br><br><i>P</i> < 0.001 for dar 15 mg and 7.5 mg vs plac<br><br>-29 vs -29 vs -21 vs -13%, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.005 for dar 15 mg and 7.5 mg vs plac<br><br>-17 vs -14 vs -10 vs -8%, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.002 for dar 15 mg and 7.5 mg vs plac | Funding: Pfizer Inc. Preparation of manuscript supported by an educational grant from Novartis Pharma AG. Editorial and project management services from Thomson Acumed.<br><br>Unclear why the blocked randomisation schedule used was chosen, leading to twice as any pts treated with 7.5 mg as 15 mg doses.<br><br>Overall compliance was > 86%.<br><br>*6% had neurogenic OAB. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                            |                   |   | that could cause urinary symptoms, recent urogenital surgery, hepatic disease, pts intending to start bladder training programme   |  |                       |                     | Mean vol. Voided (median change)                       | +20 vs +9 vs +5 vs +5%, $P \leq 0.04$ for dar 15 mg and 7.5 mg vs plac   | Baseline urgency severity score ~54–58 on 0–100 scale (0 = mild, 100 = severe).   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Nocturnal awakenings/week owing to OAB (median change) | –13 vs –14 vs –18 vs –14%<br>$P = NS$ between grps   |   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Adverse effects (%)                                    | Overall 53 vs 52 vs 45 vs 40<br>Occurring in $\geq 3\%$ of any grp:<br>dry mouth 31 vs 19 vs 12 vs 9<br>constipation 14 vs 14 vs 4 vs 7<br>dyspepsia 8 vs 2 vs 4 vs 2<br>gastritis 0 vs 0.4 vs 4 vs 0.6<br>headache 4 vs 1 vs 2 vs 2 |   |
| Steers 2005 <sup>342</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 398 randomised (84% women); 3 pts not treated after randomisation | M/F aged 22–89 years (mean 58), OAB* for $\geq 6$ months; urge UI (median 14–16/week), frequency $\geq 8$ voids/24 h (~10), urgency $\geq 1$ /day (~8) capable of independent toileting<br><br>Exclusions; contraindications to antimuscarinics, stress UI, clinically significant bladder outlet obstruction and/or PVR vol. > 200 ml, genitourinary conditions that could cause urinary symptoms, faecal | Darifenacin ER 7.5 mg/day, increasing to 15 mg after 2 weeks if required ( $n = 268$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 127$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (median change)                  | –62 vs –49%,<br>$P = 0.035$<br>responder rates 62% vs 49% $P = 0.012$  | Funding: Pfizer Inc. Preparation of manuscript supported by an educational grant from Novartis Pharma AG. Editorial and project management services from Thomson Acumed. Overall compliance was $\geq 84\%$ .<br>Dose increased by 59% of darifenacin vs 68% of placebo grp., $P = NS$ .<br>Baseline urgency severity score 53 on 0–100 scale (0 = mild, 100 = severe). |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Frequency /day (median change)                         | –19 vs –10%,<br>$P \leq 0.001$   |   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Urgency /day (median change)                           | –28 vs –11%,<br>$P \leq 0.001$   |   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Severity of urgency on 100 mm VAS (median change)      | –17% vs –6%,<br>$P < 0.05$   |   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Mean vol. Voided (median change)                       | +11% vs +5%,<br>$P < 0.05$   |   |
|                            |                   |   |  |  |                       |                     | Nocturnal awakenings/week owing to OAB (median change) | –18% vs –13%,<br>$P = NS$  |   |



| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                | Comparison                | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
|                             |                   |   | impaction or severe constipation, urogenital surgery in last 6 months, indwelling catheter or ISC  |   |                           |                     | Adverse effects (%)                               | ≥ 1 AE: 41 vs 21<br>Constipation 21 vs 8<br>dry mouth 19 vs 9<br>headache 7 vs 5.5.<br>6 vs 2 discontinuations owing to AE, mainly constipation ( <i>n</i> = 6 vs 1) and dry mouth (2 vs 0) |  |
| Cardozo 2005 <sup>343</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 72 (71% women)  | M/F mean age 54, urgency for ≥ 6 months<br>Exclusions; contraindication to antimuscarinics, stress UI, voiding difficulty, genitourinary conditions that could cause urinary symptoms, pts intending to start bladder training programme | Darifenacin ER 30 mg ( <i>n</i> = 36)       | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 36)  | 2 weeks tx          | Urgency severity (100 mm VAS)                     | Median difference vs placebo -5.8 (95% CI -11.5, +0.4)  | Funding: Pfizer Inc. and an educational grant from Novartis Pharma AG.   |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Urgency episodes/24 h                             | Median difference vs placebo -0.2 (95% CI -1.0, +0.7)   | Primary outcome was change in warning time (time from first sensation of urgency to voluntary voiding or incontinence, recorded during a 6 h clinic based monitoring period.)                          |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Adverse effects (%)                               | ≥ 1 AE: 75 vs 8<br>Dry mouth 64 vs 6, constipation 36 vs 6  | Groups were not balanced at baseline for the primary outcome (median 4.7 vs 9.3 min).  |
| Zinner 2006 <sup>344</sup>  | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 445 randomised, 439 ITT analysis; about 85% completed the study | M/F with OAB, with mean ≥ 1 urge UI episode/day (mean ~18-21 a week) frequency ≥ 8 (mean 11), and ≥ 4 urgency episodes (mean ~82-85 per week). Mean warning time ≤ 15 min (mean ~ 4.5)<br>54% had prior OAB therapy (no further          | Darifenacin ER 15 mg o.d. ( <i>n</i> = 216) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 229) | 12 weeks tx         | Warning time (median change within-patient)*      | +42% vs 18%, <i>P</i> = NS  | Funding: Novartis Pharma AG.<br>*measured over 12 consecutive h; stop watch from 1st sensation to void, pt instructed to delay void as long as possible, then stop the watch at initiation of voiding. |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Frequency per 24 h (median change)                | -2.2 vs -1.8 (20% vs 16%) <i>P</i> = NS   |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Urgency per week (median change)                  | -18.2 vs -15.6 (22% vs 18%) <i>P</i> = NS   |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Urge UI leakage episodes per week (median change) | -12.6 vs -9.8 (67% vs 46%) <i>P</i> = 0.035   |  |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |                           |                     | Volume voided (median change, ml)                 | +22.6 vs +11.3 (15% vs 8%) <i>P</i> = 0.002   |  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL            | No. of patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                      | Comparison                          | Length of follow-up                            | Outcome measures                           | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                             |                              |  | details)<br>Exclusions: stress UI, marked cystocele or pelvic prolapse; catheterisation, bladder outlet obstruction, intention to start bladder training programme  |   |                                     |  | QOL (OAB-q, KHQ)                           | Sig. improvement in all 5 domains of OAB-q with darifenacin vs placebo, $P < 0.05$<br>and in 4 of 9 domains of the KHQ (incontinence impact, role limitations, physical limitations, severity measures)       |  |
|                             |                              |  |   |   |                                     |  | Adverse effects (%)                        | Any 64% vs 50%<br>Discontinuations owing to AE 8% vs 4%<br>29% vs 6% dry mouth<br>18% vs 5% constipation<br>10% vs 8% UTI<br>8% vs 2% dyspepsia<br>6% vs 2% headache<br>4% vs 4% diarrhoea<br>4% vs 2% nausea |  |
| Chapple 1990 <sup>345</sup> | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1– | 41 'included', 25 analysed (48% women) | M/F mean age 51 years, idiopathic DO confirmed by videocystometry (frequency mean 12/day, nocturia mean 3.3; 40% UI usually, 16% sometimes, 44% rarely; 76% urgency usually, 24% sometimes)<br>Exclusions: bladder outflow obstruction, neurological disease, coexisting medical conditions that may affect the bladder | Flavoxate 200 mg t.d.s. then placebo ( $n = 11$ ) | Placebo then flavoxate ( $n = 14$ ) | 2x2 week tx periods, 1 week washout in between | Frequency/day (mean change)<br>Cystometry* | Results for only flavoxate-placebo arm after 1 or 2 weeks<br>Mean differences (95% CI) reported for flavoxate vs placebo. No sig. difference found in any parameter.  | Funding: none declared.<br>*max. pressure rise, end filling pressure, volume at initial pressure rise, volume at which incontinence occurred, final tolerated filling volume, end residual volume, free flow rate, max. voiding pressure |

| Study                       | Study type and EL            | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Comparison                               | Length of follow-up                            | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Meyhoff 1983 <sup>346</sup> | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 20              | F, median age 51 years (22–79), urge UI (50% stress UI), DO, max. urinary flow rate > 15 ml/s, residual urine vol. < 50 ml. 25% had previous continence surgery. Baseline data (medians/3 days): 24 (12–64) voids, 2 (0–22) leakage episodes, 3 (0–16) nocturia episodes<br><br>Exclusions: neurological disease, glaucoma, severe heart failure | Flavoxate 200 mg q.d.s.                  | Emepronium 200 mg q.d.s.<br><br>Placebo  | 3×2 week tx periods, 1 week washout in between | Frequency/3 days (median at end of tx)<br><br>Leakage episodes/3 days (median at end of tx)<br><br>Nocturia /3 days (median at end of tx)<br><br>Adverse effects ( <i>n</i> ; most common) | 25 (11–64) vs 23.5 (12–70) vs 23 (12–53) <i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>1 (0–17) vs 1 (0–11) vs 0 (0–14) <i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>3 (0–13) vs 2.5 (0–18) vs 0 (0–9) <i>P</i> = NS between grps<br><br>Dry mouth 5 vs 8 vs 5<br>nausea, heartburn 7 vs 7 vs 2<br>None 7 vs 6 vs 7 | Funding: flavoxate tablets supplied by Pharmacia Ltd, emepronium and placebo by Kabi Vitrum Ltd.<br><br>Patients' preferences for drugs also reported.  |
| Milani 1988 <sup>347</sup>  | DB RCT<br>EL = 1–            | 27              | F mean age ~50 years, sensory and/or motor urge syndrome<br><br>Exclusions: urogenital tract infections, neurological disease, predominant stress UI   | Flavoxate 200 mg t.d.s. ( <i>n</i> = 14) | Flavoxate 400 mg t.d.s. ( <i>n</i> = 13) | 4 weeks tx                                     | Symptoms scores* (change in mean)<br><br>Urodynamics (mean change)<br><br>Adverse effects  | –3.3 vs –3.5#<br><br>Sig. difference between grps in volume at 1st desire to void: +37% vs +48%, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br><br>Bladder volume at capacity: +7% vs +12% ( <i>P</i> < 0.01 vs baseline for 400 mg t.d.s. grp)<br><br>Nausea (3 in each grp)   | Funding: none declared.<br>*scoring system of 0–2 used for the following symptoms: diurnal and nocturnal frequency, incontinence, enuresis, urgency, dysuria.<br>#baseline scores 6.5 vs 5.7. |
| Lose 1989 <sup>348</sup>    | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 19              | F, median age 53 years (29–78), DO with frequency, urgency or urge UI, and failed to respond to other drug tx (mainly antimuscarinics). 12 had suprapubic anti-incontinence procedure, 9 vaginal repair, 7   | Doxepin 50–75 mg at night                | Placebo                                  | 2×3 week tx periods, 2 week washout in between | Leakage /3 days (change in median)<br><br>Frequency (change in median)   | Day: –3 (75%) vs –0.5 (13%) <i>P</i> = NS<br>Night: –1 (100%) vs 0, <i>P</i> < 0.05<br><br>Day: –4 (15%) vs –4 (15%) <i>P</i> = NS<br>Night: –3 (75%) vs 0, <i>P</i> < 0.001   | Funding: none declared.   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                            |                   |                 | hysterectomy. Median daytime frequency 26/3 days (range 4–99), leakage /3 days 4 (0–26), g urine loss 39 (0–101), nocturnal voids 4 (0–16), nocturia 1 (0–5)<br>Exclusions: genital prolapse or cystocele indicating an operation, drugs affecting the lower urinary tract   |   |  |                     | 1 h pad test (change in median, g)<br>Urodynamics<br>Adverse effects (n)  | –33 (84%) vs +1 (26%) <i>P</i> = NS<br>first desire to void: +87 vs +33%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Max. cystometric capacity +58 vs +22%, <i>P</i> = 0.04<br>Residual vol. 0 vs –100%, <i>P</i> = 0.014<br>Any: 14 (68%) vs 3 (16%)<br>Fatigue 8 vs 2<br>dry mouth 8 vs 2<br>dizziness 4 vs 1<br>weakness 1 vs 0<br>blurred vision 1 vs 0      |  |
| Abrams 1998 <sup>349</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 293 (76% women) | M/F 19–80 years, urodynamic bladder overactivity; 94% had frequency (≥ 8 voids/24 h); 75% urge UI (mean 2.6–3.3/24 h), 98% also had urgency. ~30% had prior surgery affecting the lower urinary tract. 60% had prior drug tx for OAB<br>Exclusions: clinically significant stress UI, detrusor hyper-reflexia, hepatic, renal, haematological disorders, UTI, bladder outlet obstruction | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 118) | Oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s. ( <i>n</i> = 118)<br>Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 57) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency /24 h (mean change)<br>Leakage episodes /24 h (mean change)<br>Mean vol. Voided (mean change, ml)<br>Subjective improvement | –21 vs –19.5 vs –10.5%, ( <i>P</i> = 0.0022 tol vs plac)<br>difference in mean change between tol and oxy –0.5 (95% CI –1.1, +0.1)<br>–47 vs –71 vs –19%, ( <i>P</i> = 0.023 oxybutynin vs plac)<br>difference in mean change between tol and oxy 0.4 (95% CI –0.2, +1.0)<br>+27 vs +31 vs +7% ( <i>P</i> < 0.001 tol and oxy vs plac) | Funding: Pharmacia and Upjohn.<br>More pts in the placebo grp had previous drug therapy for OAB (75% vs 52% tolterodine, 60% oxybutynin, <i>P</i> < 0.05).<br>Response to tx in this group was not considered separately.<br>Doses could be halved during weeks 1–2 for pts with intolerable adverse effects. This occurred in 8 vs 32% vs 2%. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|---|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                              |                   |  |   |   |   |                     | Adverse effects (%)  | <p>Pts reporting <math>\geq 1</math> AE<br/>89 vs 97 vs 81,<br/><math>P \leq 0.023</math> oxy vs<br/>other grps.<br/>Withdrawals owing to<br/>AE:<br/>8 vs 17 vs 12<br/>AE reported by <math>&gt; 10\%</math><br/>in any grp:<br/>dry mouth 50 vs 86 vs<br/>21 (<math>P &lt; 0.001</math> tol and<br/>oxy vs plac; and oxy<br/>vs tol);<br/>dyspepsia 9 vs 23 vs<br/>5; nausea 3 vs 6 vs<br/>11; upper RTI 10 vs 3<br/>vs 14</p>                 |   |
| Drutz<br>1999 <sup>350</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 277 (77%<br>women);<br>147 (53%)<br>analysed for<br>efficacy | M/F (all females<br>postmenopausal), 23–<br>91 years, DO. 99% had<br>frequency ( $\geq 8$ voids/24<br>h); 88% urge UI (mean<br>3.4–3.7/24 h), 97% also<br>had urgency. 35% had<br>prior surgery affecting<br>the lower urinary tract.<br>47% had prior drug tx for<br>urge UI<br><br>Exclusions: clinical sig.<br>stress UI or voiding<br>dysfunction, mean<br>voided vol./24 h $> 3$ litre,<br>hepatic or renal disease,<br>UTI, uninvestigated<br>haematuria or | Tolterodine 2 mg<br>b.d. ( $n = 109$<br>randomised, 70<br>analysed) | Oxybutynin 5 mg<br>t.d.s. ( $n = 112$<br>randomised, 41<br>analysed)<br><br>Placebo ( $n = 56$<br>randomised, 36<br>analysed) | 12 weeks tx         | <p>Frequency /24 h<br/>(mean change)</p> <p>Leakage episodes<br/>/24 h (mean change)</p> <p>Mean vol. Voided<br/>(mean change, ml)</p> | <p>–17 vs –17 vs –9.6%,<br/>(<math>P = 0.036</math> tol vs plac)<br/>difference in mean<br/>change between tol<br/>and oxy 0 (95% CI –<br/>0.8, +0.8)</p> <p>–45.9 vs –51.5 vs –<br/>27.8%, (<math>P = \text{NS}</math> tol or<br/>oxy vs plac)<br/>difference in mean<br/>change between tol<br/>and oxy 0 (95% CI –<br/>0.7, +0.7)</p> <p>+34 vs +50 vs +12<br/>(<math>P \leq 0.0075</math> tol and<br/>oxy vs plac) (22 vs<br/>34% vs 8%)</p> | <p>Funding: Pharmacia and<br/>Upjohn.</p> <p>More pts in the oxy grp<br/>had previous surgery for<br/>OAB (45% vs 27%<br/>tolterodine, 34% plac,<br/><math>P &lt; 0.05</math>).</p> <p>Results for pts<br/>previously receiving<br/>drug tx for urge UI not<br/>considered separately.</p> <p>Doses could be halved<br/>during weeks 1–2 for pts<br/>with intolerable adverse<br/>effects. This occurred in<br/>7 vs 23% vs 4%.</p> <p>[EL = 1–] Efficacy</p> |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                           | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                                |                   |                 | secondary to malignancy, indwelling catheter or ISC, previous tolterodine tx, previous serious AE on oxy, bladder outlet obstruction   |  |  |                     | Adverse effects (all pts randomised) %   | Pts reporting $\geq 1$ AE; 78 vs 90 vs 75, $P \leq 0.013$ oxy vs other grps. Withdrawals owing to AE: 6 vs 21 vs 7, $P \leq 0.026$ oxy vs other grps. Dry mouth 30 vs 69 vs 15 ( $P < 0.001$ oxy vs tol)  | assessed in protocol correct population (completers, dose not reduced, no protocol violations).  |
| Dmochowski 2003 <sup>351</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 361 (93% women) | M/F mean age ~63 years, currently benefiting from tx for OAB (47% tolterodine, 50% oxybutynin, 3% others); frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h; mean ~12), urge UI ( $\geq 1/24$ h; mean ~4–5), mean voided vol. $\leq 350$ ml<br><br>Exclusions: urinary tract surgery within 6 months, interstitial cystitis, urethral syndrome, painful bladder syndrome, overflow UI | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. ( $n = 123$ ) | Transdermal oxybutynin 3.9 mg/day ( $n = 121$ )<br><br>Placebo ( $n = 117$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Subjective cure of urge UI<br><br>Mean voided volume (mean change)<br><br>QOL (mean change in scores) | -18 vs -15 vs -11%<br>$P = 0.0025$ tol vs plac, $P = \text{NS}$ other comparisons<br><br>-64 vs -62 vs -42%<br>$P \leq 0.01$ tol or oxy vs plac, $P = \text{NS}$ tol vs oxy<br><br>38 vs 39% vs 22%,<br>$P = 0.014$ tol or oxy vs plac<br><br>+18 vs +19 vs +5%,<br>$P$ value not given<br><br>IIQ-travel: -22 vs -23 vs -11 (47 vs 47% vs 26%) $P \leq 0.005$ active tx vs plac<br><br>UDI-irritative symps: -28 vs -25 vs -18 (42 vs 40% vs 29%)<br>$P \leq 0.01$ active tx vs plac | Funding: Watson Pharma.<br>2 weeks washout of current tx preceded 12 weeks tx.<br><br>Oxybutynin applied twice a week on the abdomen.<br><br>No details of efficacy according to previous antimuscarinic tx. |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                           | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|---|
|  |                   |                 |   |  |   |                     | Adverse effects (%)   | Withdrawals owing to AE:<br>1.6 tol vs 11 oxy<br>With tolterodine antimuscarinic AE most common, included:<br>constipation 5.7 vs 3.3 plac; dry mouth 7.3 vs 4.1 vs 1.7<br>( $P = 0.038$ tol vs plac)<br>With oxy: application-site reactions most common; erythema 8.3 vs 1.7, pruritus 14 vs 4.3   |   |
| Homma 2003 <sup>352</sup><br>Related publication s: Homma 2004 <sup>942</sup><br>Takei 2005 <sup>395</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 605 (70% women) | M/F (Japan and Korea), mean ~59 years (25–88), urgency, frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h; mean ~11), urge UI ( $\geq 5/\text{week}$ ; mean ~20). 24% prior drug tx for OAB<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, daily urine vol. > 3 litre, mean voided vol. > 200 ml, hepatic or renal disease, contraindication to antimuscarinics, UTI, interstitial cystitis, haematuria, bladder outlet obstruction, indwelling catheter or ISC, electrostimulation or bladder training within | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. ( $n = 239$ ) | Oxybutynin 3 mg t.d.s. ( $n = 244$ )<br>Placebo ( $n = 122$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (median change)<br><br>Frequency /24 h (median change)<br><br>Mean volume voided (median change, ml)<br><br>Subjective assessment | –78.6 vs –76.5 vs –46.4%<br>$P \leq 0.017$ tol or oxy vs plac, $P = \text{NS}$ tol vs oxy<br><br>–2.0 vs –2.1 vs –1.1<br>$P \leq 0.011$ tol or oxy vs plac, $P = \text{NS}$ tol vs oxy<br><br>+17.2 vs +22.3 vs +6.6 (19 vs 19% vs 11%)<br>$P \leq 0.008$ tol or oxy vs plac, $P = \text{NS}$ tol vs oxy<br><br>Improvement 72 vs 73% vs 59%, $P = \text{NS}$<br>Deterioration 5 vs 5% vs 8% | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>2 weeks washout of current tx preceded 12 weeks tx.<br>98 vs 93% vs 94% of each grp took $\geq 75\%$ of medication.<br>Response for pts previously treated for OAB not reported. |

| Study | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention             | Comparison | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures      | Effect size  | Additional comments                         |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
|       |                       |                 | 14 days  |                          |            |                            | QOL (King's Health Q) | Selected results presented. No sig. difference reported between tol and oxy in any domain.   |   |
|       |                       |                 |  |                          |            |                            | Adverse effects (%)   | Withdrawals 10 vs 23 vs 16; owing to AE: 5 vs 17 vs 9<br>AE reported in ≥ 5% of any grp:<br>dry mouth 34 vs 54 vs 10 ( $P < 0.001$ tol vs oxy); constipation 7 vs 6 vs 5<br>abdominal pain or tenderness 6 vs 5 vs 3<br>dyspepsia 4 vs 8 vs 3<br>headache 4 vs 4 vs 7<br>difficulty in micturition 1 vs 9 vs 2 |   |
|       | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 188             | M/F mean age 64 years, ~66% female, had been treated with tolterodine ( $n = 80$ ), oxybutynin ( $n = 74$ ) or placebo | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. | –          | Continued tx to 12 months* | Efficacy              | Median reduction in leakage episodes 93%, frequency 21%, voided vol. increase by 20%   | *Japanese arm of study only. <sup>395</sup> |



| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                                |                   |                 | ( <i>n</i> = 34)  |  |                           |                     | Safety  | 34% dry mouth<br>27% nasopharyngitis<br>9% constipation<br>6% diarrhoea<br>6% arthralgia<br>6% back pain<br>5% headache<br>77% completed treatment:<br>withdrawals owing to AE (44%), lack of efficacy (35%), withdrew consent (16%), or loss to follow-up or protocol violation (5%)  |  |
| Dmochowski 2002 <sup>353</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 520 (92% women) | M/F mean age 61 years, history of OAB, ± neurological disease (proportion with not stated); 100% had urge UI (≥ 10 episodes/week; mean 30–38), frequency ≥ 8/day, mean voided vol. ≤ 350 ml; 66% also had stress UI. 22% had previously used antimuscarinics<br><br>Exclusions: UI owing to chronic illness, drugs, or anatomical weakness or abnormalities; lower urinary tract surgery within 6 months; interstitial cystitis, urethral syndrome, overflow UI, painful bladder syndrome, narrow angle glaucoma, > 5 | Transdermal oxybutynin 3.9 mg* ( <i>n</i> = 123)<br>2.6 mg ( <i>n</i> = 131)<br>1.3 mg ( <i>n</i> = 128) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 130) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)<br><br>Subjective cure of UI<br><br>Frequency/day (mean change, SD)<br><br>Voided volume (mean change, ml)<br><br>QOL (mean change in scores) | –22 vs –17 vs –19 vs –19#<br><br>13 vs 5 vs 9% vs 8%<br><br>–19 vs –15 vs –15 vs –14%<br><br>+19% ( <i>P</i> = 0.006 vs plac) vs +16% ( <i>P</i> = 0.016 vs plac) vs +7% vs +7%<br><br>IIQ: –39% for 3.9 mg vs –28% placebo ( <i>P</i> = 0.033 vs 3.9 mg)<br>No results for 2.6 mg or 1.3 mg grps<br>UDI; no data.<br>Difference between 3.9 mg and plac 'not significant' | Funding: all authors had financial interest and/or other relationship with Watson Pharmaceuticals.<br><br>*system applied twice weekly to the abdomen; mg refers to dose released over 24 h.<br><br>#absolute numbers given as no single baseline mean value quoted for each grp.<br><br>86% completed double-blind period.<br><br>Withdrawals not given per tx grp.<br><br>'Basic' info on bladder function/control, and fluid management given to all pts. During the study pts also instructed to maintain usual fluid intake and programme |

| Study                            | Study type and EL                      | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                                     | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|                                  |  |                            | caffeinated drinks/day   |  |   |   | Adverse effects (%)  | Application-site reactions: erythema 6 vs 5 vs 3 vs 2<br>pruritus 17 vs 14 vs 11 vs 6<br>dry mouth: 10 vs 7 vs 5 vs 8 ( <i>P</i> = NS oxy grps vs plac)<br>dizziness 4 vs 3 vs 2 vs 4<br>nausea 2 vs 4 vs 5 vs 5<br>constipation 1 vs 2 vs 5 vs 3 | of non-pharmacological management e.g. PFMT, timed voiding/bladder training. Of those previously treated with antimuscarinics, 'similar trends' in results were reported, with sig. benefit with 3.9 mg oxy vs placebo. |
|                                  | Open-label oxy dose-titration [EL = 3] | 411 (87% completed)        |  | Transdermal oxybutynin (dose titration)  | –   | 12 weeks (weeks 13–24)                                  | Leakage episodes/week (mean change from end RCT)<br><br>Frequency /week (mean change)<br><br>IIQ (mean change) | –23 (3.9 mg and 2.6 mg grps)<br>–25 (1.3 mg)<br><br>+0.6 (3.9 mg)<br>–1.3 (2.6 mg)<br>–1.2 (1.3 mg)<br><br>–64 to –85   | Dose taken: 3.9 mg (51%)<br>2.6 mg (34%)<br>1.3 mg (15%).   |
| Enzelsberger 1995 <sup>354</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–                         | 52 randomised, 43 analysed | F 55–64 years, frequency (> 5/12 h), nocturia (> 2/night), and urgency; idiopathic DO. 11 oxy and 10 placebo had prior continence surgery<br><br>Exclusions: genuine stress UI, neurological disorders | Intravesical oxybutynin 20 mg in 40 ml H <sub>2</sub> O ( <i>n</i> = 26 randomised, 23 analysed) | Placebo (40 ml sterile H <sub>2</sub> O) ( <i>n</i> = 26 randomised, 20 analysed) | 12 days tx, urodynamic s repeated after further 2 weeks | Frequency /day (change in median)<br><br>Urodynamics   | Diurnal: –3.5 vs –1.3<br>Night: –3.3 vs –1.1<br><i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline for oxy<br><br>Stable bladder 82% vs 0<br>Cystometric capacity (median change): +105 ml <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline vs +12 ml   | Funding: none declared. [EL = 1–] Withdrawals: 3 oxy owing to daily catheterisation, 6 placebo owing to 'lack of obvious improvement'. These pts not included in any analyses. Not a blinded study.                     |

| Study                         | Study type and EL          | No. of patients                         | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                               |                            |   |   |  |  |                     | Adverse effects (%)   | Dry mouth 17 vs 10<br>blurred vision 8 vs 5<br>constipation 8 vs 15<br>dizziness 13 vs 0<br>UTI 17 vs 10<br><i>P</i> not reported  |  |
| Ouslander 1995 <sup>331</sup> | RCT, cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 75 (78% women) randomised, 63 completed | M/F mean age ~86 years, cognitively impaired nursing home residents (MMSE < 24 in 93%), who did not meet continence criteria (≤ 1 UI episode/day) after 7 day prompted voiding trial. Involuntary bladder contraction on cystometry or history compatible with urge UI and a bladder capacity < 300 ml on single cystometry. Able to state own name. 15 (25%) females had stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: short-term rehab or medical instability, poor prognosis, no daytime UI, permanent indwelling catheter, severe behavioural disturbance during wet check. Angle closure glaucoma, or poorly controlled open angle glaucoma | Oxybutynin* + prompted voiding<br>3–5 day washout<br>Placebo + prompted voiding ( <i>n</i> = 63) | Placebo + prompted voiding<br>3–5 day washout<br>Oxybutynin* + prompted voiding ( <i>n</i> = 63) | 20 days tx          | % wet checks (absolute mean change from baseline)<br><br>Responders (> 33% reduction in % wet checks)<br><br>Leakage episodes/day (mean change)<br><br>% with ≤ 1 leakage episode/day<br><br>Total incontinence volume (% change, ml)<br><br>Number continent voids (mean change)<br><br>Total continent volume (% change, ml)<br><br>No. dry runs (mean change)<br><br>No. self-initiated toilettings (mean change)<br><br>Adverse effects | Oxy vs placebo: –6.3 vs –2.8%, <i>P</i> = 0.01<br><br>32% vs 19%, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>–2.0 vs –0.9 (23% vs 10% vs overall baseline 8.6)<br><br>40% vs 18%<br><i>P</i> = 0.005<br><br>–23 vs –7%<br><br>+0.4 vs –0.3 (7 vs –5% vs overall baseline 6.1)<br><br>+7% vs –10%<br><br>–0.2 vs –0.3 (5% vs 7% vs overall baseline 4.2)<br><br>–0.2 vs –0.3 (25% vs 38% vs overall baseline 0.8)<br><br>No sig. differences between grps in self-reported adverse effects# | Funding: none declared.<br>*oxybutynin dose 2.5 mg t.d.s. for 10 days, increased to 5 mg t.d.s. for 10 days of UI episodes > 1/day; otherwise continued on 2.5 mg t.d.s.<br><br>Prompted voiding done every 2 h during the day.<br>Wet checks done hourly from 7 am to 7 pm (7 am results not included in data).<br>Wet checks done for last 3 days of each 10 day tx period.<br>#headache, dry mouth, blurry vision, joint pain, constipation, trouble sleeping, hesitancy, straining, incomplete bladder emptying, tremor, reflux/heartburn. |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                         | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                          | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Diokno 2002 <sup>403</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 1067 (85% women)                        | M/F mean age 64 years, urge or mixed UI<br><br>Exclusions: genitourinary conditions that may cause UI, clinically significant medical conditions   | ER oxybutynin*                        |                      | 1 year              | Continuation<br><br>Individual IIQ (leakage affecting lifestyle, scale 0–2; not at all to all the time)<br><br>Sleep Impact Questionnaire (Night-time awakenings rating 1–6; none – all the time) | 46% continued tx for 1 year<br>reasons for withdrawal: AE 24% (dry mouth 8%); lack of efficacy 10%, personal 6%, non-compliance 4%, administrative 8%, miscellaneous 2%<br><br>Change from baseline –0.5 (from 0.9), $P < 0.001$<br><br>Change from 2.2 to 1.1, $P < 0.001$ from baseline | Funding: none declared.<br>*starting dose 5 mg o.d., increased weekly in 5 mg increments to 30 mg max.   |
| Dorschner 2000 <sup>355</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1–     | 107 randomised, 98 analysed (79% women) | M/F mean age ~67 years, frequency (> 7/24 h), urgency, urge or mixed UI, voided vol. < 300 ml. Baseline mean frequency 8.7 propiverine, 7.1 plac; leakage episodes 0.9 vs 0.4; voided volume 164 vs 187<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, voiding dysfunction, serious cardiac disorders | Propiverine 15 mg t.d.s. ( $n = 49$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 49$ ) | 4 weeks tx          | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br>Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)<br>Volume voided (mean change)<br>Volume voided (uroflow, mean change)<br>Patient's assessment of UI symptoms                 | –22 vs –8.4%<br>–54.5 vs –36.6%<br>+55.3 vs –1.6%<br>+25 vs +9%<br>49% vs 31% symptom-free<br>40% vs 22% improved<br>12% vs 47% unchanged   | Funding: Apogepha.<br>The main focus of the study was cardiac safety.<br>9 excluded from efficacy analysis for: no 24 h ECG (3), premature withdrawal (2), infringement of urological exclusion criteria (4). Baseline frequency and leakage higher in active tx grp vs placebo, and voided volume lower.<br>no between-grp analyses reported in |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                             | Length of follow-up              | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                             |                   |                  |   |  |  |                                  | Adverse effects  | 24 h ECG; sig. increase in min heart rate in propiverine grp vs placebo. No other differences in cardiac parameters measured<br>2 propiverine grp reported dry mouth   | efficacy outcomes.<br>ECG = electrocardiogram  |
| Mazur 1995 <sup>356</sup>   | DB RCT<br>EL = 1  | 185 (98% women)  | M/F mean age 48–50 years, DO with urgency (57%) or urge UI (43%)<br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder, UTI, GI obstructions or cardiovascular diseases | Propiverine*<br>15 mg ( <i>n</i> = )<br>30 mg ( <i>n</i> = )<br>45 mg ( <i>n</i> = )<br>60 mg ( <i>n</i> = ) | –                                      | 3 weeks tx                       | Frequency /24 h (mean change)<br>Voided vol. (mean change, ml)<br>Urodynamics<br>Subjective assessment#<br>Adverse effects (most common) | –26 vs –38 vs –32 vs –23%, <i>P</i> < 0.05 from baseline all grps<br>+34 vs +50 vs +40 vs +23%, <i>P</i> < 0.05 from baseline all grps<br>Sig. increase in vol. at 1st and at strong desire to void from baseline in all grps; sig. increase in bladder compliance with 30–60 mg grps. Intravesical pressure reduced in 30–60 mg gprs<br>Efficacy scores (1–4): 2.79, 1.88, 2.1, 2.39<br>Tolerability: 2.15, 2.05, 2.27, 2.63<br>Blurred vision<br>8 vs 16 vs 30% vs 26%<br>Dry mouth<br>6 vs 22 vs 22% vs 27% | Funding: *all daily doses.<br>#efficacy and tolerability rated on 100 mm VAS and 1–4 point ordinal scale (very good – insufficient). |
| Chapple 2004 <sup>357</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 225 (~60% women) | M/F mean age 53–59 years, idiopathic DO; frequency (≥ 8/24 h;   | Solifenacin<br>2.5 mg o.d.<br>( <i>n</i> = 40)   | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 37) | 4 weeks tx, follow-up to 6 weeks | Frequency/24 h (mean change)   | –12 vs –18* vs –21* vs –23* vs –15 vs –9%  | Funding: none declared.<br>* <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs placebo.   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison        | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|-------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                             |                   |  | mean ~11.5), UI or urgency (≥ 3 episodes during 3 day period). 100% had urge UI, 28% mixed<br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder, predominant stress UI, bladder outlet obstruction, interstitial cystitis | 5 mg o.d. (n = 37)<br>10 mg o.d. (n = 33)<br>20 mg o.d. (n = 34)    | Placebo (n = 36)  |                     | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)**<br>Urgency /24 h (mean change)**<br>Volume voided /void (mean change)<br>CONTILIFE QOL (mean change)<br>Adverse effects (%) | -41 vs -55 vs -46 vs -58 vs -27 vs -17%<br>-18 vs -42 vs -46 vs -43 vs -28 vs -20%<br>+20 vs +28* vs +35* vs +45* vs +14 vs +14%<br>-18 vs -22 vs -27 vs -33 vs -15 vs -8%,<br>P ≤ 0.003 all sol grps vs placebo<br>≥ 1 AE: 15 vs 32 vs 34 vs 57 vs 32 vs 16; blurred vision: 2 vs 2.7 vs 14 vs 14 vs 0 vs 5; constipation: 2 vs 14 vs 6 vs 16 vs 3 vs 0 dry mouth: 0 vs 14 vs 14 vs 38 vs 24 vs 0 others occurring in 5–14% of solifenacin 20 mg grp: dyspepsia, headache, micturition difficulty, dysuria, retention, nasal dryness | **P = NS for solifenacin vs placebo.  |
| Cardozo 2004 <sup>358</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 907 randomised and treated, 857 analysed (82%) | M/F mean age 56 years (18–85), symptoms of OAB; frequency (≥ 8/24 h; mean ~12), urge UI or urgency (≥ 3 episodes during 3 day  | Solifenacin 5 mg o.d. (n = 286)<br>Solifenacin 10 mg o.d. (n = 290) | Placebo (n = 281) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)  | -2.4 (20%) vs -2.8 (22%) vs -1.6 (13%) differences vs placebo; 5 mg 95% CI -1.3, -0.3; 10 mg 95% CI -1.7, -0.7  | Funding: none declared. No information on response to tx in patients who had prior drug tx. *no baseline data |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                     | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |                   | women)                             | period); 57% had UI, 47% urge UI. 34% had prior drug tx for OAB<br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder, predominant stress UI, bladder outlet obstruction, PVR > 200 ml, UTI, contraindication to antimuscarinic drugs |   |  |                     | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)  | Urge UI: -63 vs -57 vs -43% $P = 0.014$ sol 5 mg vs plac, $P = 0.042$ sol 10 mg vs plac<br>Total: -61 vs -52 vs -28% $P = 0.002$ sol 5 mg vs plac, $P = 0.016$ sol 10 mg vs plac | therefore cannot calculate % change.  |
|                             |                   |                                    |   |   |  |                     | Urgency episodes/24 h (mean change)  | -2.84 (51%) vs -2.90 (52%) vs -1.98 (33%) differences vs placebo; 5 mg 95% CI -1.44, -0.28; 10 mg 95% CI -1.49, -0.35  |   |
|                             |                   |                                    |   |   |  |                     | Nocturia episodes/24 h (mean change) | -0.58 (25%) vs -0.71 (39%) vs -0.52 (16%) differences vs placebo; 10 mg 95% CI -0.38, -0.01  |   |
|                             |                   |                                    |   |   |  |                     | Volume voided /void (mean change)*   | +30.8 ml vs +36.0 ml vs +10.7 ml ( $P = 0.0001$ sol 5 and 10 mg vs plac)   |   |
|                             |                   |                                    |   |   |  |                     | Adverse effects (%)                  | Dry mouth 7.7 vs 23 vs 2.3<br>constipation 3.7 vs 9.1 vs 2.0<br>blurred vision 4.0 vs 5.9 vs 2.3<br>withdrawals owing to AE: 2.3 vs 3.9 vs 3.3                                   |   |
| Chapple 2004 <sup>359</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 1081 randomised, 1033 analysed for | M/F mean age ~57 years (19-85), symptoms of OAB; frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h;   | Solifenacin 5 mg o.d. ( $n = 266$ )<br>Solifenacin 10 mg o.d. | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( $n = 250$ )<br>Placebo ( $n = 253$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)         | -17 vs -20 vs -15 vs -8%<br>$P \leq 0.015$ all active grps vs plac   | Funding: Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co.<br>'Estimated' differences between solifenacin and |

| Study                    | Study type and EL      | No. of patients      | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---|--|------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                          |                        | efficacy (75% women) | mean ~12), urge UI or urgency ( $\geq 3$ episodes during 3 day period); 93% had UI, 63% urge UI. 35% had prior drug tx for OAB<br><br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder, predominant stress UI, bladder outlet obstruction, PVR > 200 ml, UTI, contraindications to antimuscarinic drugs | (n = 264)  |            |                     | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)  | Urge UI: -65 vs -63 vs -58 vs -40%<br>$P = 0.002$ sol 5 mg vs plac, $P = 0.0028$ sol 10 mg vs plac<br><br>Total: -59 vs -47 vs -59 vs -29%,<br>$P = 0.008$ sol 5 mg vs plac, $P = 0.0038$ sol 10 mg vs plac | tolterodine groups also presented in published report, not reproduced here.<br><br>No information on response to tx in patients who had prior drug tx. |
|                          |                        |                      |   |  |            |                     | Urgency episodes/24 h (mean change)  | -52 vs -55 vs -38 vs -33%<br>$P < 0.001$ both sol grps vs plac  |  |
|                          |                        |                      |   |  |            |                     | Volume voided/void (mean change, ml)   | +25 vs +29 vs +20 vs +9%<br>$P < 0.001$ all active grps vs plac   |  |
|                          |                        |                      |   |  |            |                     | Adverse effects (%)  | Dry mouth 14 vs 21.3 vs 18.6 vs 4.9<br>constipation 7.2 vs 7.8 vs 2.6 vs 1.9<br>blurred vision 3.6 vs 5.6 vs 1.5 vs 2.6<br>withdrawals owing to AE: 3.2 vs 2.6 vs 1.9 vs 3.7                                |  |
| Haab 2005 <sup>360</sup> | Case series*<br>EL = 3 | 1633 (78% women)     | Patients who completed 12 week RCTs <sup>358,359</sup>  | Solifenacin 5 mg for 4 weeks, then 5 mg (42%) or 10 mg (58%; returned to 5 mg in 7%) | -          | 40 weeks            | Frequency/24 h (mean change from week 12 to 52 [change from week 0 to 52])<br>Leakage episodes/24 h<br>Urgency episodes/24 h<br>Nocturia episodes<br>Volume voided | -0.29 (-2.97)<br>-0.13 (-1.74)<br>-0.41 (-3.48)<br>-0.06 (-0.70)<br>+3.7 (+39.8)  | Funding: Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co.<br>*1 year uncontrolled tx follow-up of Cardozo 2004 <sup>358</sup> and Chapple 2004. <sup>359</sup>            |



| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|----------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                                |                   |                 |   |  |                      |                     | Adverse effects (total % reporting during 52 weeks)  | 20.7 dry mouth<br>9.6 constipation<br>6.9 blurred vision  |  |
| Malone-Lee 2001 <sup>362</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 177 (65% women) | M/F mean age 75 years (65-92), urgency, frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h; 85% with), $\pm$ urge UI (72% with; mean 2.3-5.1/24 h). 66% had prior drug tx for OAB, 60% with poor efficacy<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, urinary outflow obstruction, urinary retention, UTI, interstitial cystitis, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, electrostimulation, previous tolterodine tx | Tolterodine 1 mg b.d. ( $n = 61$ )<br>Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( $n = 73$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 43$ ) | 4 weeks             | Frequency/24 h (median change [within-grp differences from baseline])<br><br>Leakage episodes/24 h (median change)<br><br>Volume voided (median change)<br><br>Adverse effects (%) | -0.7 (-1.9, 0) vs -0.7 (-1.1, -0.3) vs 0 (0, 0.7)<br>$P \leq 0.005$ active grps vs plac<br><br>-0.3 (-0.8, -0.1) vs -0.7 (-1.3, -0.2) vs 0 (-0.4, 0.3)<br>$P = 0.0074$ 2 mg b.d. vs plac<br><br>+9 (0, 24) vs +16 (5, 30) vs 0 (-1, 10)<br>$P = 0.0099$ 2 mg b.d. vs plac<br><br>Withdrawals 13 vs 12 vs 9; owing to AE: 7 vs 10 vs 2<br><br>% reporting $\geq 1$ AE:<br>70 vs 73 vs 63<br><br>dry mouth 30 vs 48 vs 9 ( $P \leq 0.013$ tol grps vs plac)<br>diarrhoea 8 vs 4 vs 5<br>dyspepsia 6 vs 2 vs 9;<br>abdominal pain 3 vs 6 vs 5; dizziness 5 vs 4 vs 7; constipation 5 vs 0 vs 2; nausea 2 vs 3 vs 2; abnormal accommodation 0 vs 3 vs 2; headache 5 vs 7 vs 2 | Funding: Pharmacia and Upjohn.<br><br>[EL = 1-] Baseline urge UI episodes sig. lower in tolterodine grps (2.3, 2.8 vs 5.1 placebo), $P < 0.05$ ; Frequency sig. higher in tolterodine grps vs placebo, $P < 0.05$ ; 12.0, 11.6, 9.9.<br><br>Results for pts who had prior drug tx for OAB not considered separately. |
| Jonas 1997 <sup>363</sup>      | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 242 (75% women) | M/F mean ~58 years (20-92), frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h; 94% with,  | Tolterodine 1 mg b.d. ( $n = 99$ )<br>Tolterodine 2 mg                   | Placebo ( $n = 44$ ) | 4 weeks tx          | Volume at 1st contraction (mean change)  | +47 vs +63 vs +29%,<br>$P = 0.03$ tol 2 mg vs placebo   | Funding: none declared.<br><br>No bladder diary outcomes reported, or  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                               |                   |                 | mean 11–12), and urgency ± urge UI (83% with)<br>Exclusions: stress UI, urinary outflow obstruction, urinary retention, UTI, interstitial cystitis, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, electrostimulation, bladder training  | b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 99)   |                          |                     | Maximal cystometric capacity (mean change, ml)<br>Adverse effects (%)   | +7 vs +16 vs +1%, <i>P</i> = 0.034 tol 2 mg vs placebo<br>≥ 1 AE: 31 vs 32 vs 39<br>dry mouth 8 vs 10 vs 2<br>UTI 5 vs 2 vs 5<br>abnormal accommodation 3 vs 5 vs 0<br>constipation 2 vs 3 vs 5<br>headache 3 vs 3 vs 2  | patient's perception of change.   |
| Jacquetin 2001 <sup>364</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 251 (79% women) | M/F mean ~55 years (18–89), urodynamic OAB with symptoms of frequency (≥ 8/24 h; 93% with, mean 10–11), urgency and/or urge UI (75% with; mean 2.4–3.2/24 h). 64% had prior drug tx for OAB. 75% with poor efficacy response<br>Exclusions: stress UI, voiding difficulty, UTI, interstitial cystitis, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, electrostimulation, bladder training | Tolterodine 1 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 97)<br>Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 103) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 51) | 4 weeks tx          | Frequency/24 h (mean change, SD)<br>Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change, SD)<br>Volume voided (mean change, SD)<br>Adverse effects (%) | –13 vs –13 vs –10%<br><i>P</i> = NS active grps vs plac<br>–41 vs –41 vs –17%<br><i>P</i> = 0.0089 2 mg b.d. vs plac, <i>P</i> = 0.045 1 mg b.d. vs plac<br>+13 vs +12 vs +5%<br><i>P</i> = NS active grps vs plac<br>Withdrawals owing to AE:<br>3 vs 2 vs 2<br>% reporting ≥ 1 AE:<br>40 vs 53 vs 31<br>dry mouth 21 vs 34 vs 6 ( <i>P</i> < 0.05 tol 2 mg b.d. vs plac)<br>abdominal pain 6 vs 4 vs 4<br>constipation 4 vs 2 vs 4<br>headache 3 vs 3 vs 4 | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>In 75% who had poor efficacy response to previous treatment, 'good response' efficacy was seen in 49 vs 51% vs 37% of groups, <i>P</i> = NS between grp. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison       | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Abrams 2001 <sup>365</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 714 (69% women) | 80% from four 4-week placebo-controlled RCTs of tolterodine including Jacquetin 2001 <sup>364</sup> Jonas 1997 <sup>363</sup> Malone-lee 2001 <sup>362</sup><br><br>Mean age ~60 years (18–92) | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d.  | –                | Up to 1 year        | Withdrawals<br><br>Efficacy (in 62% completers) vs RCT baseline<br><br>Adverse effects (%)           | 38%:<br>adverse events 15%<br>withdrew consent 13%<br>lost to follow-up 4%<br>other 6%<br><br>Frequency /24 h:<br>median change –20%, mean –22%<br><br>Leakage episodes:<br>median change –74%, mean –45%<br><br>Vol. voided, median change +18%, mean +21%<br><br>Subjective improvement 69%<br><br>% reporting ≥ 1 AE:<br>77<br><br>dry mouth 44, (27 mild, 10 moderate, 3 severe)<br>UTI 10<br>headache 6<br>abdominal pain 6<br><br>5 serious AE possibly related to tx: hernia, dyspepsia, pulmonary oedema, abdominal pain, acute urinary retention | Funding: Pharmacia Corp.<br>23% reduced dose to 1 mg b.d.<br>14% of the 89% for whom data are available had detrusor hyperreflexia. |
| Millard 1999 <sup>366</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+     | 316             | M/F mean age 60 (24–89), DO, frequency (≥ 8/24 h; mean 11; 98% with), urge UI (≥ 1/24 h; mean 3–4; 88% with). 46% had prior drug tx for OAB, 9% with poor efficacy                             | Tolterodine 1 mg b.d. (n = 123)<br>Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. (n = 129) | Placebo (n = 64) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Subjective cure of UI | –20 vs –21 vs –12%<br>P ≤ 0.005 both tol grps vs plac<br><br>–43 vs –50 vs –37%<br>P = NS between grps<br><br>11 vs 19% vs 10%,<br>P = NS between grps  | Funding: Pharmacia and Upjohn.<br>Results for pts who had prior drug tx for OAB not considered separately.                          |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                           | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
|  |                   |                  | response<br>Exclusions: voided vol. > 3 litre/24 h, stress UI, voiding difficulty, UTI, interstitial cystitis, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, electrostimulation, bladder training   |  |  |                     | Subjective improvement                           | 41 vs 59% vs 38%,<br>$P \leq 0.01$ tol 2 mg vs 1 mg or plac   |  |
|  |                   |                  |  |  |  |                     | Volume voided/24 h (mean change)                 | +18 vs +23 vs +6%   |  |
|  |                   |                  |  |  |  |                     | Adverse effects (%)                              | Withdrawals owing to AE<br>6 vs 2 vs 0<br>% reporting $\geq 1$ AE:<br>74 vs 73 vs 78<br>dry mouth 24 vs 39 vs 13<br>dry eyes 2 vs 6 vs 2  |  |
| Van Kerrebroeck 2001 <sup>367-371,943</sup><br>[QOL outcomes <sup>3</sup><br>72,373] | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 1529 (81% women) | M/F, aged 21–93 years (mean ~60 years), frequency ( $\geq 8/24$ h; mean ~11; 92% with), urge UI ( $\geq 5/\text{week}$ ; mean 23; 97% with), symptoms of OAB for $\geq 6$ months<br>Exclusions: stress UI, daily urine vol. > 3 litre, contraindications to antimuscarinics, voiding difficulty, UTI, interstitial cystitis, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, electrostimulation, bladder training | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. ( $n = 507$ ) | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( $n = 514$ )<br>Placebo ( $n = 508$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)                     | -17 vs -15 vs -11%,<br>$P \leq 0.008$ both tol grps vs plac   | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>Results for women in the 12-week RCT have been reported separately, but as other publications reported findings in total population, the M/F study reported here.<br>~53% had been treated for OAB previously, ~40% with 'poor efficacy.' |
|  |                   |                  |  |  |  |                     | Leakage episodes/week (mean change) <sup>†</sup> | -53 vs -46 vs -30%,<br>$P = 0.0005$ both tol grps vs plac<br>(median changes -71 vs -60 vs -33%,<br>$P < 0.05$ tol ER vs tol 2 mg b.d.)   |  |
|  |                   |                  |  |  |  |                     | Volume voided/24 h (mean change)                 | +24 vs +21 vs +10%<br>$P = 0.0001$ both tol grps vs plac  |  |
|  |                   |                  |  |  |  |                     | QOL (KHQ, <sup>#</sup> SF-36)                    | KHQ: Sig. greater improvement in 6/10 domains with tol 4 mg ER vs plac and 7/10 tol 2 mg b.d. vs plac (not general health perception, social limitation, personal relationships, [and emotions with ER])<br>SF-36: no sig. difference between tol and plac grps | <sup>†</sup> sig. difference between ER and placebo grp regardless of severity at baseline <sup>371</sup><br><sup>#</sup> 2 domains (incontinence impact and role limitations) specified as primary outcomes.<br>12% withdrew (47% owing to AE).<br>subjective assessment    |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics                         | Intervention                | Comparison            | Length of follow-up                                       | Outcome measures                                      | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
|                             |                       |                  |   |                             |                       |   | Adverse effects (%)                                   | dry mouth 23 vs 30 vs 8 ( $P = 0.02$ tol ER vs tol 2 mg b.d.)<br>constipation 6 vs 7 vs 4<br>headache 6 vs 4 vs 5  | and perception of urgency reported in separate publications but inconsistent data reported for the placebo grp. <sup>370,943</sup> |
| Kreder 2002 <sup>374</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 1077 (82% women) | 78% who completed<br>12 week RCT <sup>367</sup> | Tolterodine ER<br>4 mg o.d. | –                     | 1 year<br>(analysis at 15 months from beg of 12-week RCT) | Efficacy (71% completers), median change from month 0 | Leakage episodes/week –83%<br>Frequency /24 h – 21%<br>Volume voided +25%  | Funding: none declared.<br>RTI = respiratory tract infection.  |
|                             |                       |                  |   |                             |                       |   | Subjective improvement                                | 75% (bladder condition), 51% (urgency)   |  |
|                             |                       |                  |   |                             |                       |   | Tolerability  | Withdrawals 29%:<br>withdrew consent 4.2%<br>lost to follow-up 3.8%<br>protocol violation 1.3%<br>AE 10% (dry mouth 1.8%; others 0.5–0.8%: headache, abdominal pain, dizziness, UTI, dyspepsia, constipation, dry eyes, voiding disorders)<br>AE:<br>dry mouth 13%<br>other < 5%;<br>dyspepsia, constipation, upper RTI, bronchitis, UTI, cystitis, headache, back pain, influenza-like symptoms |  |
| Khullar 2004 <sup>375</sup> | DB RCT                | 854              | F mean age 58 years, urge-predominant mixed     | Tolterodine ER<br>4 mg o.d. | Placebo ( $n = 285$ ) | 8 weeks tx  | Frequency/24 h (mean change)                          | –20 vs –12%<br>$P < 0.0001$  | Funding: Pfizer.<br>33% had previous   |

| Study                                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                  | Comparison        | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
|  | EL = 1++          |                 | <p>UI: urge UI (<math>\geq 5</math>/week; mean 21; predominant in 75%), frequency (<math>\geq 8/24</math> h; mean 10.6), urgency (mean 5/24 h), in combination with stress UI (predominant UI type in 25%)</p> <p>Exclusions: pure/predominant stress UI, daily urine vol. &gt; 3 litre, contraindications to antimuscarinics, voiding difficulty, UTI, unexplained haematuria</p> | (n = 569)                     |                   |                     | <p>Leakage episodes/week (mean change)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/24 h (mean change)</p> <p>Volume voided (mean change)</p> <p>Subjective improvement*</p> <p>QOL (KHQ)</p> <p>Adverse effects (%)</p> | <p>Urge UI: -60 vs -37%<br/><math>P &lt; 0.0001</math></p> <p>Stress UI: -52 vs -41%, <math>P = \text{NS}</math></p> <p>-34 vs -16%<br/><math>P &lt; 0.0001</math></p> <p>+19 vs +11%<br/><math>P &lt; 0.0001</math></p> <p>61% vs 46%<br/><math>P &lt; 0.001</math></p> <p>Sig. greater improvement in 9/10 domains (not general health perception) with tol vs plac<br/><math>P \leq 0.008</math></p> <p>Withdrawals owing to AE 4.6 vs 5.6<br/><math>\geq 1</math> AE: 29 vs 34<br/>dry mouth 20 vs 8<br/><math>P &lt; 0.01</math><br/>other AE <math>\leq 4\%</math>,<br/><math>P = \text{NS}</math> between grps</p> | <p>antimuscarinic therapy; in 72% with unacceptable efficacy, in ~52% with unacceptable tolerability.</p> <p>*change in 6 point scale, no problem to many severe probs by <math>\geq 1</math> point.</p> |
| Frohlich 2002 <sup>378</sup><br>SR of RCTs | EL = 1+           | 508             | <p>Mean age ~52 years, DO</p> <p>Exclusions: stress UI, contraindications to antimuscarinics</p>   | Trospium 20 mg b.d. (n = 314) | Placebo (n = 203) | 3 weeks             | <p>Subjective cure or marked improvement</p> <p>Urodynamics</p>   | <p>48% vs 20%</p> <p>Max. cystometric capacity; median tx difference +52 ml (95% CI 32 to 71)</p> <p>Vol. at 1st contraction: +48 (28, 68)</p> <p>No sig. difference in max. pressure at 1st contraction, or residual volume</p>  | <p>Funding: MADAUS AG, Germany funded Cardozo 2000.</p> <p>GI = gastrointestinal.</p>  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Comparison        | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                        | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Adverse effects (%)                     | ≥ 1 AE: 36 vs 39<br>GI effects 22 vs 19<br>dry mouth 14 vs 8                                    |   |
| Ulshofer 2001 <sup>379</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 46 (~92% women) | M/F mean age ~52 years, urodynamic motor urge UI, with bladder capacity < 300 ml, and primary urge to void at < 60% of capacity<br><br>Exclusions: contraindications to antimuscarinic, UTI   | Trospium 15 mg t.d.s. (n = 25) | Placebo (n = 21)  | 4 weeks             | Maximum bladder capacity* (mean change) | +43% vs +8%<br>P = 0.06   | Funding: Dr R Pflieger GmbH as part of clinical development programme for trospium.<br><br>No information on symptoms at baseline, and no assessment of treatment effects on symptoms.<br><br>[EL = 1-] *Baseline values 175 ml trospium vs 206 ml placebo. |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Adverse effects (%)                     | ≥ 1 AE: 56 vs 52<br>dry mouth 48 vs 50  |   |
| Zinner 2004 <sup>380</sup>   | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 512 (74% women) | M/F mean age ~62 years, OAB symptoms (urgency mean 11/24 h, frequency ≥ 10/24 h; mean 12; and urge UI ≥ 1/24 h; mean ~4)<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, neurogenic bladder disorders, uninvestigated haematuria, UTI, voiding difficulty, bladder surgery within 6 months, interstitial cystitis | Trospium 20 mg b.d. (n = 256)  | Placebo (n = 256) | 12 weeks tx         | Frequency/24 h (mean change)            | -19% vs -10%<br>P ≤ 0.0001<br>day: -18% vs -9%<br>P ≤ 0.0001<br>night: -22% vs -15%<br>P ≤ 0.05 | Funding: Indevus Corporation.<br><br>54% had prior OAB medications. No further details.<br><br>*Indevus Urgency Severity Scale, 4 point scale. Baseline score 1.8.  |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)     | -59% vs -44%<br>P ≤ 0.0001<br>Cure: 21% vs 11%  |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Urgency (mean change)                   | episodes/24 h: -20% vs -9%<br>P ≤ 0.0001<br>Severity*: -12% vs -2%<br>P ≤ 0.001                 |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Volume voided (mean change)             | +21% vs +5%<br>P ≤ 0.0001   |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | QOL (IIQ)                               | -30% vs -18%<br>P ≤ 0.05  |   |
|                              |                   |                 |   |                                |                   |                     | Adverse effects (%)                     | Withdrawal owing to AE: 8.8 vs 5.7<br>Dry mouth 21.8 vs 6.5; constipation 9.5 vs 3.8            |   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL               | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                            | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| Rudy 2006 <sup>381</sup>   | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+               | 658 (81% F)                | M/F mean age 61 years, with OAB; mean frequency ~13/day, median urge UI episodes ~3/day, mean urgency severity per toilet void 1.75<br><br>50% had prior drug tx for OAB, 21% had history of PFMT<br><br>exclusions:<br>predominantly stress UI, neurogenic bladder disorders, UTI, investigated haematuria, PVR > 100 ml, bladder surgery in past 6 months, diuretic use, oestrogen therapy | Trospium 20 mg b.d. (n = 329)                                | Placebo (n = 329)  | 12 weeks tx                                    | Frequency/24 h (change in mean values)<br><br>Urge UI leakage episodes (change in median values)<br><br>Volume voided (change in mean values)<br><br>Urgency severity (change in mean values)<br><br>Adverse effects | Day: -2.67 vs -1.76, P < 0.0001<br><br>Night: -0.57 vs -0.29, P = 0.0026<br><br>-1.86 vs -1.29, P = 0.0026<br><br>+36 vs +9 ml, P < 0.0001<br><br>Day: -0.21 vs -0.02, P < 0.0001<br><br>Night: -0.17 vs +0.01, P = 0.0005<br><br>20% vs 5% dry mouth<br>11% vs 6% constipation<br>6% vs 5% headache<br>5% vs 2% UTI<br>4% vs 4% nasopharyngitis<br>2 vs 0.3% cough<br>2% vs 4% diarrhoea<br>discontinuations owing to AE: 7% vs 5% | Funding: Indevus pharmaceuticals Inc.<br>cannot calculate % change because only approximate baseline values given for whole group.<br><br>severity measured on 4-point scale (Indevus urgency severity scale).<br>QOL also assessed, will be 'reported separately'. |
| Milani 1993 <sup>382</sup> | DB RCT<br>cross-over<br>EL = 1- | 50 randomised, 41 analysed | F mean age 51 years (19-78), sensory or motor urgency (baseline scores*:incontinence 1.7 flavoxate and 1.4 oxy, frequency 1.3 both grps, urgency 1.6 both grps, nocturia 0.7 and 0.8)<br><br>Exclusions: severely ill, over neurological   | Flavoxate 400 mg t.d.s. then oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s. (n = 41) | Oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s. then flavoxate 400 mg t.d.s. (n = 41) | 2x4 week tx periods, 1 week washout in between | Incontinence (score change*)<br><br>Frequency (score change)<br><br>Urgency (score change)   | -1.05 flavoxate vs -0.93 oxy, P < 0.01 vs baseline both grps<br><br>-0.78 flavoxate vs -0.83 oxy<br>P < 0.01 vs baseline both grps<br><br>-0.66 flavoxate vs -0.92 oxy, P < 0.01 vs baseline both grps  | Funding: none declared.<br>9 excluded from analysis owing to poor compliance (4) or unacceptable adverse effects (5).<br><br>*Scoring system of 0-2 used for symptoms, where:<br>diurnal incontinence,  |



| Study                      | Study type and EL               | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention               | Comparison             | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures                        | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                            |                                 |                 | diseases, acute or chronic UTI or obstructive diseases  |                            |                        |                              | Nocturia (score change)                 | -0.44 flavoxate vs -0.41 oxy, $P < 0.01$ vs baseline both grps  | urgency: 0 = none, 1 = occasional, 2 = frequent.  |
|                            |                                 |                 |   |                            |                        |                              | Subjective cure or improvement          | Cure 37% flavoxate vs 55% oxy improved 45% vs 24%<br>slight improvement/no change 16% vs 16% worsened 3% vs 5%, $P = NS$ between grps   | diurnal frequency: 0 = up to 6×/day, 1 = 7 to 10×/day, 2 = more than 10;<br>nocturnal frequency: 0 = once/night, 1 = 2 to 3 x/night, 2 = more than 3.   |
|                            |                                 |                 |   |                            |                        |                              | Urodynamics                             | FDV +65 vs +57%<br>FDP -23 vs -27%<br>VSDV +23 vs +19%<br>VSDP -22 vs -30%<br>MCV -25 vs -32%<br>RV -53 vs -23%<br>$P < 0.05$ vs baseline both grps, all endpoints; $P = NS$ between grps | FDV: first desire to void<br>FDP: pressure at FDV<br>VSDV: vol. at strong desire to void<br>VSDP: pressure at strong desire to void<br>MCV: vol. at max. capacity<br>MCP: pressure at max. capacity<br>RV: residual volume. |
|                            |                                 |                 |   |                            |                        |                              | Adverse effects (%)                     | Any AE 27 flav vs 90 oxy, $P < 0.01$<br>Occurring in > 10% of any grp; stomach pain, abdominal pain (flav): nausea, stomach pain, dry mouth/eyes (oxy)                                    |   |
| Holmes 1989 <sup>383</sup> | SB RCT<br>Cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 23              | F mean age 42 years (24–66), symptoms of idiopathic DO; frequency/24 h mean ~8, nocturia mean 1.3 | Propantheline 15 mg t.d.s. | Oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s. | 2×4 weeks tx, 1 week washout | Frequency/3 days, mean change           | Diurnal: -10 vs -18%<br>Night: -14 vs -35%<br>$P = NS$ for both comparisons   | Funding: Tillot's laboratory provided drugs.<br>Dose could be increased by 15 mg (Propantheline) and 5 mg oxy after 1 week if required; and could reduce dose if side   |
|                            |                                 |                 |   |                            |                        |                              | Subjective improvement                  | 48% vs 61% $P = NS$   |   |
|                            |                                 |                 |   |                            |                        |                              | Max. cystometric capacity (mean change) | +17 vs +36%, $P < 0.05$   |   |

| Study                            | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                                  |                   |  |   |   |   |                     | Adverse effects*  | Dry mouth, constipation, blurred vision reported not to be sig. difference between grps  | effects experienced.<br>*Incontinence and adverse effects measured on linear analogue scale, but ranges not reported.  |
| Madersbacher 1999 <sup>384</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 366 randomised, 310 evaluated for efficacy (93% women) | M/F, mean ~48 years urgency or urge UI, max. cystometric capacity ≤ 300 ml. 27% had prior tx for urge UI<br>Exclusions: detrusor hyperreflexia, intravesical obstruction, PVR > 15% of max. cystometric capacity, UTI, contraindications to antimuscarinics | Propiverine 15 mg t.d.s. ( <i>n</i> = 149 randomised, 126 analysed) | Oxybutynin 5 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 145 randomised, 121 analysed)<br>Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 72 randomised, 63 analysed) | 4 weeks tx          | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br>Urgency /24 h (mean change)<br>Physician's assessment of change<br>Max. cystometric capacity (mean change, ml)<br>Adverse effects (%) | –18 vs –19 vs –9%<br><i>P</i> = NS<br>–33 vs –24 vs –11%<br><i>P</i> = NS<br>Improved: 83 vs 79% vs 68% ( <i>P</i> ≤ 0.001 active grps vs plac)<br>No change: 15 vs 19% vs 32%<br>+40 vs +42 vs +25%,<br><i>P</i> = NS<br>≥ 1 AE: 64 vs 72 vs 42, <i>P</i> < 005 active tx vs plac<br>dry mouth: results in graph only<br>visual disturbance 27 vs 18 vs 14<br>nausea 4 vs 10 vs 8<br>vomiting 2 vs 1 vs 3 | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] Efficacy analysis for 85% only. No explanation for withdrawals.<br>No further details on prior tx for urge UI, or on response to tx in this subgroup. |
| Jeong 2002 <sup>385</sup>        | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 228 (77% women)  | M/F (Asian) mean age 52 years (27–8), frequency, urgency ± urge UI (39% with; mean 2.4–2.6 episodes/24 h). Symptomatic not urodynamic diagnosis. 27% had previous tx for  | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 112)                             | Oxybutynin 5 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> = 116)  | 8 weeks tx          | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br>Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)   | –21 vs –15%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>difference in mean change –0.71 (95% CI –1.66, +0.24)<br>–85 vs –58%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>difference in mean change –0.73 (95% CI –1.6, +0.15)  | Funding: Pharmacia Corporation.<br>Dose adjustment not permitted during the study.<br>Results for pts previously receiving drug tx for urge UI not   |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                        | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                                |                   |                 | OAB, with good efficacy in 45%<br>Exclusions: sig. stress UI, tx with drugs having antimuscarinic side effects within 2 weeks, contraindications to antimuscarinic tx, UTI, interstitial cystitis, haematuria, bladder outlet obstruction, bladder training, electrostimulation therapy, indwelling catheterisation, ISC   |                                     |  |                     | Subjective assessment                   | 45% vs 46% reported 'much' benefit (73% overall reported at least some benefit)   | considered separately.  |
|                                |                   |                 |  |                                     |  |                     | Adverse effects (%)                     | Pts reporting ≥ 1 AE<br>55 vs 82 $P = 0.001$<br>Withdrawals 13 vs 22; owing to AE: 10 vs 16.<br>Dry mouth 35 vs 63<br>$P = 0.001$<br>'micturition disorder' 9 vs 14<br>dyspepsia 7 vs 5<br>abdominal pain 5 vs 5<br>headache 4 vs 5 |   |
| Malone-Lee 2001 <sup>386</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 378 (67% women) | M/F ≥ 50 years (mean 65), frequency (98%; mean ~11.3/24 h) with urgency, and/or urge UI (54% with; mean 2.4–2.9/24 h). 32% had prior tx for OAB, with good efficacy response in 29%<br>Exclusions: clinical sig. stress UI, outflow obstruction, UTI, unexplained haematuria, urinary catheterisation, hepatic or renal disease, concomitant antimuscarinic tx, electrostimulation therapy or bladder training, tx with tol or oxy | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( $n = 190$ ) | Oxybutynin 2.5 mg b.d. for 2 weeks, then 5 mg b.d. ( $n = 188$ ) | 10 weeks tx         | Dry mouth (%)                           | 37 vs 61, $P < 0.0001$<br>severe 4 vs 15  | Funding: Pharmacia and Upjohn.  |
|                                |                   |                 |  |                                     |  |                     | Frequency/24 h (change in mean)         | –15 vs –15%<br>absolute difference 0<br>(95% CI –0.41, +0.43)   | Dose reduction undertaken in 25% of oxy grp, and requested *but not permitted) in 6% tol grp. |
|                                |                   |                 |  |                                     |  |                     | Leakage episodes /24 h (change in mean) | –54 vs –62%<br>absolute difference 0.5 (95% CI –0.03, +1.03)  | Results for pts previously receiving drug tx for urge UI not considered separately.           |
|                                |                   |                 |  |                                     |  |                     | Mean vol. voided (mean change, ml)      | +22 vs +23%<br>absolute difference –0.6 (95% CI –9.2, +8.1)   | RTI = respiratory tract infection.  |
|                                |                   |                 |  |                                     |  |                     | Subjective change in symptoms           | 45% vs 41% improvement<br>42% vs 51% no change<br>12% vs 8% deterioration   |   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention          | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
|                            |                       |                 | within 3 months   |                       |            |                     | Adverse effects (%)   | <p>Pts reporting <math>\geq 1</math> AE; 69 vs 81, <math>P = 0.01</math></p> <p>Withdrawals 15 vs 22; owing to AE: 12 vs 15.</p> <p>AE reported by <math>\geq 5\%</math> in any grp:</p> <p>dyspepsia 9 vs 12<br/>headache 11 vs 10<br/>constipation 8 vs 6<br/>dizziness 8 vs 5<br/>abdominal pain 6 vs 6<br/>upper RTI 5 vs 6<br/>diarrhoea 5 vs 5<br/>abnormal visual accommodation 5 vs 5<br/>nausea 4 vs 5<br/>UTI 4 vs 5<br/>dysuria 2 vs 5</p> |  |
| Appell 2001 <sup>394</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 854 (76% women) | 91% from 4x12 week placebo-controlled RCTs of tolterodine including Abrams 1998 <sup>349</sup> and Drutz 1999 <sup>350</sup><br>mean age 60 (19–89) | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. | –          | Up to 1 year        | <p>Withdrawals</p> <p>Efficacy (in 70% who completed 9 months tx) vs RCT baseline</p> | <p>30%: adverse events 9%, lack of efficacy 6%, lost to follow-up 6%, withdrew consent 4%</p> <p>Frequency /24 h: median change –22%, mean –22%</p> <p>Leakage episodes: median change –76%, mean –57%</p> <p>Vol. voided, median change +22%, mean +25%</p> <p>Subjective improvement 65%</p>  | <p>Funding: Pharmacia Corp.</p> <p>13% reduced dose to 1 mg b.d.</p> <p>RTI = respiratory tract infection.</p> |

| Study                          | Study type and EL            | No. of patients                            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                 | Comparison                                  | Length of follow-up             | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                                |                              |  |  |  |   |                                 | Adverse effects (%)  | % reporting ≥ 1 AE: 76%<br>dry mouth 28, (19 mild, 7 moderate, 2 severe); UTI 12, headache 7, abdominal pain 6, upper RTI 5  |   |
| Giannitsas 2004 <sup>387</sup> | RCT<br>Cross-over<br>EL = 1– | 128 randomised. 107 completed and analysed | F, (Hong Kong Chinese), 'urodynamic OAB'. Baseline frequency/24 h mean 8.5. 36% had urge UI. 29% had previous tx for OAB<br><br>Exclusions: UTI, neurologic disease, bladder outlet obstruction, prior pelvic surgery, severe stress UI, narrow angle glaucoma, indwelling catheterisation, ISC            | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d.                        | Oxybutynin 5 mg t.d.s.                      | 2×6 weeks tx, 3–4 weeks washout | Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Vol. voided /24 h (mean change)<br><br>Cystometric capacity (mean change)<br><br>Adverse effects (%) | –11 vs –9%<br><br>+21 vs +22%<br><br>+15 vs +16%<br><br>Dry mouth 16 vs 41   | Funding: none declared.<br>Main objective of study was to assess whether urodynamic grade can predict response to tx.<br><br>Not a blinded study. [EL = 1–] efficacy analysis for completers only. No information on 21 pts excluded from analysis.<br><br>No significant differences detected between groups in efficacy outcomes. |
| Leung 2002 <sup>388</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+               | 106  | F, median age 49.5, 'urodynamic OAB', frequency, urgency or urge UI<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, clinically sig. voiding difficulty, UTI, indwelling catheterisation or ISC, uninvestigated haematuria or bladder cancer, taking tx for OAB (incl. antimuscarinics), contraindications to antimuscarinics | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> not stated) | Oxybutynin 5 mg b.d. ( <i>n</i> not stated) | 10 weeks tx                     | Xerostomia Questionnaire<br><br>Voiding diary (frequency, urgency, UI)   | Scores not reported. Significant changes from baseline reported but no sig. difference between groups.<br><br>No numerical data; <i>P</i> values reported for between-group differences (= NS) | Funding: Pharmacia Ltd.<br>Not a blinded study.<br>*adapted from the McMaster University Head and Neck Radiotherapy Questionnaire; measures the effect of dry mouth on sensation of oral dryness, oral discomfort and ability to speak, chew, swallow, and wear dentures. Each domain is assessed on a 100 mm VAS.                  |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Appell 2001 <sup>389</sup><br>Sand 2004 <sup>390</sup><br>(separate report of data in women, by age grp) | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 378 (83% women)<br>88% had baseline and 12-week diary data and include in efficacy analysis | M/F mean age 58 years, urge UI (only or predominantly, with $\geq 7$ and $\leq 50$ episodes/week; mean 28; frequency $\geq 10/24$ h; mean 13. 60% naïve to antimuscarinics<br>Exclusions: other causes of UI; had a baby or pelvic, vaginal or bladder surgery within 6 months; PVR > 150 ml; contraindications to antimuscarinics | Tolterodine 2 mg b.d. ( $n = 193$ randomised, 172 analysed) | Oxybutynin ER 10 mg o.d. ( $n = 185$ randomised, 160 analysed) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)<br>Frequency /week (mean change)<br>Adverse effects (%) | Urge UI: -68 vs -76%, $P = 0.03$<br>Total: -66 vs -75%, $P = 0.02$<br>-22 vs -27%, $P = 0.02$<br>Withdrawals 11 vs 14; owing to AE: 8 vs 8, $P = NS$<br>Dry mouth 33% vs 28%, $P = NS$<br>No sig. difference in other AE reported; constipation, impaired urination/retention, blurred vision, dizziness, somnolence, asthenia, insomnia, nervousness, headache, dyspepsia, nausea, vomiting | Funding: ALZA corporation.<br>Primary efficacy analysis done for completers only, statistics for analysis done for all pts also quoted, which showed consistent effects. |
| Diokno 2003 <sup>391</sup><br>Associated publication:<br>Armstrong 2005 <sup>392</sup><br>(dry mouth)    | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 790   | F mean age 60 years (18–85), OAB, urge UI 21–60 episodes/week, frequency $\geq 10/24$ h. 47% had prior antimuscarinic tx<br>Exclusions: other causes of UI, PVR > 150 ml, at risk of urinary retention, existing medical   | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. ( $n = 399$ )                      | Oxybutynin ER 10 mg o.d. ( $n = 391$ )                         | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)<br>% 'dry'<br>Frequency /week (mean change)             | Urge UI: -70 vs -72%, $P = NS$<br>Total: -69 vs -73%, $P = NS$<br>17% vs 23% $P = 0.03$<br>-25 vs -28%, $P = 0.003$<br>(median -26.2 vs -28.8, $P = 0.05$ )  | Funding: ALZA corporation, and Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical.  |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
| Chu 2005 <sup>393</sup><br>(CNS side effects) |                   |  | conditions that might increase risk of antimuscarinic effects  |  |  |                     | Adverse effects (%)   | Withdrawals 11 vs 134; owing to AE: 5 vs 5<br><br>Dry mouth 22% vs 30%, $P = 0.02$ :<br>mild 17% vs 21%<br>moderate 4% vs 6%<br>severe 0.5 vs 1.5%<br><br>No sig. difference in AE reported in $\geq 5\%$ of either grp;<br>constipation 7.8 vs 6.4, diarrhoea 6.3 vs 7.9, headache 6.0 vs 5.6, UTI 3.3 vs 5.1<br><br>Any CNS effect 8.3% vs 9% |   |
| Halaska 2003 <sup>396</sup>                   | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 357 (86% women)<br>[only 77% evaluated by urodynamic s]          | M/F mean age 54 years (19–89), urge syndrome (frequency mean 11–12/24 h; urgency mean 10–11/24 h; nocturia); or urge UI (mean 1.5–2/24 h)<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI, contraindications to antimuscarinics, other causes of UI, voiding difficulty | Trospium 20 mg b.d. ( $n = 267$ )  | Oxybutynin 5 mg b.d. ( $n = 90$ )  | 1 year              | Physician-reported cure<br><br>Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Urgency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>Maximum cystometric bladder capacity, mean change ( $n = 276$ )<br><br>Adverse effects (%) | 29% vs 17%<br><br>–31 vs –34%<br><br>–34 vs –33%<br><br>+56 vs +58%, difference –6 ml (90% CI –33.0, +23.0)<br><br>$\geq 1$ AE: 68 vs 77<br>dry mouth 33 vs 50<br>$P < 0.01$<br>GI effects 39 vs 51<br>$P = 0.02$   | Funding: none declared.<br>25% withdrew (25% trospium 27% oxy)<br>no results reported for changes in leakage episodes or nocturia.<br><br>between-grp comparisons not reported for frequency or urgency<br><br>GI = gastrointestinal effects. |
| Chapple 2005 <sup>397</sup>                   | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 1200 randomised; (87% F)<br>1177 (98%) took at least one dose of | M/F mean age 56 years with OAB symptoms $\geq 3$ months, (mixed UI allowed if urge UI dominant) and being treated as   | Solifenacin 5 mg o.d. for 4 weeks, could increase to 10 mg for weeks 5–12 ( $n = 593$ analysed for | Tolterodine ER 4 mg o.d. could be increased (dummy) after 4 weeks ( $n = 607$ analysed for safety, 599 for | 12 weeks            | Frequency/24 h, difference in mean change   | 0.21 (95% CI –0.48 to 0.10)<br><br>(non-inferiority primary analysis), $P = 0.004$ for non-inferiority)   | Funding: Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co.<br>17 countries, 117 sites<br>2-week single blind placebo run-in.  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention              | Comparison | Length of follow-up                      | Outcome measures  | Effect size                 | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|---|--|---------------------------|------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
|       |                   | tx and had one post-tx assessment ; and analysed for efficacy 1049 (87%) formed per protocol population | outpatients. $\geq 8$ voids/24 h (mean $\sim 12$ ), $\geq 1$ leakage episode/24 h (mean 2–3) or urgency ( $\geq 3$ episodes during 3 day period; (mean $\sim 6$ per 24 h)<br>Exclusions: stress UI, mixed UI if stress UI dominant; neurogenic cause of abnormal detrusor activity | safety, 578 for efficacy) | efficacy)  |  | Urgency /24 h, mean change  | –47 vs –41%,<br>$P = 0.035$ | Sample size calculation based on frequency in per protocol population; 80% power to detect non-inferiority between drugs in change in frequency/24 h.<br>Dose increased in 48% solifenacin and 51% tolterodine (dummy increase) groups, controlled by pt request.<br>Prior treatment not described.<br>*proportion of pts with UI at baseline not stated.<br>**on scale of 0 to 6; categories not explained; baseline values $\sim 4.4$ .<br>Mild AE = causes discomfort but no disruption to normal daily activity; moderate = discomfort sufficient to reduce/affect normal daily activity, severe = resulted in inability to work or perform daily activity. |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Leakage /24 h, mean change*              | In urge UI:<br>–61 vs –39%,<br>$P = 0.001$<br>–58 vs –44%,<br>$P = 0.006$   |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Nocturia/24 h, mean change               | –35 vs –33%, $P = NS$   |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Cure of UI*                              | 59% vs 49%,<br>$P = 0.006$<br>50% reduction: 74% vs 67%, $P = 0.02$   |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Patients' erception of bladder condition | –34 vs –30%,<br>$P = 0.006^{**}$  |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Voided vol./void, mean change, ml        | +26 vs +21%,<br>$P = 0.01$  |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Pad usage /24 h                          | –53 vs –41%,<br>$P = 0.0023$  |                             |   |
|       |                   |   |  |                           |            | Adverse effects                          | Dry mouth 30% vs 24%<br>(17.5 vs 14.8 mild, 10.8 vs 7.7 moderate, 1.7 vs 1.5 severe)<br>Constipation 6.4 vs 2.5%<br>(3.2 vs 1.3 mild, 2.7 vs 1.0 moderate, 0.5 vs 0.2 severe)<br>Blurred vision 0.7 vs 1.7%<br>0.7 vs 0.7 mild, 0 vs 1.0 moderate, 0 severe |                             |   |



| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures                       | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|---|--|
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Discontinuation rates                  | Overall 5.9 vs 7.3%<br>1.2 vs 2.0% owing to insufficient response<br>3.5 vs 3.0% owing to AE  |  |
| Davila 2001 <sup>398</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 76 (92% women)  | M/F mean age ~63 years, DO, urge or mixed UI with predominant urge symptoms; ≥ 3 leakage episodes/day, and > 30% increase after 2 week washout from ≥ 6 weeks oral oxybutynin<br><br>Exclusions: overflow incontinence owing to underactive or noncontractile detrusor or outlet obstruction, impaired bladder compliance, medical condition or drugs that could cause or contribute to UI | Transdermal oxybutynin*<br>2.6 mg – 5.2 mg (n = 38)                       | Oral oxybutynin<br>5 mg b.d. – 7.5 mg t.d.s. (n = 38)                                 | 6 weeks tx              | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change)    | -67 vs -64%, P = NS   | Funding: Watson Laboratories.  |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Subjective cure (mean change)          | 21% vs 26%, P = NS  | *system applied twice weekly to the abdomen; mg refers to dose released over 24 h. 71% started on 2.6 mg transdermal oxy, 74% on 10 mg oral. Dose increased to max. in |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Urodynamics (mean change, n = 63)      | VFC: +17 vs +40%<br>Max. cystometric capacity: +15 vs +22%<br>P = NS between grps   | 68% vs 32%. Mean doses taken not stated.   |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Adverse effects (%)                    | Dry mouth 39 vs 82, P < 0.01<br>constipation 21 vs 50<br>somnia 18 vs 37<br>dizziness 16 vs 26<br>blurred vision 18 vs 24<br>impaired urination 24 vs 24.<br><br>Allergic contact dermatitis to 1 pt in transdermal oxy grp | VFC = vol. at first contraction.   |
| Barkin 2004 <sup>399</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 125 randomised, 94 (75%) incl. in primary analysis*, 90% of whom women) | M/F mean age ~59 years (26–83), urge UI (≥ 7 episodes/week) and frequency (≥ 8/day)<br><br>Exclusions: PVR > 100 ml, uninvestigated voiding difficulty, daily fluid intake > 3 litre, bladder  | Oxybutynin ER<br>15.2 mg/day (SD 4.4)<br>(n = 65 randomised, 53 analysed) | Oxybutynin<br>14 mg/day (SD 5.3), in 3 divided doses (n = 60 randomised, 41 analysed) | 6 weeks tx <sup>#</sup> | Leakage episodes/week (change in mean) | -57 vs -73% P = NS  | Funding: Purdue Pharma.  |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Frequency/day (change in mean)         | -16 vs -22% P = NS  | *[EL = 1–] Primary analyses done on pts who completed  |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Urgency/day (change in mean)           | -30 vs -41% P = NS  | ≥ 2 weeks of tx and did not have major protocol violations. ITT analysis done for major  |
|                            |                   |   |  |   |   |                         | Vol. voided (change in mean, ml)       | +14 vs +18% P = NS  |  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                              |                   |                                | outlet obstruction, indwelling catheter or bladder training within 2 weeks, primary diagnosis of stress UI, contraindications to drug  |  |  |                     | QOL (change in mean)                   | IIQ: -0.7 vs -0.7 (27% vs 30%) <i>P</i> = NS<br>UDI: -0.6 vs -0.7 (23% vs 28%) <i>P</i> = NS   | outcomes, but data not reported. Adverse effects reported for all pts.  |
|                              |                   |                                |  |  |  |                     | Adverse effects (%; all pts)           | <i>P</i> = NS between grps for all adverse effects<br>dry mouth 68 vs 72 others occurring in > 10% of either grp:<br>dry throat, diarrhoea<br>headache, UTI,<br>dizziness, dyspepsia, rhinitis, abdominal pain, asthenia, constipation, taste perversion, cough, dysphagia, dry eyes, nausea | #2 weeks dose titration, starting with 15 mg/day, changed by 5 mg each week if needed; then 4 weeks maintenance.<br>20% vs 37% withdrew, <i>P</i> = 0.047 mainly owing to adverse effects (32 of 35).<br>Purdue Urgency Questionnaire (unvalidated) developed and used to assess urgency.<br>Differences in tolerability also assessed after 1 week; significantly more pts in ER group rated their medication tolerable but % not given. |
| Anderson 1999 <sup>400</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 105* (92% women); 93 completed | M/F mean age ~60 years (34-76), urge or mixed UI with primary urge component (≥ 6 urge UI episodes/week; mean 23-27), previously responded to oxybutynin tx<br><br>Exclusions: known genitourinary causes of UI, PVR > 100 ml, at risk | Oxybutynin ER 5-30 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 53 randomised, 46 analysed) | Oxybutynin 5-20 mg/day in 3 divided doses ( <i>n</i> = 52 randomised, 47 analysed) | Up to 6 weeks       | Leakage episodes/week (change in mean) | Urge: -84 vs -88%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Total UI: -82 vs -88%, <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>Doses of both oxy preps titrated upwards from 5 mg/day, based on efficacy and tolerability, dose adjustment in 5 mg increments every 4-7 days. Actual doses taken not reported.  |
|                              |                   |                                |  |  |  |                     | Cure                                   | Urge UI: 52% vs 51%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Total: 41% vs 40%, <i>P</i> = NS   |   |
|                              |                   |                                |  |  |  |                     | Voided vol. (change in mean)           | +32 vs +20% <i>P</i> = NS  | *[EL = 1-] efficacy   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients                  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                       | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                           |                   |                                  |  |  |  |                                       | Adverse effects   | Dry mouth 68% vs 87% $P = 0.04$<br>(moderate to severe dry mouth 25% vs 46%, $P = 0.03$ )<br>No other sig. differences in AE reported:<br>somnolence, blurred vision, constipation, dizziness, impaired urination, nervousness, nausea  | analyses only done for completers. Adverse effects reported for all pts.<br>Two pts withdrew owing to anticholinergic side effects. No further details. Severity of dry mouth did not therefore appear to affect withdrawal rate. |
| Birns 2000 <sup>401</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 130 (68% women), 128 analysedITT | M/F mean age 56 years (18–76), voiding problems stabilised on standard oxybutynin. Urodynamic diagnosis: 77% DO (urge UI, unstable bladder, frequency), 8% UI (unspecified), 4% mixed UI, 1.5% stress UI, 5% neuropathic bladder<br>Exclusions: contraindications to anticholinergics, symptomatic UTI, clinically sig. bladder outlet obstruction, or symptoms of only nocturnal enuresis | Oxybutynin ER 10 mg o.d. ( $n = 63$ ; 62 analysed) | Oxybutynin 5 mg b.d. ( $n = 67$ ; 66 analysed)                     | 4 weeks tx*                           | Daytime continence<br><br>Night-time continence, day and night frequency, day and night leakage episodes<br><br>Adverse effects (%) | 53% vs 58% (95% CI for difference –22% to +13%)<br><br>No numerical data. No sig. differences found in any outcome<br><br>Any: 55 vs 67<br>No sig. difference between grps in AE: dry mouth 23% vs 17%<br>dizziness 2% vs 9%<br>vision abnormality 7% vs 5%<br>coughing 3% vs 5%<br>headache 0% vs 5% | Funding: Leiras Oy, and Pharmacia and Upjohn.<br>*following 2-week run-in period with standard oxy.   |
| Versi 2000 <sup>402</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 226 (89% women)                  | M/F mean age 59 years, 7–45 urge UI episodes/week, previously responded to   | Oxybutynin ER 5–20 mg/day* ( $n = 111$ )           | Oxybutynin 5–20 mg/day*, dosing frequency not stated ( $n = 115$ ) | Up to 5 weeks tx (actual duration not | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)   | Urge UI: –83 vs –76%, $P = NS$<br>Total: –81 vs –75%, $P = NS$  | Funding: ALZA Corporation.<br>*dose increased by 5 mg every week based on   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures    | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|---|
|       |                   |                 | anticholinergic meds or specifically to oxybutynin before enrolment<br>Exclusions: clinically sig. medical problems, PVR > 100 ml, contraindications to oxybutynin |              |            | stated)             | Adverse effects (%) | Dry mouth 48 vs 59, $P = NS$<br>(cumulative rates by dose#, $P = 0.003$ between grps):<br>5 mg: 19 vs 36;<br>10 mg: 40 vs 61;<br>15 mg: 57 vs 74;<br>20 mg: 80 vs 83 | efficacy and tolerability, plus 1 week at optimal dose.<br>Results are vs 2-week baseline run-in.<br>#first report of dry mouth at a give dose. |

## Antimuscarinics – health economics

| Study   | Population<br>Study method   | Intervention<br>details  | Costs<br>Outcomes  | Results   | Additional comments   | Study type                  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Hughes 2004 <sup>405</sup><br>UK<br>Funding:<br>Janssen<br>Pharmaceutical | A hypothetical cohort with urge incontinence associated with OAB<br><br>Empirical models of drug effects and persistence used to derive clinical effectiveness estimates. This was combined with cost data to derive an estimate of cost effectiveness | 3 pharmaceutical treatments for OAB: oxybutynin ER (Oxy-ER), immediate-release oxybutynin (Oxy-IR), tolterodine immediate-release (Tol-IR), tolterodine extended-release (Tol-ER) (IR) tolterodine | Total annual cost (base case):<br>Oxy-IR £40, Oxy-ER £79, Tol-IR £74, Tol-ER £63<br><br>Total annual cost (discontinuers adopt baseline values):<br>Oxy-IR £42, Oxy-ER £82, Tol-IR £78, Tol-ER £68<br><br>Total annual cost (discontinuers adopt placebo values):<br>Oxy-IR £37, Oxy-ER £77, Tol-IR £73, Tol-ER £63<br><br>Total annual cost (full persistence):<br>Oxy-IR £129, Oxy-ER £241, Tol-IR £383, Tol-ER £362<br><br>Annual number of incontinent-free weeks (base case):<br>Oxy-IR: 7.5, Oxy-ER: 11.1, Tol-IR: 9.6, Tol-ER 10.9<br><br>Annual number of incontinent-free weeks (discontinuers adopt baseline values):<br>Oxy-IR: 2.5, Oxy-ER: 3.0, Tol-IR: 1.3, Tol-ER 1.4<br><br>Annual number of incontinent-free weeks (discontinuers adopt placebo values):<br>Oxy-IR: 14.3, Oxy-ER: 14.3, Tol-IR: 13.4, Tol-ER 13.8<br><br>Annual number of incontinent-free weeks (full persistence):<br>Oxy-IR: 22.1, Oxy-ER: 20.1, Tol-IR: 14.0, Tol-ER 19.4 | Incremental cost per incontinent-free week (Base case):<br>Oxy-IR: £5.25 <sup>a</sup> , Oxy-ER: £84.82 <sup>b</sup> , Tol-IR: Dominated, Tol-ER: £7.14 <sup>c</sup><br><br>Incremental cost per incontinent-free week (Discontinuers adopting baseline values):<br>Oxy-IR: £16.59 <sup>a</sup> , Oxy-ER: £87.43 <sup>c</sup> , Tol-IR: Dominated, Tol-ER: Dominated<br><br>Incremental cost per incontinent-free week (Discontinuers adopting placebo values):<br>Oxy-IR: £2.58 <sup>a</sup> , Oxy-ER: £1375.50 <sup>c</sup> , Tol-IR: Dominated, Tol-ER: Dominated<br><br>Incremental cost per incontinent-free week (Full persistence):<br>Oxy-IR: £5.81 <sup>a</sup> , Oxy-ER: Dominated, Tol-IR: Dominated, Tol-ER: Dominated<br><br><sup>a</sup> versus no treatment<br><sup>b</sup> versus Tol-ER<br><sup>c</sup> versus Oxy-IR | Model<br><br>Direct medical costs – drugs, appliances, containment products, staff costs and direct overheads, surgical procedures.<br><br>NHS perspective, 1998 prices inflated to 2001 values.<br><br>Time horizon one year.<br><br>Model results were robust to parameter uncertainty but were affected by assumptions made about early discontinuation. | Cost effectiveness analysis |

| Study   | Population<br>Study method  | Intervention<br>details      | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  | Study type  |
|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Kobelt 1998 <sup>410</sup><br>Sweden<br>Funding:<br>Pharmacia and<br>Upjohn | Hypothetical<br>patient cohort with<br>overactive bladder<br><br>A Markov model<br>was used to<br>estimate the cost,<br>utility and months<br>of cure over one-<br>year<br><br>QALYs were<br>calculated by a<br>regression<br>analysis of the<br>correlation<br>between urinary<br>symptoms and<br>EQ-5D scores<br><br>Costs were based<br>on drug costs and<br>pad usage | Tolterodine; no<br>treatment | Average Total costs per patient over one year:<br>tolterodine SEK8,595, no treatment SEK3,286<br><br>Average Total QALYs per patient per year:<br>tolterodine 0.6977, no treatment 0.6728<br><br>Average cured months per patient per year:<br>tolterodine 3.6709, no treatment 0.816 | Incremental cost per QALY of<br>tolterodine vs no treatment:<br>SEK213,000 (USD 28,000)<br><br>Incremental cost per cured<br>month of tolterodine vs no<br>treatment:<br>SEK1,860 (USD215) | Model<br>Swedish context.<br>Exchange rate:<br>USD1 = SEK7.6.<br><br>The authors report that the<br>ICER of SEK213,000 per<br>QALY is within the range<br>usually considered cost<br>effective.<br><br>Markov model utilizes 5<br>severity states.<br><br>Model assumed no further<br>treatment effect after 3 months. | Cost-utility<br>analysis and<br>cost<br>effectiveness<br>analysis |

| Study   | Population<br>Study method   | Intervention<br>details   | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments  | Study type  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| O'Brien 2001 <sup>409</sup><br>Canada<br>Funding:<br>Pharmacia<br>Corporation | Hypothetical<br>patient cohort with<br>urge incontinence<br>A Markov model<br>was used to<br>estimate the<br>effects of two<br>treatment<br>strategies on cost,<br>utility, and time in<br>"normal" health<br>state over one-<br>year<br>Discontinuation<br>rates were<br>obtained from<br>Quebec<br>prescription claims<br>data<br>Utility estimates<br>were obtained<br>from a previous<br>Swedish study | generic<br>oxybutynin with<br>no further<br>treatment in<br>patients who<br>discontinue initial<br>therapy; generic<br>oxybutynin with<br>switch to<br>tolterodine in<br>patients who<br>discontinue initial<br>therapy | Total average costs to health care payer per patient<br>over one year:<br>oxybutynin to no therapy CAD82, oxybutynin to<br>tolterodine CAD294<br>Total average costs to patient over one year::<br>oxybutynin to no therapy CAD285, oxybutynin to<br>tolterodine CAD236<br>Total costs per patient over one year:<br>oxybutynin to no therapy CAD367, oxybutynin to<br>tolterodine CAD530<br>Average Total QALYs per patient over one year:<br>oxybutynin to no therapy 0.67, oxybutynin to<br>tolterodine 0.69<br>Average months in normal health state over one year:<br>oxybutynin to no therapy 0.50, oxybutynin to<br>tolterodine 1.15 | Incremental cost per QALY of<br>tolterodine vs no further<br>therapy:<br>CAD9,982<br>Incremental cost per additional<br>month in a normal health state<br>of tolterodine vs no further<br>therapy:<br>CAD251 | Model<br>Canadian context.<br>Patient and health care payer<br>perspective.<br>One-way sensitivity analysis<br>produced did not produce large<br>variations from base rates. | Cost-utility<br>analysis and<br>cost<br>effectiveness<br>analysis |

| Study   | Population<br>Study method  | Intervention<br>details  | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   | Study type                        |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Guest 2004 <sup>406</sup><br>Austria, France<br>and UK<br>Funding:<br>Sanofi-<br>Synthelabo | Hypothetical<br>patient cohort of<br>patients with<br>OAB > = 18 years<br>of age, and urge<br>or mixed<br>incontinence with<br>a primary-urge<br>component<br>A decision analytic<br>model to estimate<br>costs and<br>incontinence<br>outcomes of three<br>treatment<br>strategies over a<br>six-month period<br>Data was obtained<br>from a systematic<br>literature review<br>and information<br>about resource<br>utilization were<br>derived from<br>interviews with<br>clinicians | Controlled-release<br>oxybutynin;<br>immediate-<br>release<br>oxybutynin;<br>tolterodine | Total average costs per patient over 6 months (UK):<br>Controlled-release oxybutynin Euro1078.05,<br>immediate-release oxybutynin Euro1097.30,<br>tolterodine Euro1359.20<br>Total average costs per patient over 6 months<br>(France):<br>Controlled-release oxybutynin Euro872.91, immediate-<br>release oxybutynin Euro834.25, tolterodine<br>Euro861.90<br>Total average costs per patient over 6 months<br>(Austria):<br>Controlled-release oxybutynin Euro912.84, immediate-<br>release oxybutynin Euro986.64, tolterodine<br>Euro1108.71<br>Average percentage reduction in frequency of<br>incontinence at 6 months (UK):<br>CR oxybutynin 72.3, IR oxybutynin 62.3, tolterodine<br>56.3<br>Average percentage reduction in frequency of<br>incontinence at 6 months (France):<br>CR oxybutynin 72.2, IR oxybutynin 54.7, tolterodine<br>48.4<br>Average percentage reduction in frequency of<br>incontinence at 6 months (Austria):<br>CR oxybutynin 76.4, IR oxybutynin 62.1, tolterodine<br>63.8<br>Average change in daily no. of incontinence episodes<br>per patient at 6 months (UK):<br>CR oxybutynin 3.6 to 1.0, IR oxybutynin 3.6 to 1.4,<br>tolterodine 3.6 to 1.6<br>Average change in daily no. of incontinence episodes<br>per patient at 6 months (France):<br>CR oxybutynin 3.6 to 1.0, IR oxybutynin 3.6 to 1.6,<br>tolterodine 3.6 to 1.9<br>Average change in daily no. of incontinence episodes<br>per patient at 6 months (Austria):<br>CR oxybutynin 3.6 to 0.9, IR oxybutynin 3.6 to 1.4,<br>tolterodine 3.6 to 1.3<br>Average percentage reduction in micturition frequency<br>at 6 months (UK):<br>CR Oxybutynin 24.1, IR Oxybutynin 17.4, tolterodine<br>20.1 | Incremental cost effectiveness<br>in reducing the frequency of<br>incontinence (UK):<br>CR oxybutynin dominates other<br>treatments, IR oxybutynin<br>dominates tolterodine<br>Incremental cost effectiveness<br>in reducing the frequency of<br>incontinence (France):<br>CR oxybutynin vs IR<br>oxybutynin; Euro64 per<br>additional reduction in the no.<br>of daily incontinence episodes,<br>CR oxybutynin vs tolterodine;<br>Euro12 per additional reduction<br>in the no. of daily incontinence<br>episodes, IR oxybutynin<br>dominates tolterodine<br>Incremental cost effectiveness<br>in reducing the frequency of<br>incontinence (Austria):<br>CR oxybutynin dominates other<br>treatments, IR oxybutynin vs<br>tolterodine; Euro1,219<br>Incremental cost effectiveness<br>in reducing the frequency of<br>micturition (UK):<br>CR oxybutynin dominates other<br>treatments, IR oxybutynin vs<br>tolterodine; Euro1,455 per<br>additional reduction in no. of<br>daily micturitions<br>Incremental cost effectiveness<br>in reducing the frequency of<br>micturition (France):<br>CR oxybutynin vs IR<br>oxybutynin; Euro39 per<br>additional reduction in the no.<br>of daily micturitions, CR<br>oxybutynin vs tolterodine;<br>Euro14 per additional reduction<br>in the no. of daily micturitions, ,<br>IR oxybutynin vs tolterodine;<br>Euro138 per additional<br>reduction in the no. of daily | Model<br>Conducted from perspective of<br>payers (Sick Funds in Austria,<br>Social Security in France and<br>NHS) and patients, 2000/01<br>prices (Euros).<br>Costs to patients and societal<br>costs arising from lost<br>productivity were also<br>estimated. | Cost<br>effectiveness<br>analysis |



| Study   | Population<br>Study method  | Intervention<br>details  | Costs<br>Outcomes  | Results                                   | Additional comments  | Study type                  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Getsios 2004 <sup>407</sup><br>Canada<br>Funding:<br>This work was supported in part by a grant from Janssen-Ortho Canada | Hypothetical patient cohort: baseline characteristics; 83.3% female, 59.1 years mean age, 45% had 7–21 incontinent episodes per week, 34% had 22–42 incontinent episodes per week, 21% > 42 episodes per week<br>A Markov model was used to estimate the costs and outcomes resulting from each treatment over one-year | 2 pharmaceutical treatments for overactive bladder: extended-release (ER) oxybutynin; immediate-release (IR) tolterodine | Total costs per patient at one year:<br>Tolterodine IR CAD688, Oxybutynin ER CAD656<br>Completely continent at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 17.2%, Oxybutynin ER 20.4%<br>No or minimal incontinence at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 48.7%, oxybutynin ER 54.3%<br>Days per year with no incontinent episodes:<br>Tolterodine IR 146.0, oxybutynin ER 162.5<br>Total annual incontinent episodes:<br>Tolterodine IR 679.8, oxybutynin ER 584.6<br>Patients receiving drug at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 81.5%, oxybutynin ER 79.1% | Oxybutynin ER dominates<br>Tolterodine IR | Model<br>Direct costs only – drugs, doctor visits, pads and laundry.<br>Canadian context; health care payer perspective; 2002 costs.<br>Time horizon one year.<br>5 severity states.<br>Transition probabilities into different states was calculated from the OBJECT clinical trial.<br>Clinical data comparing oxybutynin ER and tolterodine IR only available for 3 months and it was assumed that there would be no change in severity among patients who were compliant with treatment.<br>Treatment persistence rates over 3 months were based on OBJECT study, a common dropout rate was assumed for all patients after this.<br>Sensitivity analysis showed that net savings would be eliminated if oxybutynin cost CAD0.11 more than tolterodine. | Cost effectiveness analysis |

| Study  | Population<br>Study method  | Intervention<br>details  | Costs<br>Outcomes   | Results                                   | Additional comments   | Study type                                   |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Getsios et al., 2004<br>UK <sup>404</sup><br>Funding:<br>This work was in part supported by a grant from Janssen Pharmaceutica | Hypothetical patient cohort: baseline characteristics; 83.3% female, 59.1 years mean age, 45% had 7–21 incontinent episodes per week, 34% had 22–42 incontinent episodes per week, 21% > 42 episodes per week<br><br>A Markov model was used to estimate the costs and outcomes resulting from each treatment | 2 pharmaceutical treatments for overactive bladder: extended-release (ER) oxybutynin, immediate-release (IR) tolterodine | Total costs per patient at one year:<br>Tolterodine IR £418, Oxybutynin ER £332<br><br>Completely continent at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 17.2%, Oxybutynin ER 20.4%<br><br>No or minimal incontinence at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 48.7%, oxybutynin ER 54.3%<br><br>Days per year with no incontinent episodes:<br>Tolterodine IR 146.0, oxybutynin ER 162.5<br><br>Total annual incontinent episodes:<br>Tolterodine IR 679.8, oxybutynin ER 584.6<br><br>QALYs:<br>Tolterodine IR 0.686, oxybutynin ER 0.690<br><br>Patients receiving drug at week 52:<br>Tolterodine IR 81.5%, oxybutynin ER 79.1% | Oxybutynin ER dominates<br>Tolterodine IR | Model<br><br>Direct costs only – drugs, doctor visits, pads and laundry.<br><br>UK context, perspective of a comprehensive healthcare payer; 2002 costs.<br><br>Time horizon one year.<br><br>5 severity states.<br><br>Transition probabilities into different states was calculated from the OBJECT clinical trial.<br><br>Clinical data comparing oxybutynin ER and tolterodine IR only available for 3 months and it was assumed that there would be no change in severity among patients who remained compliant after this date.<br><br>Health utilities derived from study by Kobelt <i>et al.</i> , 1998.<br><br>Treatment persistence rates over 3 months were based on OBJECT study, a common dropout rate was assumed for all patients after this.<br><br>Sensitivity analysis suggested that the results were quite stable to different assumptions. Increasing discontinuation rates reduced the cost effectiveness of oxybutynin ER relative to tolterodine IR. The dominance of oxybutynin ER was also sensitive to the costs of treatment.<br><br>Only examined a fixed dose for each drug.<br><br>Data to estimate the effect of lower compliance were not available. | Cost–utility and cost effectiveness analysis |

| Study   | Population<br>Study method   | Intervention<br>details  | Costs<br>Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments  | Study type                        |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Arikian 2000 <sup>408</sup><br>US<br>Funding:<br>This research<br>was supported<br>by a grant from<br>the Alza<br>Corporation | Hypothetical<br>patient cohort of<br>patients with OAB<br><br>A decision analytic<br>model to<br>determine the<br>costs, weekly<br>incontinence<br>episodes and<br>expected number<br>of continent days<br>of three treatment<br>strategies over a<br>six-month period<br><br>Data was derived<br>from a review of<br>RCT data<br>combined with<br>expert opinion<br><br>Drug costs were<br>based on the<br>January 1999<br>wholesaler<br>acquisition cost<br>and average daily<br>dosage was based<br>on clinical opinion | 3 pharmaceutical<br>treatments for<br>overactive<br>bladder: once-<br>daily controlled-<br>release<br>oxybutynin, twice<br>daily tolterodine,<br>immediate-<br>release<br>oxybutynin | Treatment success*:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release 52.30%; immediate-<br>release oxybutynin 46.15%; tolterodine 31.89%<br><br>Continent days:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release 75; immediate-release<br>oxybutynin 65; tolterodine 44<br><br>Surgery (second-line treatment)<br><br>Cost:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release USD 1,403; immediate-<br>release oxybutynin USD 1,395; tolterodine USD 1,650<br><br>Surgery (third-line treatment)<br><br>Cost:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release USD 894; immediate-<br>release oxybutynin USD 819; tolterodine USD 918<br><br>*Treatment success defined as patients with zero<br>incontinence episodes per week at the end of six<br>months | Surgery (second-line<br>treatment)<br><br>Cost per success:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release<br>USD 2,682; immediate-release<br>oxybutynin USD 3,022;<br>tolterodine USD 5,177<br><br>Cost per continent day:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release<br>USD 18.70; immediate-release<br>oxybutynin USD 21.60;<br>tolterodine USD 37.20<br><br>Surgery (third-line treatment)<br><br>Cost per success:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release<br>USD 1,708; immediate-release<br>oxybutynin USD 1,774;<br>tolterodine USD 2,882<br><br>Cost per continent day:<br>oxybutynin controlled-release<br>USD 11.90; immediate-release<br>oxybutynin USD 12.60;<br>tolterodine USD 20.70 | Model<br>US context.<br><br>Authors report that sensitivity<br>analysis shows that results are<br>robust to model assumptions.<br><br>Baseline results suggest that<br>tolterodine is dominated. | Cost<br>effectiveness<br>analysis |

## Desmopressin

| Study  | Study type and EL                             | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison               | Length of follow-up               | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Lose 2003 <sup>413</sup><br>Lose 2004 <sup>414</sup><br>(up to 1 year tx with desmopressin [all patients]) | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+<br>(long-term study EL = 3) | 144 randomised.<br>117 enrolled in long-term tx study; 87 [74%] completed<br>10–12 month follow-up | F mean age 57 years (SD 13.4) with nocturia (mean voids 2.98 [SD 0.91]), mean nocturnal volume 798 ml (SD 296), nocturia index score > 1*; returned to ≥ 78% of baseline nocturnal diuresis value after the 1-week washout following dose titration<br><br>Exclusions: shift work, pregnancy, vaginitis, urethritis, clinically significant abnormal blood or urine values, hyponatraemia, diabetes insipidus, MS, polydipsia, overt lower urinary tract dysfunction, tx with diuretics, tricyclic antidepressants, indometacin, carbamazepine, chlorpropamide | Desmopressin, optimal dose# orally ( <i>n</i> = 72) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 72) | 3 weeks tx, 10–12 month follow-up | Responders (≥ 50% reduction in mean no. nocturnal voids)<br><br>Vol. Nocturnal voids (mean change, ml)<br><br>Duration of sleep until first nocturnal void (mean change, mins)<br><br>Nocturnal diuresis (mean change, ml/min)<br><br>Ratio of nocturnal/24 h urine vol.<br><br>Ratio of daytime/24 h urine vol.<br><br>QOL (BFLUTS); % reporting nocturia as bothersome<br><br>Adverse effects ( <i>n</i> = 224; total screened) | 46% vs 7%, OR 13.4 (95% CI 4.6 to 39.2), <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br><i>At 12 months</i> ( <i>n</i> = 67): 67%; mean number voids 1.2 after tx end ( <i>n</i> = 85); and 1.3 at 12 months ( <i>n</i> = 79)<br><br>–46 vs –17%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>+78% (to 272 min) vs +20%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br><i>At 10–12 months</i> duration 307–310 min<br><br>–44 vs –6%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>–30 vs +2%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>–36 vs +9%, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br><br>75% vs 84% after tx (97% vs 98% at baseline)<br><br><i>At 10–12 months</i> 30–31%<br><br><i>Dose titration</i> : headache 22%, nausea 8%, hyponatraemia 6%, | Funding: Ferring Pharmaceuticals.<br><br>*defined as mean nocturnal volume divided by largest voided volume.<br><br>Randomisation occurred after #dose titration of up to 3 weeks (then a 1 week washout period): 0.1 mg orally at bedtime for 1 week, maintained if 0 nocturia. If ≥ 1 nocturia episode, dose increased to 0.2 mg for 1 week and if required to 0.4 mg for 1 week. 14%, 39%, 47% took 0.1 mg, 0.2 mg, 0.4 mg respectively. <sup>414</sup><br><br>During longer-term study, all women could continue with their optimal dose of desmopressin and were advised to void just before going to bed, not to drink more than sufficient to satisfy thirst from 1 h before bed until 8 h after drug dose, also advised to avoid drinking liquids with a diuretic effect at night (e.g. caffeine, alcohol).<br><br>75% completed 1 year of tx. Withdrawals owing to AE (10%), lack of efficacy (7%), on pt request (4%), other reasons (5%). |

| Study                       | Study type and EL            | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison       | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures            | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
|                             |                              |                 |   |  |                  |                     |                             | <p>abdominal pain, frequency, dry mouth (each 4%), dizziness, fatigue, peripheral oedema (each 3%).</p> <p><i>Double-blind period:</i> headache 10% vs 7%; serious adverse events: 2 deaths (unrelated to tx), 2 serious hyponatraemia, 1 angina and SVT)</p> <p><i>At 10–12 months (data for F only):</i> most frequent AE related to tx: hyponatraemia 12% (none required tx, none &lt; 125 mmol/l); headache 7%, frequency, peripheral oedema, UTI (each 3%), nausea, dizziness (each 2%)</p> |  |
| Asplund 1999 <sup>415</sup> | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 17 (5 women)    | M/F 60–74 years (mean 68), ≥ 2 nocturnal voids and nocturnal urinary output ≥ 0.9 ml/min, completed and responded to an initial dose-response study* <sup>944</sup><br><br>Exclusions: desmopressin tx within 2 weeks, heart disease, hypertension, | Desmopressin (optimal dose from dose-titration study)*, (n = 17) | Placebo (n = 17) | 2×2 week tx periods | Nocturnal diuresis (ml/min) | 1.0 (0.4) vs 1.6 (0.8) difference between grps: –0.59 (95% CI –0.33, –0.85), P < 0.0001  | Funding: none declared; some authors from Ferring pharmaceuticals.<br><br>*Dose titration <sup>944</sup> : 0.1 mg orally at bedtime for 1 week, increased to 0.2 mg for 1 week and 0.4 mg for 1 week; dose increased if none of the following: nocturnal diuresis < 0.5 ml/min, unable to void in the morning, adverse events. Optimal dose for 17 patients include in this study: |
|                             |                              |                 |   |  |                  |                     | 24 h diuresis               | No sig. change (1.3 at baseline, 1.3 vs 1.4 after tx)  |  |
|                             |                              |                 |   |  |                  |                     | Nocturia (mean [SD])        | 1.1 (0.7) vs 1.7 (0.8), P < 0.0001<br><br>difference between grps: –0.59 (95% CI –0.32, –0.85), P < 0.0001   |  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL            | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison               | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|---|
|                            |                              |                 | liver disease, Crohn's disease, renal or neurological problems, primary polydipsia, diabetes insipidus, UTI, tx known to affect water or electrolyte metabolism, smokers   |                                     |                          |                        | Adverse effects        | 1 hyponatraemia, resolved at end of tx   | 0.1 mg ( <i>n</i> = 4), 0.2 mg (10), 0.4 mg (3).<br>No fluid restriction; pts permitted to drink as much as needed to avoid thirst. |
| Hilton 1982 <sup>416</sup> | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1+ | 25              | F mean age 56 years (41–76), nocturia (mean 3.17 episodes) who had failed to respond to treatment with antispasmodic agents and evening fluid restriction. 13 had urge UI, 6 stress UI, 23 urgency, 18 daytime frequency. Urodynamic diagnosis: 18 DO (14 idiopathic, 3 MS, 1 interstitial cystitis); 1 DO + urethral sphincter incompetence, 2 voiding difficulty, 2 sensory urgency, 2 urodynamically normal (uterovaginal prolapse)<br>Exclusion: ischaemic heart disease, congestive heart failure, hypertension | Desmopressin 20 µg ( <i>n</i> = 25) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 25) | 4 weeks tx (2×2 weeks) | Nocturnal frequency    | –39 vs –18% ( <i>P</i> < 0.01 des vs baseline and plac)  | Funding: Ferring pharmaceuticals supplied materials.  |
|                            |                              |                 |  |                                     |                          |                        | Nocturnal urine output | –39 vs –11%, ( <i>P</i> ≤ 0.02 des vs baseline and plac)   | Drugs given as a single intranasal dose at bedtime.   |
|                            |                              |                 |  |                                     |                          |                        | Diurnal frequency      | +11 vs +10%, <i>P</i> = NS des vs baseline and plac  | 11 took desmopressin followed by placebo, 14 took placebo then desmopressin.  |
|                            |                              |                 |  |                                     |                          |                        | Diurnal urine output   | +11 vs –10%, <i>P</i> = NS des vs baseline and plac  |   |
|                            |                              |                 |  |                                     |                          |                        | Other urinary symptoms | Urge UI ( <i>n</i> ); 11 vs 12<br>Stress UI ( <i>n</i> ); 6 vs 6<br>Urgency: 19 vs 20  |   |
|                            |                              |                 |  |                                     |                          |                        | Adverse effects        | 2 transient headache, 2 nausea, 2 earache during each tx phase.<br>1 hypertensive pt developed BP 190/110 mmHg and ankle oedema with desmopressin tx |   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL           | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison | Length of follow-up                             | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|------------|---|--|---|---|
| Robinson 2004 <sup>417</sup> | DB RCT 'cross-over' EL = 1+ | 64 randomised, 57 analysed | F mean age 53 years (25–78), daytime UI (23% stress, 50% mixed, 20% urge), daily fluid intake < 2.5 litre<br><br>Exclusions: tx with diuretics, tricyclic antidepressants, indometacin, carbamazepine, chlorpropamide; or abnormally low serum sodium | Desmopressin 40 µg intranasally (7 doses) and placebo (3 doses)* | *          | To end of 10 doses (actual duration not stated) | Mean (SD) no. of periods with no leakage (≤ 5 g increase in pad weight) for the first 4 h after voiding ( <i>n</i> = 58 desmo, 55 plac)<br><br>Mean (SD) vol. leaked /UI episode in 1st 4 h (ml; <i>n</i> = 45 desmo, 39 placebo)<br><br>Mean (SD) vol. voided in 1st 4 h (ml; <i>n</i> = 59 desmo, 58 plac)<br><br>Mean (SD) no. of periods with no leakage over 24 h ( <i>n</i> = 57 desmo, 50 plac)<br><br>Mean (SD) vol. leaked /UI episode over 24 h (ml; <i>n</i> = 51 desmo, 48 plac)<br><br>Mean (SD) vol. voided over 24 h (ml; <i>n</i> = 58 desmo, 57 plac)<br><br>Mean (SD) time to first UI episode or void from dose taken | 61.7 (35.4), 95% CI 52.4 to 71.0<br><br>vs<br><br>47.9 (40.2), 95% CI 37.0 to 58.7<br><br>22.2 (18.9), 95% CI 16.5 to 27.9 vs<br><br>26.1 (25.1), 95% CI 17.9 to 34.2<br><br>237 (121), 95% CI 206 to 269 vs<br><br>317 (194), 95% CI 266 to 368<br><br>32.7 (38.1), 95% CI 22.6 to 42.9 vs<br><br>25.3 (37.7), 95% CI 14.6 to 36.0<br><br>24.3 (18.6), 95% CI 19.1 to 29.6 vs<br><br>25.7 (18.5), 95% CI 20.3 to 31.1<br><br>1180 (582), 95% CI 1027 to 1333 vs<br><br>1375 (625), 95% CI 1209 to 1541<br><br>2.3 (1.0) h vs 2.1 (1.0) | Funding: Ferring Pharmaceuticals.<br><br>*F randomised to one of 4 tx sequences, in which the placebo doses were taken as the 1–3, 3–5, 6–8, or 8–10 doses. Results not given for each sequence, and do not know over what time period women used the tx for. Results from the 4 tx sequences pooled for desmopressin vs placebo. Each dose of desmopressin or placebo was taken when required, but at least 4 h before bedtime, not on > 2 consecutive days, and not > once in 24 h. The confidence intervals for each outcome for desmopressin and placebo groups overlapped. |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size   | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|------------------|---|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Adverse effects  | % reporting any; 42% desmo vs 25% plac<br>most common with desmopressin; headache 36%, nausea 10% |                     |



## Diuretics

| Study                        | Study type and EL            | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention    | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures       | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|------------|---------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| Pedersen 1988 <sup>418</sup> | DB RCT cross-over<br>EL = 1– | 33; 28 completed (13 women) | M/F median age 66.5 years, $\geq 2$ nocturia episodes (median 17.5/week)<br><br>Exclusions: urinary retention, UTI, hypo- or hyper-kalaemia, creatinine $> 120 \mu\text{mol/l}$ | Bumetanide 1 mg | Placebo    | 2x2 weeks tx        | Nocturia episodes/week | 10 vs 13.8; difference – 3.8 (IQR –1.5, 5.5), $P < 0.05$ | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] 5 pts excluded from analysis owing to protocol violations (2), adverse effects (3; indisposition, headache, stranguria).<br>Doses taken 4–6 h before bedtime. |

## Duloxetine

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                       | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Norton 2002 <sup>420</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 553             | F 18–65 years (mean 50), predominant stress UI for $\geq 3$ months, (positive cough stress test and positive stress pad test), $\geq 4$ episodes/week (mean 1.6 to 1.9/day), diurnal frequency $\leq 7/\text{day}$ , nocturnal frequency $\leq 2/\text{day}$ , absence of predominant symptoms of urge UI or enuresis. 8% had prior continence surgery and 19% performed PFMT<br><br>Exclusions: unable to tolerate bladder infusion filling to 400 ml, or first sensation of bladder filling $< 100 \text{ ml}$ , or no | Duloxetine 80 mg/day ( $n = 140$ ) | Duloxetine 40 mg/day ( $n = 137$ )<br>Duloxetine 20 mg/day ( $n = 138$ )<br>Placebo ( $n = 138$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes, (median change)<br>Frequency/day (mean change)<br>Voiding interval (mean change, mins)<br>I-QOL (mean change in score)<br>Patients Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I)<br>Stress pad test (median change in weight) | –64 vs –59 vs –54 vs –41%<br>$P \leq 0.002$ for duloxetine 80 mg or 40 mg vs placebo<br>–1.4 vs –1.2 vs –1.0 vs –0.6<br>$P \leq 0.003$ for duloxetine 80 mg or 40 mg vs placebo<br>+24 vs +19 vs +16 vs +7<br>$P \leq 0.004$ for all duloxetine grps vs placebo<br>+9.3 vs +7.8 vs +5.3 vs +5.8,<br>$P = 0.03$ duloxetine 80 mg vs placebo<br>44 vs 37 vs 31% vs 27% reported their condition was very much/much better,<br>$P = 0.005$ duloxetine 80 mg vs placebo<br>–29 vs –43 vs –11 vs –30%,<br>$P = \text{NS}$ between grps | Funding: Eli Lilly and Company.<br>Duloxetine 80 mg and 40 mg groups; daily dose taken in two divided doses. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                       | Comparison            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                             |                   |                 | sensation at any time during the filling  |                                    |                       |                     | Adverse effects  | At least 1 AE:<br>73 vs 69 vs 62% vs 61%<br>Nausea 13 vs 9 vs 9% vs 2%,<br>$P < 0.05$ duloxetine grps vs placebo.<br>Other events occurring in $\geq 5\%$ in any grp (no sig. differences between grps): headache, diarrhoea, constipation, dry mouth, dizziness, insomnia, sinusitis, fatigue, nasopharyngitis, upper resp tract infection |  |
|                             |                   |                 |   |                                    |                       |                     | Discontinuation owing to AE  | 15 vs 12 vs 9% vs 5%, $P = 0.04$ duloxetine grps vs placebo   |  |
| Millard 2004 <sup>421</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 458             | F 27–79 years (mean ~ 53), predominant stress UI for $\geq 3$ months, (positive cough stress test and positive stress pad test), $\geq 7$ episodes/week (mean ~18), diurnal frequency $< 9$ /day, nocturnal frequency $< 3$ /night, absence of predominant urge UI symptoms. 18% had prior continence | Duloxetine 80 mg/day ( $n = 227$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 231$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes, (median change)<br>Voiding interval (mean change, mins)<br>I-QOL (mean change in score)<br>PGI-I | -53.6 vs -40.0% $P = 0.05$<br>responders:# 59.5 vs 43.2%,<br>$P < 0.001$<br>+20.4 vs +8.5, $P < 0.001$<br>+10.3 (SD 16) vs +6.4 (SD 17),<br>$P = 0.007$<br>74% vs 64%, $P = 0.028$<br>reported their condition was very much/much/little better   | Funding: Eli Lilly and Company, and Boehringer Ingelheim.<br>Duloxetine 80 mg taken in two divided doses.<br>#proportions with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes.<br>More placebo-treated pts completed the study, 92% vs 75%, $P < 0.001$ . Higher discontinuation rate related to side effects.<br>Results also available for monthly visits. Not reproduced |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
|                                |                   |                 | surgery.* 5.7%<br>duloxetine vs 12.1%<br>placebo performed<br>PFMT ( $P = 0.017$ )<br><br>Exclusions: unable to tolerate bladder infusion filling to 400 ml, or first sensation of bladder filling < 100 ml, or no sensation at any time during the filling |                                     |                       |                     | Adverse effects  | Any 76% vs 59%<br>nausea 25% vs 4%<br>dry mouth 12% vs 2%<br>constipation 13% vs 2%<br>fatigue 10% vs 4%<br>insomnia 14% vs 3%<br>dizziness 11% vs 3%<br>increased sweating 6% vs 1%<br>vomiting 6% vs 2%<br>somnolence 8% vs 0%<br>anorexia 7% vs 0%<br>(all $P \leq 0.016$ duloxetine vs placebo)<br><br>Mean change in heart rate (bpm); +2.8 vs -0.07, $P < 0.001$ | here.<br>*previous continence surgery includes injections.<br>bpm = beats per minute.  |
|                                |                   |                 |   |                                     |                       |                     | Discontinuation owing to AE  | 17.2 vs 1.7%, $P < 0.001$  |  |
| Dmochowski 2003 <sup>422</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 683             | F 22–84 years (mean ~ 53), predominant stress UI for $\geq 3$ months, (positive cough stress test and positive stress pad test), $\geq 7$ episodes/week (mean ~18, diurnal frequency < 8/day, nocturnal frequency < 3/night, absence of predominant urge UI | Duloxetine 80 mg /day ( $n = 344$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 339$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | Leakage episodes, (median change)<br><br>Voiding interval (mean change, mins)<br><br>I-QOL (mean change in score)<br><br>PGI-I | -50% vs -27.5% $P < 0.001$<br>responders:#: 51.4% vs 33.5%, $P < 0.001$<br><br>+20 vs +1.7, $P < 0.001$<br><br>+11.1 (SD 14.8) vs +6.8 (SD 13.8), $P < 0.001$<br><br>62% vs 40%, $P < 0.001$ reported improvement  | Funding: Eli Lilly and Co.<br>Duloxetine 80 mg taken in two divided doses.<br>#proportions with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes.<br>More placebo-treated pts completed the study, 87% vs 69%, $P < 0.001$ . Higher discontinuation rate related to side effects.<br>*Previous continence surgery |

| Study                               | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                                     |                   |                 | <p>symptoms. 13% had prior continence surgery.* 16.9% duloxetine vs 18% placebo performed PFMT</p> <p>Exclusions: unable to tolerate bladder infusion filling to 400 ml, or first sensation of bladder filling &lt; 100 ml, or no sensation at any time during the filling, women taking antidepressants</p>  |                                     |                       |                     | <p>Adverse effects</p> <p>Any 74% vs 50%<br/>nausea 23% vs 2%<br/>dry mouth 12% vs 1%<br/>constipation 10% vs 2%<br/>fatigue 15% vs 4%<br/>insomnia 14% vs 2%<br/>somnolence 9 vs 0.3%<br/>dizziness 8% vs 2%; (all <math>P \leq 0.002</math> between grps)</p> <p>Headache 7% vs 4%<br/>diarrhoea 6% vs 3%, <math>P = 0.04</math>.</p> |   | includes injections.  |
|                                     |                   |                 |   |                                     |                       |                     | Discontinuation owing to AE   | 24% vs 4%, $P < 0.001$ (mainly nausea 6.4% vs 0, $P < 0.001$ )  |   |
| van Kerrebroeck 2004 <sup>423</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 494             | <p>F 24–83 years (mean 52–54), predominant stress UI for <math>\geq 3</math> months, (positive cough stress test and positive stress pad test), <math>\geq 7</math> episodes/week (mean ~17), diurnal frequency &lt; 8/day, nocturnal frequency <math>\leq 2</math>/day, absence of predominant urge UI symptoms. 8% had prior continence surgery and 19%</p> | Duloxetine 80 mg /day ( $n = 247$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 247$ ) | 12 weeks tx         | <p>Leakage episodes, (median change)</p> <p>Voiding interval (mean change, mins)</p> <p>I-QOL (mean change in score)</p> <p>PGI-I</p>   | <p>–50% (95% CI –57.1, –42.9) vs –29.3% (95% CI –36.8, –20.0), <math>P = 0.002</math></p> <p>responders#: 51.9% vs 33.5%, <math>P &lt; 0.001</math></p> <p>+15 vs +3.8, <math>P &lt; 0.001</math></p> <p>+5.5 vs +4.1</p> <p>95% CI for tx difference –0.5, +4.1, <math>P = NS</math></p> <p>56.2 vs 48.2%, <math>P = NS</math> reported their condition was very much/much/little better</p> | <p>Funding: Eli Lilly and Boehringer Ingelheim.</p> <p>Duloxetine 80 mg taken in two divided doses.</p> <p>#proportions with <math>\geq 50\%</math> reduction in leakage episodes.</p> <p>More placebo-treated pts completed the study, 92% vs 73%, <math>P &lt; 0.001</math>. Higher discontinuation rate related to side effects.</p> <p>Results also available for monthly visits. Not reproduced here.</p> <p>bpm = beats per minute.</p> |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                         | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                                  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                             |                   |   | performed PFMT<br>Exclusions: unable to tolerate bladder infusion filling to 400 ml, or first sensation of bladder filling < 100 ml  |   |   |                     | Adverse effects  | Nausea 28% vs 7%<br>dry mouth 19% vs 2%<br>constipation 14% vs 4%<br>fatigue 14% vs 5%<br>insomnia 13% vs 1%<br>dizziness 12% vs 3%<br>increased sweating 9% vs 2%<br>vomiting 7% vs 2%<br>somnolence 4% vs 0%<br>tremor 4% vs 0%<br>(all $P \leq 0.024$ duloxetine vs placebo)<br><br>Mean change in heart rate (bpm); < 3 for duloxetine ('sig. greater with duloxetine'); placebo results not given |   |
|                             |                   |   |  |   |   |                     | Discontinuation owing to AE  | 22% vs 5%, $P < 0.001$   |   |
| Cardozo 2004 <sup>425</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 109 randomised, 92 included in analysis | F aged 33–75 years (mean ~53), predominant symptom of stress UI with urodynamic evidence, leakage episodes $\geq 14$ /week (mean ~21–24), continence surgery already scheduled. 16% had prior continence surgery | Duloxetine 80 mg/day for 4 weeks, then 120 mg/day for 4 weeks ( $n = 55$ randomised, 46 analysed) | Placebo ( $n = 54$ randomised, 52 analysed) | 8 weeks tx          | Leakage episodes, (median change)<br><br>I-QOL (mean change in score)<br><br>PGI-I | -59.8 vs -26.9% $P < 0.001$<br><br>Responders#: 63 vs 13.5%, $P < 0.001$ ; RR 4.68 (95% CI 2.27 to 9.66)<br><br>+10.6 (SD 19.1) vs +2.4 (SD 9.4), $P = 0.003$ (95% CI for tx difference 3.0 to 14.2)<br>% change 20 vs 4.5<br><br>Very much or much better 33.3 vs 7.7%<br>Little better or no change 60.8 vs 80.8%<br>Little or very much worse 5.9 vs 11.5%<br>$P = 0.003$ duloxetine vs placebo     | Funding: Eli Lilly and Boehringer Ingelheim.<br>Duloxetine total daily dose taken in two divided doses.<br><br>#proportions with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes. [EL = 1-] owing to drop out rate; only completers analysed.<br><br>*women asked: based on your current symptoms of stress UI, would you consider a surgical intervention? (strongly interested, somewhat interested, unsure, somewhat not interested, strongly not interested). |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison            | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
|                             |                   |                 |  |                                     |                       |   | Willingness to consider surgery* (% changing from unsure or interested in surgery to NOT interested) | 20.4% vs 0, $P = 0.001$<br>(results for 94, because 1 duloxetine and 6 placebo pts excluded from analysis owing to stating they were not interested in surgery at baseline)  |   |
|                             |                   |                 |  |                                     |                       |   | Adverse effects  | Any AE 93% vs 72%, $P = 0.006$<br>Nausea 46% vs 13%<br>dry mouth 22% vs 0%<br>constipation 27% vs 6%, (all $P \leq 0.004$ duloxetine vs placebo)<br>Headache 27% vs 9%<br>fatigue 18% vs 11%<br>insomnia 13% vs 6%<br>dizziness 16% vs 4%<br>vomiting 13% vs 2%,<br>somnolence 13% vs 2% (all $P = NS$ ) |   |
|                             |                   |                 |  |                                     |                       |   | Discontinuation owing to AE  | 33% vs 6%, $P < 0.001$   |   |
| Kinchen 2005 <sup>424</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 451             | F mean age ~53 years (SD 13), with symptoms of stress UI ( $\geq 1$ leakage episode/week; median ~7). 16% had pure stress UI, 69% stress-predominant UI, 9% urge-predominant UI, 6% 'balanced' UI.<br>About 50% had genital prolapse on training, 10% prior continence | Duloxetine 40 mg b.d. ( $n = 224$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 227$ ) | 9 months (3 month analysis also done because of high drop-out rate at 9 months) | I-QOL (mean score increase)  | At 3 months:<br>ITT analysis 13.0 vs 10.4, $P = NS$<br>completers 13.5 vs 10.8, $P = NS$<br>At 9 months:<br>ITT 13.8 vs 12.1, $P = NS$<br>completers 15.6 vs 15.7, $P = NS$  | Funding: none declared. All authors Eli Lilly-based.<br>Urodynamic testing was not required prior to study entry.<br>Pts were permitted to take other treatments and/or change dose of study medication during the study But cross-over not allowed. Use of other interventions at any time was: oestrogens 45% vs 49%, antimuscarinics 11% vs 14%, |
|                             |                   |                 |  |                                     |                       |   | PGI-I at 9 months  | ITT: 48% vs 42%, $P = NS$<br>Completers: 70% vs 51%<br>$P < 0.05$  |   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|       |                   |                 | surgery, 5% prior antimuscarinic drug use<br>35% undertaking PFMT at baseline<br>Exclusions: active UTI, participated in previous duloxetine trials, other medical conditions (arrhythmias, uncontrolled hypertension, liver disease, seizure disorders, unstable cardiac conditions) |              |            |                     | Adverse effects (all AE sig. different between groups) | 88% vs 70% reported $\geq 1$<br>Very common with duloxetine:<br>31% vs 6% nausea<br>20% vs 5% fatigue<br>15% vs 6% insomnia<br>13% vs 4% dizziness<br>13% vs 6% headache<br>10% vs 2% somnolence<br>12% vs 2% dry mouth<br>Common with duloxetine:<br>9% vs 2% constipation<br>9% vs 4% diarrhoea<br>9% vs 4% vomiting<br>7 vs 0.4% increased sweating<br>5% vs 1% appetite decreased<br>4% vs 1% anxiety<br>5 vs 0.4% tremor<br>3.6 vs 0.4% reduced libido<br>2% vs 0% nightmare<br>0% vs 3% fungal infection | pseudoephedrine or phenylpropranolamine 11% vs 13%.<br>Another outcome 'integrated percent of possible improvement' also reported but no numerical data given.<br>Drop-out rates at 3 months: 14.7 vs 11.5%; at 6 months 24.1 vs 18.5%, at 9 months 27.7% vs 22%.<br>Proportion still taking study drug: 62.9 vs 81.9% at 3 months, 49.6 vs 71.8% at 6 months, 37.9 vs 53.7% at 9 months. |
|       |                   |                 |   |              |            |                     | Discontinuation owing to adverse effects (at 9 months) | 8.9 vs 2.2%, $P < 0.05$<br>(discontinuations overall at 9 months: 62.1 vs 46.3%)   |   |

## Duloxetine – health economics

| Study  | Population<br>Study method   | Intervention details   | Costs<br>Outcomes  | Results  | Additional comments   | Study type            |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| Das Gupta 2006 <sup>4268</sup> ;8)41<br>UK<br>Funding: Eli-Lilly and Company Ltd. And Boehringer Ingelheim | A hypothetical patient population<br>A Markov model was used to estimate the cost and QALYs over a time horizon of 2 years<br>Disutility from SUI symptoms estimated from two previous studies<br>Cost data taken from standard UK sources | Conservative treatment of stress UI: duloxetine vs standard treatment (PFMT followed by surgery);<br>and<br>duloxetine in combination with PFMT vs standard treatment<br>In both cases duloxetine was assessed as a first line and second line treatment | Costs:<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (first line); standard treatment GBP620.20, duloxetine GBP717<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (second line); standard treatment GBP620.20, duloxetine GBP717<br>duloxetine + PFMT vs standard treatment (first line); standard treatment GBP618, duloxetine GBP910<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (second line); standard treatment GBP618, duloxetine GBP501<br>QALY gain:<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (first line); standard treatment 0.0434, duloxetine 0.0544<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (second line); standard treatment 0.0436, duloxetine 0.0518<br>duloxetine + PFMT vs standard treatment (first line); standard treatment 0.0409, duloxetine 0.0909<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (second line); standard treatment 0.0399, duloxetine 0.0599 | ICER:<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (first line); GBP8,730 per QALY<br>ICER:<br>duloxetine + PFMT vs standard treatment (first line); GBP5,854 per QALY<br>ICER:<br>duloxetine vs standard treatment (second line); duloxetine dominates<br>ICER:<br>duloxetine + PFMT vs standard treatment (second line); duloxetine dominates | Model<br>UK context.<br>Cost data 2004/05.<br>Costs and benefits discounted at 3.5%.<br>Baseline analysis based on two year timeframe<br>Markov model used 3 months cycles.<br>Waiting times for outpatient attendance, urodynamics, formal PFMT and surgery are included in the model.<br>Sensitivity analysis suggested that the second line use of duloxetine alone or in combination with PFMT was cost effective (using a £30,000 per QALY willingness to pay threshold) at 5 years; first line use of duloxetine alone would not be considered cost effective at 5 years with an ICER of GBP49,658. | Cost-utility analysis |

## Oestrogens

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                    | Intervention  | Comparison                      | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                    | Effect size            | Additional comments                      |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Dessole 2004 <sup>431</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 88              | Postmenopausal women, (mean ~7 years since | Estriol 'ovule' intravaginally (1 mg/day for 2 weeks, then 2 mg | Placebo intravaginally (n = 44) | 6 months tx         | Subjective improvement of stress UI | 68% vs 16%, $P < 0.01$ | Funding: none declared.<br>Not a blinded |



| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
|                           |                   |                 | menopause), mean age ~57 years, stress UI, vaginal atrophy, recurrent UTI<br>Exclusions: uterovaginal prolapse, cystocele, rectocele, (grade II or III), severe systemic disease, thromboembolic disease, biliary lithiasis, previous breast or uterine cancer, abnormal uterine bleeding, BMI $\geq 25$ kg/m <sup>2</sup> | once /week), $n = 44$   |                      |                     | UPP (mean changes)                                 | MUP (cmH <sub>2</sub> O): +22% vs -6%, $P < 0.05$<br>MUCP (cmH <sub>2</sub> O): +26% vs -3%, $P < 0.05$<br>Pressure transmission ratio (%): +23% vs 0, $P < 0.05$                        | study.   |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | Urodynamics  | No significant difference between groups in volume at 1st sensation, bladder capacity or compliance, or max. bladder pressure.<br>Sig. greater increase in UPP in estriol grp vs placebo |  |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | Adverse events                                     | 2 from each grp withdrew owing to localised adverse reactions; vaginal irritation, burning, itching.<br>No systemic AE reported  |  |
| Fantl 1996 <sup>432</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 83              | F, hypoestrogenic, aged $\geq 45$ years (mean 67), UI at least once/week. 45% stress UI, 26% DO, 29% stress UI + DO<br>Exclusions: institutionalisation, permanent catheterisation, cognitive impairment, functional disability, neuropathic or uncontrolled metabolic conditions, chronic UTI, reversible causes of UI    | Conjugated equine oestrogen 0.625 mg /30 days + medroxyprogerterone for 10 days each cycle ( $n = 44$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 39$ ) | 3 months tx         | Leakage episodes/week (mean change)                | -3 vs -3%, $P = NS$  | Funding: National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Wyeth-Ayerst, Upjohn. |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | Fluid loss (standardised pad test; mean change, g) | -20 vs -13% $P = NS$   |  |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | Frequency/week (mean change)                       | Diurnal: -4 vs -6%, $P = NS$<br>Nocturnal: -11% vs 0%, $P = NS$  | Sig. differences between grps at baseline in   |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | QOL  | IIQ: -25 vs -23 (-20 vs -19%), $P = NS$<br>UDI: -12 vs -20 (-10.5 vs -16.5%), $P = NS$   | vaginal parity (3.1 vs 2.4), and use of diuretics (32% vs 26%), $P < 0.05$ .               |
|                           |                   |                 |  |   |                      |                     | Perception of improvement (5 pt ordinal scale)     | Much or somewhat better 54% vs 45%, $P = NS$   |  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Jackson 1999 <sup>433</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 67                         | Postmenopausal F (at least 1 year) mean age 63 years, genuine stress UI (mean 1 leakage episode/day and 1/night), not taken HRT in last 12 months<br><br>Exclusions: breast, endometrial or liver cancer; endometrium > 4 mm thick | Estradiol valerate 2 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 33)                | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 34) | 6 months tx         | BFLUTS   | No sig. difference between grps in % reporting symptoms  | Funding: MRC. Unit at which study based<br><br>funded by educational grant from Pfizer.<br><br>Progesterone not given in addition to estradiol, in order to maintain blinding of treatment.<br>Norethisterone 5 mg for 12 days/month given if breakthrough bleeding occurred with estradiol.<br><br>*baseline values 10 vs 3 g. |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | SF-36  | No sig. difference between grps in changes in scores   |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | 1 h pad test (mean change, g)                                    | +3 vs +6 g (30% vs 200%)*<br><i>P</i> = NS   |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | Frequency–volume chart parameters (change in median values/24 h) | Frequency: +1 vs –7%<br>Nocturia: –10 vs +10%<br>Mean voided vol.: +12 vs –1%<br>Leaks/day: +0.4 (40%) vs 0 ( <i>P</i> = NS for all comparisons) |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | Urodynamics (change in median values)                            | 1st desire to void: +2% vs +9%<br>Functional capacity: +11% vs +7%<br>MUCP increased in both grp, <i>P</i> = NS between grps                     |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | Urodynamic cure  | 14% both grps  |   |
| Wilson 1987 <sup>434</sup>  | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 36 randomised, 34 analysed | Postmenopausal F mean age 57 years (47–72), genuine stress UI, and stable detrusor function, no HRT in past 3 months   | Piperazine estrone sulphate, 3 mg at night ( <i>n</i> = 16) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 18) | 3 months            | Subjective assessment  | Much improved 7 vs 5, improved 5 vs 5, no better 4 vs 8; <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | Frequency/24 h (mean change)                                     | –16 vs –3%, <i>P</i> = NS  |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | Urilo nappy test (change in mean, ml/2 h) ( <i>n</i> = 22)       | +1 ml (20%) vs –2 ml (40%)   |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     | MUCP (change in mean, cmH <sub>2</sub> O)                        | –4 (7%) vs –3 (6%),<br><i>P</i> = NS   |   |
|                             |                   |                            |  |   |                          |                     |  |  |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                             |                   |  |  |   |   |                     | Adverse events  | 2 in oestrogen grp withdrew (1 palpitations and trembling, 1 posterior subendocardial infarct). 'other minor symptoms e.g. leg pain, breast discomfort, chest pain, nausea, were uncommon'   |  |
| Cardozo 1993 <sup>435</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 64 randomised, 56 completed and analysed | Postmenopausal F, ambulant, mean age ~59 years, sensory or motor urge UI* (21 had stress UI, 48 urge UI)<br><br>Exclusions: symptoms present for 3 months before the menopause, voiding difficulty, pelvic anatomical defect requiring surgery, neurological disease, recent oestrogen use, contraindications to oestrogen use | Estriol 3 mg/day ( <i>n</i> = 34 randomised, 31 analysed) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 30 randomised, 25 analysed)        | 3 months tx         | Leakage episodes/day (change in mean)<br>Cure of UI<br>Frequency (change in mean/day)<br>Urgency<br>1st desire to void (change in mean)<br>Cystometric capacity (change in mean)<br>Adverse effects | Diurnal: -21 vs -59%<br>Night: -81 vs -70%<br>Stress UI: 6/11 vs 6/10<br>Urge UI: 11/25 vs 7/23<br>Diurnal: -16 vs -32% ( <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline for both grps)<br>Nocturia: -25 vs -46% ( <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline for plac grp)<br>Change on severity scale of 0-3: -1.1 vs -1.1<br>Cure: 7/29 vs 9/25 ( <i>P</i> < 0.05 vs baseline for both grps)<br>Bladder volume at: +28 vs +24%<br>Detrusor pressure at: 0 vs +29%<br>Bladder volume: +2 vs +13%<br>Detrusor pressure: -19 vs +52%<br>None | Funding: none declared.<br>*sensory urge UI: 1st desire to void at < 150 ml and cystometric capacity < 400 ml in the absence of detrusor activity); motor urge UI: uninhibited detrusor contractions > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>No between-group statistical comparisons reported.<br>[EL = 1-] only completers analysed. |
| Lose 2000 <sup>436</sup>    | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 251                                      | Postmenopausal F (> 2 years), mean age 66 years, at least  | Estradiol-releasing ring, 7.5 mg/24 h ( <i>n</i> = 134)   | Estriol pessaries 0.5 mg (1/day for 3 weeks, then every | 6 months tx         | Urgency   | Responder rate 51% vs 56%<br>Cure 27% vs 33%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Second author   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients                | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                               |                   |                                | 1 bothersome lower urinary tract symptom. 23% had cystocele. 70% had urgency, 59% frequency, 52% urge UI, 50% stress UI, 50% nocturia, 19% dysuria<br>Exclusions: oestrogen-dependent neoplasia, or breast, ovarian or endometrial cancer, undiagnosed vaginal bleeding, liver disease, porphyria, uterovaginal prolapse grade II or III, sex hormone tx in last 6 months |  | other day), <i>n</i> = 117                        |                     | Frequency<br>Urge UI<br>Stress UI<br>Nocturia<br>Improvement of symptoms (VAS)<br>Adverse effects  | Responder rate 61% vs 58%<br>Cure 34% vs 44%<br>Responder rate 58% vs 58%<br>Cure 33% vs 34%<br>Responder rate 53% vs 59%<br>Cure 34% vs 41%<br>Responder rate 51% vs 54%<br>Cure 31% vs 35%<br>+21.1 mm vs +23.2 mm<br>'most', including vaginal discomfort/discharge and breast pain were mild and transient<br>3.7 vs 2.6% withdrew owing to an adverse event | medical director of Pharmacia and Upjohn.<br>No sig. difference identified between grps in any outcome.<br>Responder rate not defined; assumed to be $\geq 50\%$ reduction in symptoms.<br>Not a blinded study. |
| Ouslander 2001 <sup>437</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 32 randomised, 21 completed tx | F nursing home residents aged $\geq 65$ years (mean 88), UI at least daily  | Oestrogen 0.625 mg + medroxyprogesterone acetate 2.5 mg ( <i>n</i> = 15 randomised, 9 completed) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 17 randomised, 12 completed) | 6 months tx         | Wet rate (% checks wet during 3 days prompted voiding); change in mean<br>Appropriate toileting rate (continent voids/total), change in mean<br>Incontinent volume (change in mean)<br>Bladder capacity (change in mean, ml) | -10 vs -11%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>+20 vs +23%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>-1 vs -20%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>-5 vs +4%, <i>P</i> = NS  | Funding: National Institute on Aging. Materials supplied by Wyeth-Ayerest. F also received prompted voiding when wet checks (primary outcome) were carried out  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                                     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                             |                   |                 |   |  |  |                     | Adverse effects   | Active tx grp: 2 vaginal spotting; ~10% breast tenderness  | (3 days for 8 h).<br>[EL = 1-] owing to high drop out rate.<br>Not a blinded study  |
| Rufford 2003 <sup>438</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 40              | F with 'urge syndrome' (29 urge UI, 17 stress UI), age not stated, postmenopausal (> 1 year) or estradiol < 150 pmol/l if had hysterectomy. 2 had colposuspension<br><br>Exclusions: any medication for urge syndrome, diabetes mellitus or insipidus, diuretics, HRT within 3 months or hormone implant /IM hormone injection within 1 year, endometrial thickness > 4 mm in women with intact uterus, UTI, haematuria, pelvic masses or urogenital prolapse | 17-beta estradiol subcutaneous implant (n = 20)          | Placebo implant (n = 20)                       | 6 months tx         | Self-reported cure<br><br>Leakage episodes (median, IQR)<br><br>Frequency/24 h (median, IQR)<br><br>Volume voided (median ml, IQR)<br><br>Urodynamics* (at 3 months)<br><br>Adverse effects (n) | 35% vs 30% urge UI<br>20% vs 15% stress UI<br>15% vs 10% urgency<br><br>0 (0, 1.8) vs 0 (0, 0.5)<br><br>8.6 (6.5, 11.4) vs 8.0 (7.0, 9.8)<br><br>177 (143, 209) vs 161 (107, 200)<br><br>No between-group analysis<br><br>Estradiol; 9/12 women with intact uterus had irregular bleeding (5 requiring hysterectomy); 1 angina<br>Other; UTI (8 vs 11), breast tenderness (4 vs 1) | Funding: Organon.<br>At final visit all women with intact uterus given norethisterone 5 mg/day for 2 weeks, repeated until no further vaginal bleeding.<br>Number of women recruited did not reach the target set in the power calculation.<br>No significant difference identified between groups for any outcome.<br>*first sensation, maximum capacity, pressure rise on filling, volume pressure > 15 cmH <sub>2</sub> O. |
| Simunic 2003 <sup>439</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 1612            | Postmenopausal F (> 1 year) with urogenital symptoms  | 17-beta estradiol intravaginal tablet (n = 828; 371 with | Placebo (n = 784; 315 with frequency/nocturia, | 1 year tx           | Frequency/nocturia prevalence (mean change)   | -38% (P = 0.001 vs baseline) vs -10.1%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Treatment given  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|                            |                   |                 | (28% had UI, 43% frequency/nocturia)<br>Exclusions: oestrogen tx within 6 months, systemic disease or infection, suspected or proven malignant disease, unexplained uterine bleeding, hysterectomy or surgery for stress UI, acute urogynaecological infection | frequency/nocturia, 245 UI)   | 206 UI)              |                     | UI prevalence (mean change)<br>Cystometry<br>Adverse effects                             | -17.8% ( $P = 0.002$ vs baseline) vs -10.2%<br>Max. cystometric capacity, bladder volume at 1st or strong sensation to void sig. increased in estradiol grp ( $P \leq 0.05$ from baseline); no sig. change in plac grp<br>Increased vaginal discharge 2.7 vs 0.4%<br>vaginal bleeding 0.6% vs 0%<br>erythema 0.8 vs 0.1%<br>itching 0.5 vs 0.1%<br>UTI 0.4 vs 0.1%<br>labial oedema 0.3 vs 0.1%<br>'other' 2.4% vs 0% | daily for 2 weeks then twice a month for 12 months. Tx interrupted for 1 month every 4 months.   |
| Walter 1978 <sup>440</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 29              | Postmenopausal F mean age 56 years (46-69), UI (21 frequency, urgency and urge UI, 29 stress UI), no detrusor hyperreflexia  | Estradiol 2 mg + estriol 1 mg orally for 20 days, then 8 day break/cycle ( $n = 15$ ) | Placebo ( $n = 14$ ) | 4 months tx         | Change in frequency, urgency, urge UI<br>MUCP (29 pts with stress UI)<br>Adverse effects | Cure 7/11 vs 1/10<br>Mean change (cmH <sub>2</sub> O): +4.6 vs +0.17, $P = NS^*$<br>'no subjective adverse effects'   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1-] No baseline data reported<br>Aim of study was to evaluate effects of oestrogen on symptoms related to vaginal atrophy and urge UI /MUCP<br>*baseline values not given |

| Study                        | Study type and EL             | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison                                       | Length of follow-up              | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Samsioe 1985 <sup>441</sup>  | DB RCT, cross-over<br>EL = 1– | 34                                | Postmenopausal F aged 77–78 years, (32% stress UI, 41% urge UI, 26% mixed)                        | Estriol 3 mg orally ( <i>n</i> = 34)  | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 34)                         | Unclear whether 3 or 6 months tx | Incontinence   | Urge UI: two thirds reported symptoms alleviated<br>Mixed UI: 6/8 reported symptoms 'ameliorated' | Funding: AB Leo supplied tablets.<br>[EL = 1–]<br>Duration of tx unclear (3 months or 2×3 months).<br>Main aim of study was to evaluate effects of oestrogen on symptoms related to vaginal atrophy. |
| Molander 1990 <sup>442</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+             | 35                                | F with urogenital oestrogen deficiency syndrome including urinary frequency and dysuria           | Estriol 3 mg/day for 4 weeks then 2 mg/day for 6 weeks ( <i>n</i> = 18)               | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 17)                         | 10 weeks tx                      | Severity of urinary frequency on 4 point scale                             | No change from 2.5 in estriol grp; change from 2.4 to 2.3 in placebo grp                          | Funding: none declared.<br>Main aim of study was to assess effects of tx on vaginal bacterial flora, cytology, and urogenital symptoms.  |
| Eriksen 1992 <sup>443</sup>  | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+             | 164 randomised, 154 completed and | F mean age 58 years (45–70) with atrophic vaginitis; 53% in estradiol grp and 41% placebo grp had | 17-beta estradiol intravaginal tablet, 25 µg ( <i>n</i> = 81 randomised, 75 analysed) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 83 randomised, 79 analysed) | 3 months tx                      | Improvement in urological symptoms (frequency, dysuria, urge or stress UI) | 63% vs 32% <i>P</i> < 0.001   | Funding: none declared.<br>Daily dose given for 2 weeks then   |

| Study   | Study type and EL  | No. of patients analysed                       | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison        | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|--------------------|--|---|---|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
|   |                    |  | urological symptoms<br>Exclusions: history of cancer or thromboembolism, unexplained vaginal bleeding   |   |                   |                               | Adverse effects   | Estradiol (7 reports); local effects (alopecia, slight pain, rash, smell); aggravation of psoriasis, dizziness, GI pain<br>Placebo (11 reports): local effects (itching, burning, eczema, discharge); palpitations, sweats, leg itching, weight gain (2), leg cramp, pain | 2x/week.<br>10 withdrew: 6 estradiol, 4 placebo.<br>Main aim of study was to evaluate effects of oestrogen on symptoms related to vaginal atrophy.   |
| Grady 2001 <sup>444</sup><br>(Analysis of data from HERS study#) <sup>445</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1++ | 1,525 (55% of the HERS study population)       | Postmenopausal F < 80 years with established coronary heart disease, not had a hysterectomy; included in the HERS study who had at least 1 episode incontinence weekly (23% stress UI, 51% mixed, 26% urge). 78% had ≥ 2 UI episodes/week, 23% had ≥ 7 episodes/week; mean 5.6 (SD 9.1) | Conjugated oestrogen 0.625 mg with medroxyprogesterone acetate 2.5 mg (n = 768) | Placebo (n = 757) | Mean duration of tx 4.1 years | % markedly improved or improved*<br>% worsened or markedly worsened<br>Leakage episodes /week (change in mean)<br>Frequency | 20.9% vs 26%, P = 0.001<br>38.8% vs 27%, P = 0.001 (OR for worsening by > 1 category 1.51 [95% CI 1.26 to 1.82])<br>+0.7 vs -0.1, P < 0.001<br>'essentially unchanged'; no numerical data   | Funding: Wyeth-Ayerst.<br>#aim of HERS study was to determine whether oestrogen + progesterone alters the risk of coronary events in postmenopausal women with established coronary heart disease. |
|   |                    | Total HERS study population <sup>445,945</sup> |   | (n = 1380)  | (n = 1383)        | Mean duration of tx 4.1 years | Adverse effects   | Confirmed venous thromboembolism: 6.3 vs 2.2 per 1000 woman/years (RH 2.89, 95% CI 1.50 to 5.58), P = 0.002<br>Gallbladder disease, 6 vs 4.4% (RH 1.38, 95% CI 1.00 to 1.92), P = 0.05  | *markedly improved: reduction of ≥ 5 UI episodes/week; improved: reduction of 2-4 UI   |



| Study                         | Study type and EL       | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison                | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|
|                               |                         |                 |  |  |                           |                         |  | No significant differences between grps in the risk of breast or endometrial or other cancer, or fracture   | episodes/week; unchanged: no greater than change of 1 UI episode/week; worsened: increase of 2–4 UI episodes/week; markedly worsened: increase of ≥ 5 UI episodes/week. Compliance: ≥ 80% of study medication taken by 82% vs 88% at 1 year, and 69% vs 74% at 4 years. 6% vs 4% took tx for UI during the study, and 1.3 vs 0.9% had continence surgery. |
| Steinauer 2005 <sup>450</sup> | As Grady <sup>444</sup> | 1208            | F from the HERS study who did not report UI at baseline (any episodes of stress or urge UI in the last week) | Conjugated oestrogen 0.625 mg with medroxyprogesterone acetate ( <i>n</i> = 597) | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 611) | As Grady <sup>444</sup> | % pts reporting weekly UI episode at least once (Odds Ratio, 95% CI) | Any type of UI: 64% vs 49%, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.01 (OR 1.6, 95% CI 1.3 to 1.9)<br>Urge UI: 48% vs 36%, <i>P</i> < 0.001 (OR 1.5 to 95% CI 1.2 to 1.8)<br>Stress UI: 54% vs 38%, <i>P</i> < 0.001 (OR 1.7, 95% CI 1.5 to 2.1) | Funding: Wyeth-Ayerst. Women in placebo grp were on average 1 year older than HRT grp.  |

| Study  | Study type and EL  | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison         | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures                         | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--|--------------------|--|---|--|--------------------|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Hendrix 2005 <sup>446</sup><br>(Analysis of data from the Women's Health Initiative [WHI] study#) <sup>447,448</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1++ | 23,296 who had baseline and 1 year UI data (85% of WHI study population) | Postmenopausal F aged 50–79 years. Across tx grps, 34.1–36.9% had no UI; 24–26.7% stress UI, 21.9–24.2% urge UI, 15–17.9% mixed UI, 0.2–0.5% UI only at night. Of those with UI, leakage episodes < 1/month 30.9%, ≥ 1/month but < 1/week 26.4%, ≥ 1/week but < 1 day 27.9%, daily 14.7%<br><br>Exclusions: breast cancer, other invasive cancer in last 10 years, venous thromboembolism, hypertriglyceridaemia, severe menopausal symptoms at end of 3 month HRT washout period prior to start of study | Conjugated equine oestrogen (CEE) 0.625 mg + medroxyprogesterone acetate (MPA) 2.5 mg (n = 7247) | Placebo (n = 7056) | 1 year tx and follow-up | Incident UI                              | Any: 11.5 vs 7.9%, RR 1.39 (95% CI 1.27 to 1.52)<br>Stress UI: 5.9 vs 3.1%, RR 1.87 (95% CI 1.61 to 2.18)<br>Mixed UI: 1.3 vs 0.1%, RR 1.49 (95% CI 1.10 to 2.01)<br>Urge UI: 4.2 vs 3.9%, RR 1.15 (95% CI 0.99 to 1.34) | #aim of WHI study was to assess effects of HRT on coronary heart disease, and other risks and benefits. Those with an intact uterus randomised to CEE + MPA or placebo; those who had hysterectomy randomised to CEE or placebo. Both studies were stopped early; CEE+MPA vs placebo at a mean of 5.6 years owing to more harm than benefit, and CEE vs placebo study at mean 7.1 years owing to increased risk of stroke and no benefit for CHD. |
|  |                    |  |   | Conjugated equine oestrogen (CEE) 0.625 mg (n = 4476)  | Placebo (n = 4517) | 1 year tx and follow-up | Incident UI                              | Any: 12.4 vs 8.1%, RR 1.53 (95% CI 1.37 to 1.71)<br>Stress UI: 5.9 vs 2.9%, RR 2.15 (95% CI 1.77 to 2.62)<br>Mixed UI: 1.7 vs 1.1%, RR 1.79 (95% CI 1.26 to 2.53)<br>Urge UI: 4.7 vs 4.0%, RR 1.32 (95% CI 1.10 to 1.58) |   |
|  |                    |  |   |  |                    |                         | Worsening of prevalent UI<br>RR (95% CI) | Quantity of leakage: 1.20 (1.06, 1.36)<br>Leakage episodes 1.38 (1.28, 1.49)<br>Limitations in daily activities related to UI 1.18 (1.06, 1.32)<br>Bother factor 1.22 (1.13, 1.32)                                       |   |
|  |                    |  |   |  |                    |                         | Worsening of prevalent UI<br>RR (95% CI) | Quantity of leakage: 1.59 (1.39, 1.82)<br>Leakage episodes 1.47 (1.35, 1.61)<br>Limitations in daily activities related to UI 1.29 (1.15, 1.45)<br>Bother factor 1.50 (1.37, 1.65)                                       |   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|                               |                   |                 | Total population <sup>447,448</sup>   | CEE + MPA ( <i>n</i> = 8506)                                | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 8102)   | Mean 5.2 years follow-up | Adverse effects (annualised %, i.e. events per 10,000 person years [hazard ratio, 95% CI]) | CHD 0.37 vs 0.30 (HR 1.29, 95% CI 1.02 to 1.63)<br>Stroke 0.29 vs 0.21 (HR 1.41, 95% CI 1.07 to 1.85)<br>Venous thromboembolism 0.34 vs 0.16 (HR 2.11, 95% CI 1.58 to 2.82)<br>Invasive breast cancer 0.38 vs 0.30 (HR 1.26, 95% CI 1.0 to 1.59)  | Compliance at 1 year: ≥ 80% of study medication taken by 74% vs 81% in CEE+MPA vs placebo arm, and by 77.4 vs 81.4% in CEE vs placebo arm. % who stopped taking medication: 9.7 vs 6.6%, and 8.4% vs 8%.<br>3 year data published for 8.6% of the 23,296; not reproduced here.<br>CHD = coronary heart disease. |
|                               |                   |                 |   | CEE ( <i>n</i> = 5310)                                      | Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 5429)   | Mean 6.8 years follow-up | Adverse effects  | CHD 0.49 vs 0.54 (HR 0.91, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.12)<br>Stroke 0.44 vs 0.32 (HR 1.39, 95% CI 1.10 to 1.77)<br>Venous thromboembolism 0.28 vs 0.21 (HR 1.33, 95% CI 0.99 to 1.79)<br>Invasive breast cancer 0.26 vs 0.33 (HR 0.77, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.01) |   |
| Goldstein 2005 <sup>449</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 619             | F enrolled in a placebo-controlled study evaluating raloxifene and oestrogen for osteoporosis prevention in postmenopausal women<br><br>F had prior hysterectomy, mean age 53 years.<br>Prevalence of UI at baseline: 4% CEE grp, 3% raloxifene 60 mg, 3% raloxifene 150 mg, 6% placebo | Conjugated equine oestrogen 0.625 mg o.d. ( <i>n</i> = 158) | Raloxifene 60 mg o.d. ( <i>n</i> = 152)<br>Raloxifene 150 mg o.d. ( <i>n</i> = 157)<br>Placebo ( <i>n</i> = 152) | 3 years                  | New or worsening UI  | 7 vs 0.7 vs 0.6 vs 1.3%,<br><i>P</i> < 0.02 for CEE grp vs others   | Funding: Eli Lilly and Co.<br><br>60% of pts still taking study medication at 3 years. No difference between grps in reasons for discontinuing tx.  |
|                               |                   |                 |   |   |  |                          | % patients with improvement in existing UI (% of 4 vs 3 vs 3% vs 6%)                       | 50 vs 100 vs 100% vs 89%  |   |

## Non-therapeutic interventions

## Absorbent products

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients            | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Holtedahl 1998 <sup>454</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 90 randomised, 87 analysed | F mean age ~60 years (50–74), ≥ 2 leakage episodes/month, objectively shown<br>Exclusions: pacemaker, dementia, psychological medical problems | Immediate conservative tx* (n = 42) | Delayed conservative tx – pads and pants provided (n = 45) | 6 months tx         | Severity of UI (change on 1–8 ordinal scale)<br>Impact of UI (change on 1–4, ordinal scale#)<br>Leakage episodes/day (n analysed = 63)<br>Frequency/24 h<br>% cured, improved, unchanged, worse | 6 months: –2.0 vs –0.1, P < 0.001<br>6 months: –0.8 (95% CI –0.5, –1.1) vs 0 (95% CI –0.2 to 0.2), P < 0.001<br>6 months: 0.3 vs 1.8, P < 0.001<br>6 months: 6.5 vs 7.4, P = NS<br>6 months: 22%, 39%, 28%, 11% vs 0, 9%, 61%, 30% | Funding: Norwegian Medical Association Fund, Odd Berg Medical Research Fund, Medicon A/S, Organon A/S, Coloplast A/S, SABA Molnlycke A/S, LIC Hygiene A/S.<br>*consisted of pads and pants, estriol (depending on oestrogen status), PFMT (6 training sessions), bladder training (for urge or mixed UI), electrical stimulation (urge UI ~2 months, stress/mixed, overnight stimulation 4–6 months).<br>Delayed grp: pads and pants for 6 months, then as immediate grp (results at 12 months, when both groups had conservative tx not reproduced in this table)<br>#scale: 1 = slight, 2 = moderate, 3 = disturbing, 4 = incapacitating leakage. |

## Products to prevent leakage

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size                                     | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| Sirls 2002 <sup>480</sup><br>(ongoing study at time of this published) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 150             | F mean age 54 years (27–78), 52% stress UI, 48% mixed UI, 3 or more leakage episodes/week, urine loss 2 g or more on pad | FemSoft      | –          | Mean 15 months      | Leakage episodes* | 0.56/day with device vs 1.32/day without device | Funding: Rochester Medical Corporation.<br>51% withdrew in 1st year, reasons: 13 loss to follow-up, 15 unable to insert, 4 chose |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. of patients               | Patient characteristics   | Intervention             | Comparison | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|
| report)   |                       |                               | test<br>Exclusions: urge UI, bladder capacity < 200 ml, PVR > 100 ml, neurogenic bladder, recurrent UTI, lower urinary tract malignancy or prior pelvic radiation, significant cystocele, other treatment for stress UI |                          |            |   | Cure on pad test ('standardised' test; believed to be 1 h test)<br>Adverse effects                          | 93% vs 14%<br>47% symptomatic UTI<br>10% insertion trauma<br>5% haematuria<br>3% spotting<br>5% cystoscopic bladder/urethral irritation or trauma<br>1.3% ( <i>n</i> = 2) device migration (1 into bladder)   | surgery, 8 study demands, 8 adverse effects, 4 unrelated health reasons, 3 personal, 1 cure, 2 non-compliance, 3 unable to retain.<br>*all comparisons with or without device, not vs baseline.   |
| Thyssen 1996 <sup>456</sup><br>1 year follow-up reported by Thyssen 1997 <sup>457</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 26 to 1 month<br>19 to 1 year | F mean age 49 years, stress UI. 5 had hysterectomy, 4 anterior vaginal repair. 5 receiving oestrogen therapy  | Continen-<br>ce<br>Guard | -          | 1 month; and 1 year of those who were improved/cured ( <i>n</i> = 19) | Subjective assessment (of 22 completers)<br>24 h pad test<br>Uroflowmetry and ultrasound<br>Adverse effects | At 1 month: 9 cure, 10 improved, 3 unchanged<br>At 1 year: 13 cure, 5 improved, 1 unchanged<br>At 1 month: reduced leakage in all (information read from graph)<br>At 1 year: reduced leakage in 18/19<br>At 1 month and 1 year: No sig. change in peak flow rate, voided vol., PVR urine<br>At 1 month: 'No significant' | Funding: none declared.<br>Device used during the day.<br>4 discontinued use in 1 month study; 2 owing to discomfort, 2 difficulties in placing the device.<br>At 1 year, 11 used device every day, 8 used it 2-5x/week. 15 reported not feeling the device after a few days. All 19 women were followed up from month 1 to 1 year. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention             | Comparison                  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                             |                       |                  |   |                          |                             |                     |   | irritation or erosion on gynaecological examination.<br>1 (4%) 'slight voiding difficulties' with device in place<br>1 (4%) difficulties during defaecation<br>4 (15%) lost device when straining at stool.<br>At 1 year:<br>2 (11%) 'slight voiding difficulties' with device in place<br>9 (47%) expulsion when straining at stool |  |
| Thyssen 1999 <sup>458</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 38               | F mean age 57 years, uninhibited bladder contractions on sitting cystometry, motor urge UI (37% mixed). 21 receiving oestrogen therapy; prior tx received: PFMT (15), electrical stimulation (13), drug tx (30), colposuspension (6), hysterectomy (9), anterior vaginal repair (3) | Continen-<br>ce<br>Guard |                             | 1 month             | Subjective assessment (of 30 completers)<br>24 h pad test<br>Uroflowmetry and ultrasound<br>Adverse effects | 2 cure<br>15 improved<br>13 unchanged<br>Mean change in leakage – 32%, $P = 0.001$<br>No sig. change in peak flow rate, corrected peak flow, PVR urine<br>No sign of irritation on pelvic examination.<br>11% uncomplicated UTI  | Funding: none declared.<br>Device used during the day.<br>8 discontinued use; 4 local discomfort; 1 difficulties in placing the device; 1 device expulsion; 1 unsatisfactory effects.  |
| Nilsson 2000 <sup>459</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 25               | F mean age 56 years, urodynamic stress UI; failed tx with PFMT, in whom surgery not recommended (19 had prior continence surgery)   | Continen-<br>ce<br>Guard | –                           | 3 weeks             | Subjective assessment (19 completers)<br>24 h pad test<br>Adverse effects                                   | 17 cure or improvement<br>16 cure<br>No vaginal irritation on gynae examination<br>No AE reported  | Funding: none declared.<br>Device used during the day.<br>6 discontinued use; 2 device did not stay in place, 1 discomfort; 1 difficulties in placing the device; 1 no symptom relief; 1 admitted to hospital for other reasons. |
| Thyssen 2001 <sup>462</sup> | Cross-over RCT        | 94; 62 completed | F mean age 51 years, stress UI, no major uterovaginal prolapse.   | Conveen continence guard | Controlle continence tampon | 2×5 weeks           | Subjective improvement  | Cure: 36% vs 48%, $P = NS$<br>Improvement 40% vs 36%<br>no change 24% vs 16%   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] Only completers   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                     | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                               | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                               | EL = 1–               |                 | 51% had received PFMT, 10% continence surgery, 31% hysterectomy                         |  |            |                     | 24 h pad test (mean change, g)<br>Uroflowmetry | –53 vs –75%, $P = 0.03$<br>no sig. change in peak flow, voided volume, residual urine                | analysed.<br>Ease of use also reported, and preferred device; 26% vs 63%. |
|                               |                       |                 |   |  |            |                     | Adverse effects                                | minor voiding difficulties 14% vs 23%<br>vaginal irritation 34% vs 26%<br>device expulsion 8% vs 10% |   |
| Mouritsen 2001 <sup>461</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 15              | Women mean age 53 years, stress UI (mixed in 6/15), leakage > 8 g/24 h on home pad test | Conveen continence guard (1 of 2 models offered) | –          | Not stated          | Adverse effects                                | none   | Funding: Coloplast A/S.<br>Device used during the day.                    |

### Complementary therapies

#### Acupuncture – RCTs

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                | Intervention   | Comparison                           | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                     | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Zheng 1992 <sup>485</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 60              | F mean age 56 years (22–75), stress UI | Acupuncture, 30 sessions, every other day ( $n = 34$ ) | Placebo (not described) ( $n = 26$ ) | 60 days tx; 10 pts from acupuncture grp followed up to 1 year | % reporting Improvement<br><br>Urodynamic parameters | 88% vs 23%, $P < 0.01$<br>10 of 36 followed up to 1 year; 8 'still effective', 2 relapsed.<br><br>urethral max. pressure: +13 (cmH <sub>2</sub> O) vs no change, $P < 0.01$<br>No sig. differences between grps in changes in urethral length | Funding: none declared.<br>Acupoints used: Ren 6, Ren 4, St 28, UB23, UB29, UB35, UB39 if symptoms identified as owing to insufficiency of Kidney-Qi and dysfunction of urinary bladder; plus Sp6, Lu7, K3 if Insufficiency owing to Kidney-Yin and deficiency of ling and kidney-Qi. For deficiency of Kidney-Yin and decline of kidney-Yang, acupoints were: Moxibustion to Guanyuan and Qihai, and Du4.<br>It is unclear from the report how many women were stimulated by which acupoints.<br>Improvement: 'clinical' improvement and improvements in 1 or more of 5 urodynamic parameters. |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Ellis 1990 <sup>483</sup><br>Ellis 1993 <sup>484</sup> | SB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 20   | Elderly M/F* (aged 65–96 years), with problem of night urinary frequency on long-stay hospital wards<br><br>*Two publications of this study identified; one stated 15 /20 were women, the other stated that 17 were women<br><br>Exclusions:<br>200rethra200n200 within 1 month, UTI | Acupuncture (acupoints Sp 6, St36; needles left in situ for 20 min) | Placebo (mock TENS) for 20 min                                     | 2 weeks treatment  | Nocturnal frequency (median change for h 9 pm to 7 am)*  | -2 (95% CI -1.0, -3.0) vs 'no significant change'   | Funding: none stated.<br><br>*2 hospitals measured this in different ways: 1 monitoring device introduced into one-way incontinence pads, connected to a visual alarm checked hourly; other hospital toileted pts in usual way.<br><br>1 pt from each grp withdrew.  |
| Emmons 2005 <sup>486</sup>                             | SB RCT<br>EL = 1- | 85 randomised, 74 (87%) completed all aspects of study and analysed* | F median age 51 years (22–82) with symptoms of OAB and urge UI (> 8 voids per 24 h, urgency, and urge UI at least twice in a 3 day period)<br><br>18% had prior continence surgery<br><br>Exclusions: if taking drug tx for OAB, or acupuncture for any condition; haematuria or UTI | Acupuncture (n = 44 randomised, 38 completed and analysed)          | Placebo acupuncture (n = 41 randomised, 36 completed and analysed) | Tx given weekly for 4 weeks<br><br>Assessment at 6–8 weeks | Leakage episodes/ 3 days, mean change<br><br>Frequency/ 3 days, mean change<br><br>Urgency/ 3 days, mean change<br><br>Functional bladder capacity, mean change<br><br>UDI (mean score change)<br><br>IIQ (mean score change)<br><br>Adverse effects | -59 vs -40%, P = NS<br><br>-14 vs -4%, P = 0.03<br><br>-30 vs -3%, P = 0.016<br><br>+12 vs -2%, P = 0.01<br><br>-57 vs -32%, P = 0.05<br><br>-52 vs -23%, P = 0.004<br><br>23% bleeding or bruising from acupuncture<br><br>25% minor discomfort on needle displacement (none had discomfort beyond the time of tx) | Funding: in part by Oregon Health Science Foundation.<br><br>Physician who performed acupuncture not blind to randomisation code; assessment was blinded.<br><br>[EL = 1-] only completers analysed.<br><br>*3 withdrew owing to difficulty scheduling appointments; others had incomplete assessment data.<br><br>Acupuncture: needles placed bilaterally at SP6 (inner legs), BL39 (outer knee fold), BL28 (low back), CV4 (low abdomen) and rotated clockwise until patient reported a sensation of warmth and tightening.<br><br>The needles retained for 20 min without further stimulation.<br><br>Placebo; same method as active tx grp but tx designed for relaxation; sites were GB31 (outer thigh), ST36 (outer legs), BL12 (upper back), and mid-line CV12 (epigastrium). |



## Acupuncture – case series

| Study   | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients         | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Chang 1988 <sup>487</sup><br>Chang 1993 <sup>488</sup><br>follow-up study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate urodynamic effects of acupuncture  | 52<br>(21 in follow-up) | F mean age 35 years (17–52) with frequency, urgency and dysuria   | Symptomatic cure or improvement <sup>487</sup><br><br>Urodynamics* <sup>487</sup><br><br>Long-term follow-up of 21 treated at Sp6 (mean 66.2 months, range 60–72) <sup>488</sup> | Sp6: improvement in 22 of 26, cure in 17 of 22, no response in 4 (at mean follow-up 8 months, range 2–14). Relapse was seen in 6 women after 6–8 months<br>St-36: improvement in 6<br><br>Sp6: sig. increase in maximum cystometric capacity, and a sig. decrease in peak urinary flow rate<br>St-36: No sig. changes<br><br>Acupuncture repeated in all owing to recurrence of symptoms; mean no txs 4.8 (range 2–8)<br><br>No significant changes in any urodynamic measurements at 1 or 3 years' follow-up<br><br>Unstable detrusor (present in 8 at baseline) was evident in 7 at 1 year, and 8 at 2 years | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Acupoints used: Sp-6 in half the patients, St-36 in the other half; needles rotated until patients felt numbness around the point (single session).<br><br>*undertaken 30 min after acupuncture.                         |
| Philp 1988 <sup>489</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate the possible role of 201rethra201n201n in the treatment of DO  | 20 (17 F)               | F with lower urinary tract symptoms associated with a diagnosis of bladder instability  | Symptomatic improvement<br><br>Urodynamic assessment (n = 16)<br><br>Side effects  | 10 of 13 patients with diurnal symptoms ('sig. improvement'); 0 of 3 with sensory urgency; of 3 with enuresis, 2 were unchanged, 1 dry at night, 1 completely dry<br><br>no consistent changes; instability was no longer evident in 1 patient who experienced no symptomatic improvement<br><br>None  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Acupuncture given at urinary bladder points 23 and 28 plus Du4, or points Ren 4 and 6 plus spleen 6 for 30 min once a week for 10–12 weeks.  |
| Bergstrom 2000 <sup>491</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate whether acupuncture could: reduce subjective inconvenience of urgency, reduce leakage episodes, reduce nocturnal frequency; increased self-perceived QOL; maintain effects 3 months after tx | 15                      | F mean age 76 years (66–82) who had urge (5) or mixed (11) incontinence who were not satisfactorily treated with PFMT, bladder training or drug treatment<br><br>Exclusions: pts with other conditions or receiving | Urgency, leakage episodes, 48 h pad test results (at tx end)<br><br>Global impression (at 3 months)  | all showed significant improvement after 6 weeks acupuncture (incomplete numerical data).<br><br>8 reported they were much improved  | Funding: Dept RandD, South Stockholm Medical Area.<br><br>Acupoints BL31–33, BL23, SP6, K13, L11 (3 sacral, 1 lumbar, 1 paravertebral, 1 lower legs, 1 near elbow) used. Needles left in situ for 25 min; 8–12 acupuncture sessions given over 6 weeks. |

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim of study | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                            | Outcomes     | Results | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|--|--------------|---------|---------------------|
|       |                   | completed    |                 | other treatments that could influence urge to void | Side effects | none    |                     |

*Hypnosis*

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | Aim of study  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes   | Results   | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------|---|--|---|--|
| Freeman 1982 <sup>492</sup> | Case series           | To investigate whether hypnosis is a useful treatment for UI caused by DO; and whether psychological factors are important in the aetiology of DO | 50              | F (age 17–74, mean age 44 years) with incontinence owing to proven bladder instability, who underwent 12 sessions of hypnotherapy over 1 month (and later continued at home using an audiocassette). Hypnotherapy involved symptom removal by direct suggestion and 'ego strengthening' | Self-reported improvement <sup>492</sup>               | 29 cured, 14 improved, 7 unchanged*   | Funding: none declared.  |
| Freeman 1987 <sup>493</sup> | EL = 3                |   |                 |   | Cystometry at 3 months ( <i>n</i> = 44) <sup>492</sup> | cure of instability in 22, improvement in 16, and no change in 6                            | *7 patients relapsed between 2 months and 1 year; further treatment was given to 6, 5 of whom became symptom free. <sup>492</sup>  |
|                             |                       |   |                 |   | Follow-up at 2 years ( <i>n</i> = 30) <sup>493</sup>   | Of 18 and 10 who were subjectively or objectively cured at 3 months, 9 and 3 remained cured | Methods, definitions of cystometry conform to ICS recommendations.   |
| Smith 1999 <sup>494</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Part of a larger study to pilot brief individualised hypnotherapy for the unstable bladder  | 4 (3 women)     | M/F with unstable bladder (DO); all pts had received tx by a continence nurse practitioner in the MRC Continence Care Study   | Self-reported improvement                              | 2 of the 3 women reported remission of symptoms at 6 months                                 | Funding: none declared.<br>Hypnotherapy involved 3×1 h sessions, including anxiety control methods, ego-strengthening, training in self-hypnosis, age progression, explanation of stable bladder function and 'hand-on-abdomen technique'. |

*Herbal medicines*

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Outcomes | Results  | Additional comments                 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------|---|----------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Steels 2002 <sup>496</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | Investigate efficacy of a tablet preparation containing <i>Crataeva nurvala</i> , a herb used in traditional Hindu science of medicine, and equisetum (Horsetail) to treat urge and/or | 8               | F, symptoms of urge UI and/or stress UI 'on a regular basis'. One aged 20 years, others 54–65 years<br>Exclusions: hysterectomy or prolapse repair within | UDI      | Significant positive change to perceptions of frequency, leakage related to urgency or activity, and difficulty emptying the bladder | Funding: BioLogic Health Solutions. |

| Study | Study type and EL | Aim of study   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Outcomes | Results   | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------|---|---------------------|
|       |                   | stress UI for 12 weeks<br>2 tablets taken b.d. ( $\equiv$ 12 g Crataeva and 6 g Equisetum/day) |                 | 12 months; serious health conditions; medications for UI in past month | IIQ      | All parameters except physical recreation and household chores improved significantly |                     |

### Preventive use of conservative therapies

#### Behavioural therapy

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison                     | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Diokno 2004 <sup>499</sup><br>Associated reference<br>Sampselle 2005 <sup>500</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 480 randomised, 359 (75%) completed and analysed | Women 55–80 years (mean ~66), continent (no more than 1–5 days UI in past 12 months, and negative paper towel stress test), no tx for UI; MMSE score $\geq$ 24; able to contract PFM<br><br>Exclusions: neurological disease, difficulties with activities of daily living, uterine prolapse beyond introitus | Behavioural modification program ( $n = 238$ ; completed) | No tx ( $n = 242$ ; completed) | 12 months follow-up | Continence status*              | Cure (0 episodes) 37% vs 28%, $P = \text{NS}$ , OR 2.03 (95% CI 1.04 to 3.98, $P = 0.04$ )<br>Same/better: 56% vs 41%, $P = 0.01$<br>OR 1.97 (95% CI 1.15 to 3.38, $P = 0.01$ ) | Funding: none declared.<br>Behavioural modification program: 2 h classroom presentation on education on anatomy and nervous control of lower urinary tract, healthy habits and self-care, voiding frequency, bladder capacity, bladder training and PFMT. Audiotape of PFMT provided, daily PFMT encouraged. Bladder training used if voiding interval < 3.5 h. Nurse follow-up 2–4 weeks after initial instruction.<br><br>*at baseline 31% reported zero UI episodes, 69% reported 1–5 days of UI episodes over past year.<br>PFM strength (pressure and displacement) assessed using digital test. |
|   |                   |  |   |   |                                |                     | Frequency/day, mean change      | $-1.2$ vs $+0.1$ , $P < 0.0001$   |   |
|   |                   |  |   |   |                                |                     | Intervoid interval, mean change | $+33$ vs $+2$ min, $P < 0.0001$   |   |
|   |                   |  |   |   |                                |                     | PFM pressure                    | Improved 33% vs 16%, $P = 0.0008$<br>no change 60% vs 70%<br>decreased 7% vs 14%  |   |
|   |                   |  |   |   |                                |                     | PFM displacement                | Improved 39% vs 8%, $P < 0.0001$<br>no change 52% vs 64%<br>decreased 9% vs 28%   |   |

## Physical therapies during pregnancy

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                 | Comparison                                      | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Reilly 2002 <sup>501</sup>  | RCT<br>EI = 1+    | 268 randomised, 230 analysed      | Primigravidae with increased bladder neck mobility (> 5 mm on linear movement following standardised 204rethra204), approx 20 weeks gestation. Age 17–47 years<br><br>Exclusions: pre-pregnancy UI, neurological disorder | PFMT (n = 139; 120 analysed)                 | Control (n = 129; 110 analysed)                 | Tx from 20 weeks to delivery; follow-up (all results) at 3 months post-partum | Stress UI   | 19.2 vs 32.7%<br>RR 0.59 (95% CI 0.37 to 0.92)   | Funding: none declared.<br><br>PFMT: Met physio every month; 3×8 contractions 2×/day, increased to 3×12 from week 34 gestation; also instructed to contract PFM when coughing or sneezing. Those unable to follow protocol owing to inability to contract PFM had individualised programmes until able to follow study regimen.<br><br>Control: routine antenatal care, likely to have received verbal advice on pelvic floor exercises. 51% reported doing PFM exercises.<br><br>No significant difference between mode of delivery between grps.<br><br>In total 101 (38%) withdrew from study before completion, mainly owing to time and travel to hospital, and dislike of perineometry or ultrasound. |
|                             |                   |                                   |   |  |   |   | Positive 1 h pad test (n = 148)   | 9.5 vs 10.8%<br>RR 0.87 (95% CI 0.35 to 2.23)  |   |
|                             |                   |                                   |   |  |   |   | Bladder neck mobility (n = 166), difference in means, mm  | –0.08 (95% CI –0.22 to 0.07)   |   |
|                             |                   |                                   |   |  |   |   | PFM strength (perineometry); difference in means, cmH <sub>2</sub> O  | 1.0 (95% CI –1.3 to 3.4)   |   |
|                             |                   |                                   |   |  |   |   | QOL   | No differences between grps in KHQ<br>On SF-36, sig. higher score in PFMT grp in general health domain   |   |
| Sampsel 1998 <sup>502</sup> | RCT<br>EI = 1-    | 72 randomised, 46 completed study | Primigravid F ≥ 18 years (mean 27), at 20 weeks gestation. No history of genitourinary pathology. Not stated whether any had UI at baseline   | PFMT (n = 34 randomised, n analysed unclear) | Control (n = 38 randomised, n analysed unclear) | Follow-up at 12 months post-partum  | UI score on gentle /hard coughing, sneezing, and laughing (4 point scale; 0 no leakage, 1 dampness, 2 wetness, 3 soaking) | No numerical data per tx grp. No significant difference reported between grps. Mean scores ranged from 0.3 (SD 0.5) to 0.7 (SD 0.6) across all time points evaluated.          | Funding: National Institutes of Health.<br><br>All women paid \$150 for participation.<br><br>PFMT: tailored to individual's ability. Correct contraction checked. Recommended 30 contractions/day at max. or near maximum intensity.<br><br>Control: routine care, no systematic PFMT programme. 20% reported exercising PFM.<br><br>The 46 women with complete data had vaginal (n = 37) or caesarean delivery (n = 9). Between-grp comparison not reported.  |
|                             |                   |                                   |   |  |   |   | PFM strength (n = 16; women who had vaginal delivery and complete speculum data)  | No numerical data per tx grp. No significant difference reported between grps. Mean scores ranged from 6.6 (SD 3.0) to 13.0 (SD 7.6) newtons across all time points evaluated. |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                 | Comparison                   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Morkved 2003 <sup>503</sup> | RCT<br>EI = 1++   | 301             | Nulliparous F<br>≥ 18 years, at<br>18 weeks gestation,<br>singleton pregnancy.<br>32% reported UI<br><br>Exclusions: pregnancy<br>complications, high risk<br>for preterm labour, pain<br>during PFM<br>contractions, ongoing<br>UTI  | PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 148)    | Control<br>( <i>n</i> = 153) | 12 weeks tx<br>(to 36 weeks<br>pregnancy)<br>follow-up<br>3 months<br>post-partum   | Self-reported UI<br>(≥ 1<br>episode/week)<br><br>Leakage episodes<br>per tx grp over<br>3 days<br><br>PFM strength<br>(vaginal squeeze<br>pressure); mean,<br>cmH <sub>2</sub> O<br><br>Adverse effects | 32% vs 38% (end of<br>tx); RR 0.67 (95% CI<br>0.50 to 0.89), <i>P</i> = 0.007<br><br>20% vs 32% (3 months<br>post-partum); RR 0.61<br>(95% CI 0.40 to 0.90),<br><i>P</i> = 0.018<br><br>17% vs 31%, <i>P</i> = 0.014<br>(end of tx)<br><br>14% vs 24%, <i>P</i> = 0.049<br>(3 months post-partum)<br><br>39.9 vs 34.4, <i>P</i> = 0.008<br>(end of tx)<br><br>29.5 vs 25.6, <i>P</i> = 0.048<br>(3 months post-partum)<br><br>None | Funding: The Norwegian Fund for<br>Postgraduate Training in<br>Physiotherapy; and Norwegian<br>Women's Public Health Association.<br><br>Women in both grps given individual<br>instruction in pelvic floor anatomy<br>and PFM contraction; and ability to<br>contract PFM checked by vaginal<br>palpation before randomisation.<br><br>PFMT: 60 mins group (10–15)<br>training with physio once/week;<br>lying, sitting, standing, kneeling<br>positions; breathing exercises and<br>relaxation of abdominal, back and<br>thigh muscles taught. Home PFMT<br>encouraged: 8–12 contractions<br>2×/day.<br><br>Control: 'usual' information from<br>midwife or GP.<br><br>81% of PFMT grp followed training<br>protocol. 30% PFMT vs 28% control<br>reported PFM exercising at<br>baseline.<br><br>No significant difference between<br>groups in the proportion of vaginal,<br>forceps, vacuum, or caesarean<br>deliveries. |
| Hughes 2001 <sup>504</sup>  | RCT<br>EI = 1+    | 1169            | Nulliparous F mean<br>age 28 years, 25%<br>reported UI at baseline;<br>20 weeks gestation<br><br>Exclusions: insulin<br>dependent diabetes,<br>neurological<br>abnormality, previously<br>investigated or treated<br>urinary symptoms | Control<br>( <i>n</i> = 586) | PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 583)    | Duration of<br>intervention<br>unclear, tx<br>started<br>between<br>weeks 22<br>and 25 of<br>gestation,<br>and follow-<br>up to<br>6 months<br>post-partum* | Stress UI<br>(prevalence and<br>odds ratio)<br><br>Urge UI  | Ante-natal (36 weeks):<br>66% vs 61%, OR 0.78<br>(0.59, 1.04)<br><br>Post-natal: 38% vs<br>36%, OR 0.90 (95% CI<br>0.64 to 1.28)<br><br>Ante-natal (36 weeks):<br>46% vs 45%, OR 0.93<br>(0.71, 1.23)<br><br>Postnatal: 27% vs<br>30%, OR 1.04 (95% CI<br>0.72 to 1.52)  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>BFLUTS questionnaire completed<br>weeks 26 and 36 weeks gestation;<br>and 3 and 6 months post-natally.<br>Response rates to questionnaire:<br>84% at 26 weeks gestation, 76% at<br>36 weeks gestation, unclear at<br>3 months post-partum, and 68% at<br>6 months post-partum. Response<br>rates to questionnaires tended to be<br>higher in the control group.<br><br>PFMT: physio-led class (max. <i>n</i> = 6)  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | 'spontaneous incontinence'             | Ante-natal (36 weeks): 25% vs 22%, OR 0.87 (0.63, 1.21)<br>Post-natal: 8% vs 10%, OR 1.33 (95% CI 0.77 to 2.30)  | between weeks 22 and 25 gestation. Also individual tx, with use of perineometer. Written instructions for home daily exercise, ante- and post-natal.<br>Control: no formal instruction in PFMT. |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Leakage episodes ('occasions')         | Ante-natal (36 weeks): 65% vs 64%, OR 0.97 (0.73, 1.29)<br>Post-natal: 36% vs 37%, OR 1.00 (95% CI 0.72 to 1.41) | Vaginal palpation of PFM contraction (both grps).<br>No sig. difference in mode of delivery or in severity of any perineal tears between groups.  |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | 'amount of leakage $\geq$ drop'        | Ante-natal (36 weeks): 69% vs 66%, OR 0.85 (0.63, 1.14)<br>Post-natal: 40% vs 39%, OR 0.94 (95% CI 0.67 to 1.31) | *all postnatal results correct for symptom antenatally.   |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Incontinence affects physical activity | Ante-natal (36 weeks): 24% vs 20%, OR 0.83 (0.56, 1.16)<br>Post-natal 7% vs 8%, OR 1.20 (95% CI 0.66 to 2.18)    |   |

*Physical therapies after pregnancy*

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|---|--|---|---|---|------------------|---|--|
| Chiarelli 2002 <sup>506</sup><br>Chiarelli 2004<br>(1 year follow-up) <sup>510</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 720 randomised, 676 (94%) followed up at 3 months, 569 (79%) at 12 months | F who had a forceps or ventouse delivery or had babies of $\geq$ 4 kg birthweight, recruited within 48 h of delivery. Number of pregnancies: 1 | PFMT ( $n = 370$ randomised, 348 followed up) | Usual care ( $n = 350$ randomised, 328 followed up) | 8 weeks intervention; telephone interview at 3 months post-partum | Prevalence of UI | 31 vs 38.4% (difference 7.4%, 95% CI 0.22% to 14.5%, $P = 0.044$ )<br>adjusted OR 0.65 (95% CI 0.46 to 0.91, $P = 0.01$ ) | Funding: Medical Benefits Fund, Physiotherapy Foundation, and University of Newcastle Research Management Committee.<br>PFMT grp: instruction from physio whilst in hospital and |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison     | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
|       |                   |                 | (57%), 2 (29%), 3 (15%), $\geq 4$ (6%)<br>17% reported UI before this pregnancy.<br>Women with disability such that they would not be able to contract PFM were excluded | <i>n</i> = 294 | <i>n</i> = 275 | 12 months post-partum | Adherence to PFM exercises (3×/week or more)<br>Prevalence of UI<br>Adherence to PFMT | 84% vs 58%, <i>P</i> = 0.001<br>34.4 vs 36.4%<br>adjusted OR 0.94 (95% CI 0.64 to 1.37, <i>P</i> = NS)<br>daily 14% vs 11%<br>several times/week 26% vs 21%<br>$\leq$ weekly: 55% vs 38%<br>none: 5% vs 30% | at 8 weeks. PFMT: up to 5 contractions 3×/day, held for 3–6 s; individually tailored to functional ability of PFM.<br>Also taught 'good bladder habits', advice not to drink caffeine, and to drink plenty of fluids; all contained in booklet designed for the study.<br>Usual care: routine post-partum care; no visit from physio; supplied with information about general postpartum care and PFM exercises and invited to join routine physio post-natal class when in hospital. |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                         | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Sleep 1987 <sup>507</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 1800<br>randomised,<br>results reported<br>for 1609 | F within 24 h of<br>vaginal delivery. 32%<br>of the intensive grp<br>vs 29% standard<br>reported UI during<br>pregnancy. 49%<br>primiparous | Intensive PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 816)  | Standard PFMT<br>( <i>n</i> = 793) | 4 weeks exercise<br>diary in the<br>intensive grp.<br>Questionnaire<br>follow-up at<br>3 months post-<br>partum | Prevalence of UI   | 22% vs 22%<br>< once/week: 13%<br>vs 14%<br>1–2×/week: 7% vs<br>6%<br>≥ 3×/week: 1% vs<br>1%<br>episodes not<br>recorded: 1% both<br>grps | Funding: Oxford Regional<br>Health Authority.<br>Both grps given initial<br>instruction in PFMT during<br>ante-natal care, reinforced by<br>physios post-natally to grps<br>of 2–4 women. In standard<br>care grp, women given leaflet<br>to take home, and<br>reinforcement from<br>community midwife.<br>'Intensive' grp individually<br>instructed by midwife, given<br>a diary detailing PFMT to be<br>done every week, telephone<br>reminder every week,;<br>women checked PFM<br>contraction by palpation at<br>week 4. In both grps women<br>were advised to repeat<br>exercises daily as often as<br>they could remember.<br>58% intensive vs 42%<br>reported PFMT during the<br>3 months post-partum.<br>[EL = 1–] No explanation of<br>missing data for women not<br>followed-up, or of potential<br>differences between groups<br>in number who performed<br>PFMT during pregnancy<br>(57% intensive vs 46%<br>standard grp). |
| Meyer 2001 <sup>509</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 107   | Nulliparous F mean<br>age 29 years (SD 4),<br>enrolled from<br>2 months post-<br>partum<br>Exclusions:                                      | PFMT, with<br>biofeedback<br>and electrical<br>stimulation<br>( <i>n</i> = 51) | Control ( <i>n</i> = 56)           | 6 weeks<br>intervention,<br>follow-up at<br>10 months post-<br>partum   | Prevalence of<br>stress UI at<br>10 months post-<br>partum | 12% vs 14%,<br><i>P</i> = NS  | Funding: Swiss National<br>Fund for Scientific Research.<br>PFMT: 12 sessions of PFMT<br>followed by 20 min<br>biofeedback and 15 min<br>electrical stimulation (vaginal   |



| Study  | Study type and EL   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention          | Comparison                  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|---------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
|  |                     |                 | pregnancy complications, those beginning labour, history of urinary infections                   |                       |                             |  | PFMT strength, MUCP, pressure transmission values   | No sig. differences between groups  | electrode, biphasic stimulation, impulse width 200–400 $\mu$ s, frequency 50 Hz, intensity 15–50 mA, 6/12 contraction/rest; using Compact-Elite 2.7 device).<br>Control grp: no training.<br>[EL = 1–] Treatment allocation in an 'alternating manner', not truly random. 31% PFMT vs 16% control had stress UI at baseline; implication of this on findings at 10 months not explored. |
| Morkved 1997 <sup>508</sup><br>Morkved 2000 <sup>511</sup><br>(1 year post-partum follow-up) | Cohort<br>[EL = 2+] | 198             | F enrolled 8 weeks post-natally. ~41% had UI at baseline. Mean no. of deliveries 1.8 (range 1–5) | PFMT ( <i>n</i> = 99) | Usual care ( <i>n</i> = 99) | 8 weeks intervention, follow up after further 8 weeks (= week 16 postpartum) | Stress UI prevalence at week 16 post-partum<br><br>Pad test (g), week 16 post-partum<br><br>Leakage index (1–5, never-always) | Self-reported 14% vs 28%, <i>P</i> = 0.01<br><br>Shown on pad test 3% vs 13%, <i>P</i> = 0.009<br><br>0.09 (SD 0.6) vs 1.3 (SD 4.5), <i>P</i> < 0.01<br><br>No sig. difference between grps | Funding: Foundation for Education and Research in Physical Therapy and the Norwegian Board of Health.<br>Women in the 2 grps matched for age, parity, type of delivery.<br>PFMT: individual instruction in PFM anatomy and contraction. Grp ( <i>n</i> = 5–10) training with physio for   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients                       | Patient characteristics | Intervention      | Comparison              | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|       |                   |                                       |                         |                   |                         |                     | Social activity index (0–10, impossible-no problem in participation)  | No sig. difference between grps  | 45 min 1×/week for 8 weeks. Home practice 8–12 contractions 2×/day. Usual care: provided with written post-partum instructions that included recommendation to exercise PFM daily. More women in the usual care grp undertook PFMT during pregnancy than in the PFMT grp (57% vs 35%) and (83% vs 65%), $P \geq 0.003$ . During the active intervention period, 65% vs 99% undertook PFMT, $P \ll 0.00$ . |
|       |                   | 162 followed up to 1 year post-partum |                         | PFMT ( $n = 81$ ) | Usual care ( $n = 81$ ) | 1 year post-partum  | PFM strength (mean change from week 16 to 1 year, cmH <sub>2</sub> O) | +4.4 (95% CI 3.2 to 5.6) vs +1.7 (95% CI 0.8 to 2.7), $P < 0.001$                | 16% vs 31% of this grp reported stress UI at week 16. 53% vs 30% had continued to exercise PFM at least 3×/week after week 16 post-partum.  |
|       |                   |                                       |                         |                   |                         |                     | Stress UI   | Self-reported 17% vs 38%, $P = 0.003$<br>Shown on pad test 6% vs 17%, $P < 0.03$ |   |
|       |                   |                                       |                         |                   |                         |                     | Social activity index (0–10, impossible-no problem in participation)  | No sig. difference between grps  |   |

## Surgical management

## Procedures for overactive bladder

## Sacral nerve stimulation – RCTs

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                     | Comparison   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Weil 2000 <sup>514</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 44 (91% F)      | M/F median age 43 years (20–66) refractory urge UI, muscular and sensory responsiveness shown on peripheral nerve evaluation (as ≥ 50% improvement in at least 1 of 3 primary outcomes during PNE)<br><br>Duration of urge UI median age 9 years (range 2–34)<br><br>45% had prior lower urinary tract or pelvic surgery<br><br>36% prior medication (most commonly antimuscarinics or antispasmodics): 50% had used ≥ 1 drug. Other unsuccessful txs: biofeedback, various external electrical stimulation, ISC, psychological counselling, denervation<br><br>Exclusions: stress UI | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 foramen* (n = 20) | Continued prior conservative management** (n = 23) | 6 months tx   | Leakage episodes/24 h<br><br>Leakage severity#<br><br>Pad usage /24 h | difference in means at 6 months: 88%, <i>P</i> < 0.0005 implant vs control<br><br>difference in means: 24%, <i>P</i> < 0.047 vs control<br><br>difference in means: 90%, <i>P</i> < 0.0005 vs control<br><br>% dry (no pads used): 56% vs 4%  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>123 pts had percutaneous sacral nerve test stimulation, hence 36% received implant.<br><br>*PISCES Quad lead fixed to sacral periosteum bone, implantable pulse generator (ITREL II, Medtronic), implanted in lower abdominal pocket connected to lead by an extension.<br><br>1 in active tx grp withdrew after randomisation.<br><br>**'oral medication' or pelvic floor exercises.<br><br>#0 = dry, 1 few drops, 2 = 1–2 tablespoons, 3 complete wetting.<br><br>Tx failures if (1) < 50% improvement vs baseline in 1 of 3 outcomes (leakage episodes, severity, pad usage); or (2) underwent removal of device.<br><br>QOL measures also reported, but scale used not stated. Significant improvement in 2 of 10 domains (mean physical functioning, and standardised physical component of scale).<br><br>[EL = 1–] No clear info on what control grp took, unclear whether all pts randomised analysed. |
|                          |                   |                 |   |  |  | Follow-up of all pts (after control grp crossed over to active tx, n = 43), median 18 months (6–36) | Treatment failure<br><br>Adverse events (% reporting)                 | 9 (21%); 8 deterioration in outcomes, 1 device removal<br><br>actural failure rate at 36 months 32.4% (95% CI 17 to 56)<br><br>29% pain at implant site<br>17% lead migration<br>17% leg pain<br>5% leg stimulation<br>5% bowel function disturbance<br>2% urinary retention<br>2% vaginal cramps<br>2% anal pain<br>2% skin irritation at implant site |   |
|                          |                   |                 |   |  |  |   | Surgical procedures to resolve adverse effects                        | 8 revisions to correct lead migration<br><br>8 to ameliorate pain at implant site (3 in 1 pt in whom device removed)  |   |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Hassouna 2000 <sup>516</sup><br>Siegel 2000 <sup>517</sup> (up to 2 year follow-up) | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 51 (90% F)  | M/F mean age 39 years (SD 12), refractory urinary urgency-frequency, all had failed prior treatment (94% prior drug tx); other procedures included hydrodistention and other surgical interventions<br><br>Frequency 16/day; voided vol. 1693 ml/day<br><br>Exclusions: neurological conditions, stress UI, primary pelvic pain | Sacral nerve stimulation<br>(n = 25)  | Control group<br>(n = 26)  | 6 months tx and follow-up   | Frequency/day<br><br>Urodynamics<br><br>SF36   | 9.3 ± 5.1 vs 15.7 ± 7.6, P < 0.0001<br><br>≥ 50% reduction in 56% vs 4%<br><br>Mean voided vol. +92% vs – 0.8%, P < 0.0001<br>Bladder vol. at 1st sensation of fullness +50% vs –12%, P = 0.01<br><br>Sig. improvement in active vs control grp in physical function, role physical, bodily pain, general health, vitality, social function, mental health | Funding: none declared; all authors declared financial interest and/or other relationship with Medtronic.<br><br>InterStim* system.<br>51 pts underwent test stimulation; the 50% with > 50% improvement offered implant.<br>[EL = 1–] Only bladder diary data given per randomised groups. Assumed all pts randomised followed-up to 6 months. |
|   |                   |   |   | Sacral nerve stimulation (after 6 months controlled trial; where control grp offered implant) |  | Up to 2 year follow-up (n = 56 at 6 months, 46 at 12 months, 21 at 2 years) | Frequency (≥ 50% reduction, or within 4–7/day)<br><br>Volume voided (≥ 50% increase)<br><br>Adverse effects/ complications | 46% at 6 months<br>54% at 12 months<br>43% at 2 years<br><br>53% at 6 months<br>57% at 12 months<br>62% at 2 years<br><br>See Schmidt 1999 <sup>515</sup>  |   |
| Schmidt 1999 <sup>515</sup><br>Siegel 2000 <sup>517</sup>                           | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 98 randomised, 76 had data at 6 months (Female proportion not stated) | M/F urinary urge incontinence refractory to standard medical therapy, 100 ml capacity with normal upper urinary tract<br><br>Of 155 who underwent PNE, 81% women; overall mean age 47 (20–79); prior tx: 99% drugs, 36% non-surgical, 57% surgical.   | Sacral nerve stimulation<br>(n = 34)  | Control group (standard medical therapy for 6 months and then were offered implantation)<br>(n = 42) | 6 months tx and follow-up   | Urge UI<br><br>QOL (SF-36, change in scores)   | Leakage episodes/day: 2.6 ± 5.1 vs 11.3 ± 5.9, P < 0.0001<br>Severity: 0.8 ± 0.9 vs 2.0 ± 0.6, P < 0.0001<br>Pad usage/day: 1.1 ± 2.0 vs 6.3 ± 3.6, P < 0.0001<br><br>Physical health status mean score 46 vs 36, P = 0.0008<br>No sig. difference in mental health component  | Funding: Medtronic 16 centres.<br>155 pts underwent test stimulation; the 63% with > 50% improvement offered implant.<br>[EL = 1–] Only completers analysed; no explanation for other pts. Only leakage data given per randomised pt grps; all other baseline data for 155 PNE pts  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|------------|--|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | In randomised pts, baseline leakage episodes ~9, severity ranking (scale 1–3) 1.9, daily pad usage ~5–6<br>Exclusions: neurological conditions, stress UI, primary pelvic pain | Sacral nerve stimulation (after 6 months controlled trial; where control grp offered implant) |            | Up to 18 months ( <i>n</i> = 58 at 6 months, 38 at 12 months, 21 at 18 months)<br>41 at 3 years <sup>517</sup> | Cystometry<br>Continenence (% dry: % with ≥ 50% reduction in leakage episodes)<br>Pad usage (% none: % with ≥ 50% reduction in usage)<br>Adverse effects/ complications ( <i>n</i> = 157)* | Vol. at 1st sensation of fullness 222 vs 79 ml, <i>P</i> = 0.017<br>% with stable detrusor function 56% vs 16%, <i>P</i> = 0.014<br>47%: 28% at 6 months<br>45%: 34% at 12 months<br>52%: 24% at 18 months<br>46%: 13% at 3 years<br>57%: 26% at 6 months<br>55%: 21% at 12 months<br>57%: 19% at 18 months<br>33% AE requiring surgical revisions (probability 29% at 6 months, 12% in 2nd 6 months)<br>16% pain at stimulator site<br>19% pain at implant site<br>9% lead migration<br>5% infection /skin irritation requiring device removal | only.<br>*data from pts enrolled across 3 Sacral Nerve Stimulation Group trials (for urge UI, urgency-frequency, an retention). <sup>516</sup> |

*Sacral nerve stimulation – case series*

| Study                        | Study type and EL                                 | No. of patients                             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention             | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures              | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Spinelli 2001 <sup>518</sup> | Case series (Italian National Register)<br>EL = 3 | 196 (93 in retro- and 103 in pro-spective)* | M/F<br>Retrospective register*: 81% F mean age 51 years (17–79). Diagnosis 47% DO, 22% retention, 9% detrusor hyperreflexia, 5% urgency-frequency, 17% others | Sacral nerve stimulation | Retrospective register:<br>mean 41 months (28–73, median 40)<br><i>n</i> = 61 (66%) | Leakage episodes<br>Frequency | 39% cured (dry)<br>23% < 1 episode/day<br>23% 1–3 episodes/day<br>15% > 3/day<br>42% frequency of < 8/day<br>42% 8–12/day<br>18% > 12/day | Funding: none declared.<br>*Italian register set up in Feb 1997 to collect national results on sacral neuromodulation; collected retrospective data up to 1998, then prospective subsequently<br>Devices; Itrel II or IntermStim |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up                          | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|                              |                       |                 | (pelvic pain, urethral instability, interstitial cystitis)<br>Prospective register*: mean age 50 years (17–79).<br>Diagnosis: 41% DO, 34% retention, 15% detrusor hyperreflexia, 5% urgency-frequency, 6% others   |   |  | Complications   | 7% lead displacement<br>4% device removal (1 infection, 3 tx failure)<br>1% lead breakage   | implanted after positive response to PNE.  |
|                              |                       |                 |  |   | Prospective register:<br>12 months           | Leakage episodes  | 80% reduction from baseline<br>5.4/day ( $P < 0.001$ )<br>59% cured at 12 months  |  |
|                              |                       |                 |  |   | Results for DO grp<br>( $n = 42$ )           | Frequency (% with < 8 voids/day)                          | 75% at 3 months<br>84% at 6 months<br>64–71% 'between 6 and 9 months'<br>No results for 12 months   |  |
|                              |                       |                 |  |   |  | QOL (IQOL) ( $n = 41$ with DO), change in mean scores     | +125% at 3 months<br>+143% at 6 months<br>+110% at 12 months<br>+123% at 18 months<br>$P < 0.001$ vs baseline   |  |
|                              |                       |                 |  |   |  | Complications   | 10% surgical revision (4% lead fracture, 4% device removal, 2% lead repositioning)<br>4% pain at implant/connector site<br>2% haematoma/wound problem   |  |
| Everaert 2000 <sup>519</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 53 (85% women)  | M/F mean age 43 years with 'tx-resistant' symptoms of urgency, urge UI, dysuria, urinary retention, and/or perineal pain<br>Prior tx included colposuspension /sling in 8, hysterectomy in 9<br>72% had symptoms of dysuria and/or retention, 42% urgency and/or urge UI, 36% perineal pain<br>UD diagnosis: hypo-/a-contractile detrusor in 23, dysfunctional voiding 13, DO 10, detrusor hyperreflexia 4 | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 foramen* | Min 12 months<br>(mean 24 SD 8; range 13–49) | Objective response#<br>Pt satisfaction<br>Adverse effects | 70% ( $n = 37$ ; 27 cured, 10 improved)<br>68%<br>34% device-related pain<br>17% other causes of pain<br>11% current-related problems<br>8% disturbing toe flexion<br>6% diarrhoea<br>6% technical problems with device<br>4% lead migration(model 3886)<br>2% infection<br>2% operation-related problems<br>8% 'other' | Funding: none declared.<br>*implanted with a quadripolar electrode (Medtronic Interstim, model 3886 in 6 pts, 3080 in 47), and a subcut pulse generator in the abdominal site. Initially 49 pts implanted with unilateral leads, 4 with bilateral).<br>#≥ 50% reduction in leakage or frequency, (≥ 50% reduction in pain in pts with perineal pain, normalisation of PVR or reduction to < 50 ml in pts with dysuria/retention).<br>device-related pain treated successfully by physio in 8/18 pts. |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Grunewald 1999 <sup>520</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 43 (88% F)      | M/F mean age 49 years (23–76)<br>42% idiopathic motor urge UI, 49% urinary retention owing to severe detrusor sphincter dyssnergia, 7% sensory urge UI, 2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) mixed UI, refractory to conservative treatment  | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 or S4 foramen* ('usually' S3) | Mean 43.6 months (2–77) | Symptomatic clinical improvement of $\geq 50\%$<br><br>Urodynamic parameters (motor urge UI grp)<br><br>Adverse effects   | 13/18 (72%) motor urge UI (7/13 cured)<br>18/21 (86%) urinary retention<br>2/3 (67%) sensory urge UI<br>0 mixed UI<br><br>Sig. increase at 6 months in mean voided vol., from 208 to 292 ml, (40%) $P < 0.05$<br><br>30% complications requiring 'surgical revisions' (9% infections, 5% lead migrations, 7% pain at site of implant, 2% lead fracture, electrode insulating defect and skin erosion)  | Funding: none declared.<br>154 pts had percutaneous sacral nerve test stimulation, hence 28% received implant.<br><br>*quad lead Medtronic device, connected to ITREL II Medtronic pulse generator, implanted subcut at the lower abdominal wall.  |
| Aboseif 2002 <sup>521</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 64 (54 women)   | M/F mean age 47 years (22–76) with various forms of voiding dysfunction, refractory to other tx including behavioural therapy, PFMT with biofeedback, drug tx with 'various agents'<br><br>69% had frequency, urgency, or urge UI, 31% chronic retention requiring intermittent catheterisation – results reported separately for each grp | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 foramen*                      | Mean 24 months (6–36)   | Bladder diary (in population with UI/OAB <i>n</i> = 44), mean change/day<br><br>Satisfaction (in population with UI/OAB <i>n</i> = 44),<br><br>Complications (all pts, <i>n</i> = 64) | Leakage episodes –4.4 (69%), $P < 0.05$ vs baseline<br>Frequency –9.3 (52%), $P < 0.05$ vs baseline<br>Mean vol. voided +4 oz (91%)<br><br>77% reported '> 50% improvement in QOL'<br><br>Incidence 19% ( <i>n</i> = 12):<br>'most common' seroma formation at pulse generator site<br>2 (3%) superficial wound infections<br>1 (2%) deep infection (req device removal)<br>3% lead migration (op repeated)<br>3% device malfunction (op repeated) | Funding: none declared. 2 authors proctors for Medtronic Inc.<br>160 underwent PNE, those with > 50% objective cure (bladder diary) in voiding symptoms given permanent implant (40%).<br><br>*Medtronic Interstim Sacral Nerve Implant. Device activated 1 week after implantation.<br><br>Mean hospital stay 24 h. |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Amundsen 2002 <sup>527</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 12              | F# with 'severe LUTS' (all had urge UI; 7/12 had DO) who had failed behavioural and drug tx<br><br>Mean age of 25 undergoing test stimulation 69 years (55–78)   | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 foramen* | Mean 7.8 months (1–16)   | Bladder diary (mean change vs baseline)<br><br>IIQ (mean change vs baseline)<br><br>Adverse effects  | Leakage episodes/day: –5 (71%), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Frequency/day: –4 (36%), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Pad usage: –5 (71%), <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>–188 (75%), <i>P</i> = 0.03<br><br>2 (17%) mild discomfort at device site, resolved at 3 months<br>5 (42%) reqd reprogramming (which improved symptoms)  | Funding: none declared.<br>25 pts had percutaneous sacral nerve test stimulation, 48% had ≥ 50% improvement during the test phase.<br><br>#inferred from baseline examination described (urogynaecological) – population referred to as 'patients' throughout.<br><br>*Interstim device (Medtronic), implanted under GA.   |
| Bosch 2000 <sup>522</sup><br>[Earlier publications of same population identified <sup>946,947</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45 (39 women)   | M/F mean age 45 (16–65) years, urge UI owing to DO refractory to drug tx and bladder retraining. Bladder capacity 150 to 500 ml<br>5 (11%) F had neurogenic bladder<br>Mean 1.3 prior continence operations. 56% F had undergone hysterectomy, and 62% colposuspension<br>Exclusions: stress UI, untreated UTI | Sacral nerve stimulation in S3 foramen* | Mean 47 months (6–96)<br><br>(100% at 1 year, 78% at 2 years, 69% 3, 58% 4, 51% 5) | Subjective cure†/<br>improvement<br><br>Bladder diary (change from baseline to 6 months and 5 years)<br><br>Filling cystometry (standing) at 6 months, median change from baseline | 40% cure<br>20% partially successful (50–90% reduction in pad use and/or leakage)<br>40% tx failure<br><br>Leakage episodes/24 h (median change): –5.8 (82%) and –6.4 (90%), <i>P</i> = 0.0001<br>Frequency/24 h (median change): –4.9 (37%) and –4.2 (32%), <i>P</i> = 0.0001<br>Mean voided vol. (mean change): +47 ml (36%), <i>P</i> = 0.0001, and +21 ml (16%), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Pads used/24 h (median change): –4.2 (78%), and –4.1 (76%), <i>P</i> = 0.0001<br><br>Sig. change in: bladder capacity +28%, <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>Detrusor pressure at max. unstable contraction –55% (cmH <sub>2</sub> O), <i>P</i> = 0.001 | Funding: Fund for Developments in Medicine (Health Insurance Council of the Netherlands).<br>85 pts had percutaneous sacral nerve test stimulation, 54% had ≥ 50% improvement during the test phase.<br>† > 90% improvement in pad use and/or leakage episodes.<br><br>*quad lead Medtronic device, connected to pulse generator implanted subcut. Initial stimulation parameters pulse width 210 μs, freq 10 pulses/s, mean amplitude 2.6 (SD 0.2) Volts. Pt retained external magnet to switch generator on/off. |



| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up                                | Outcome measures                             | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Adverse effects                              | 19 re-operations in 17 (38%) pts; 9 owing to electrode dislocation, 3 suboptimal positioning during initial procedure; 2 extension cable exchanges owing to fracture; 1 early device failure<br>2 pain at generator site, resolved after repositioning |  |
| Cappellano 2001 <sup>523</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 113 (73% women) | M/F mean age 51 years (17–79), urge UI (56%), urgency/frequency (4%), voiding disturbance (36%), pelvic pain (4%), resistant to conservative treatment. Baseline leakage episodes $5.8 \pm 4.2$ per day<br>14% had neurogenic bladder | Sacral neuromodulation implant (no further details) | 18 months (results for non-neurogenic bladder grp) | I-QOL (mean change in score from baseline)   | +41.9 (122%) at 3 months<br>+49.2 (143%) at 6 months<br>+40.5 (118%) at 9 months<br>+38.3 (111%) at 12 months<br>+49.4 (144%) at 18 months<br>$P \leq 0.01$ for all changes  | Funding: none declared.<br>All pts had shown response in prior percutaneous sacral nerve test stimulation.<br>I-QOL: 22 item domain specific; score 0–100 poor QOL to no impact. |
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Leakage episodes (mean change from baseline) | –90% at 3 months<br>–81% at 6 months, $P < 0.01$<br>–86% at 9 months<br>–84% at 12 months, $P < 0.01$<br>–79% at 18 months   |  |
| Janknegt 2001 <sup>524</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 96 (89% women)  | M/F aged 22–78 years, urge UI refractory to 'standard medical technologies' (no details of previous treatments). Mean $11 \pm 6.5$ leakage episodes/day, severity* $2 \pm 0.6$  | Sacral neuromodulation implant in S3 or S4 foramen  | Mean 30.8 months (12–60)                           | Leakage episodes/day (mean change)           | –6.7 (61%), $P < 0.0001$   | Funding: none declared.<br>All pts underwent test stimulation those with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in UI symptoms during test given implant (InterStim), quad leads.                 |
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Cure (dry) or improvement                    | 26% cured<br>36% had $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage episodes   | *severity on scale of 1–3; 1 mild/drops of urine, 2 moderate/several tablespoons, 3 heavy/soaked pad/outer clothing.   |
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Frequency /day (mean change)                 | –4.0 (30%), $P < 0.0001$   | Adverse effects/complications – not considered.  |
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Severity* (mean change in score)             | –0.3 (15%), $P < 0.0001$   |  |
|                                |                       |                 |   |   |  | Pad usage ( $n = 90$ ), mean change          | –4.2/day, $P < 0.0001$   |  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                 | Length of follow-up                                    | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|                               |                       |   |  |  |  | Volume voided ( $n = 85$ ), mean change                                     | Sig. increase in mean and max. voided vol.; no sig. change in total voided vol./day  |  |
|                               |                       |   |  |  |  | Device removal  | 11% (9 for lack of efficacy, 1 chronic leg pain, 1 bowel dysfunction)  |  |
| Scheepens 2002 <sup>525</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 15 (13 F)<br>8 had retention<br>(1 both UI and retention) | M/F mean age 53 years (44–66), urge UI or retention (no further details)<br>Mean no leakage episodes/day 9, frequency 13, pad usage 5  | Sacral neuromodulation implant in S3 foramen | Mean 4.9 years (median 5.2, range 2.5–7.5)<br>$n = 12$ | Bladder diary variables in UI pts ( $n$ unclear), mean change from baseline | Leakage/day –64%, $P = NS$<br>Frequency/day –39% $P = 0.05$<br>Pad usage/day –80% $P = 0.003$<br>Max. voided vol. +267%<br>$P = 0.013$ | Funding: none declared.<br>All pts underwent test stimulation (mean 2.1 per pt); 2 stage technique used for pts who failed initial PNE test but had good response in the acute phase of testing or the first 2–3 days of the subchronic phase. |
| Shaker 1998 <sup>526</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 18 (16 F)<br>7 had retention                              | M/F mean age 42 years (22–67) refractory to all conservative treatments. Leakage episodes/24 h 6.49                                    | Sacral neuromodulation implant in S3 foramen | 18 months ( $n = 7$ )                                  | Bladder diary variables (mean change from baseline)                         | Leakage episodes –80%<br>Frequency –43%<br>Volume voided +8%   | Funding: none declared.<br>All pts underwent test stimulation those with $\geq 50\%$ reduction in UI symptoms during test given implant.   |
|                               |                       |   |  |  |  | Complications ( $n = 18$ )  | 2 (11%) superficial wound dehiscence<br>11% cable erosion needing repositioning<br>11% pain at implant site with back pain             | Other than 18 month follow-up, 1 month results also reported.  |
| Hedlund 2004 <sup>528</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 14 (12 F)   | M/F mean age 47 years (33–73) with severe symptoms of OAB an urge UI<br>21% (of the 53 who underwent PNE had prior continence surgery) | Sacral neuromodulation implant in S3 foramen | Mean 18 months (9–32)                                  | Subjective cure   | 8 of 11 (73%)<br>5 (45%) had > 50% improvement   | Funding: none declared.<br>36% responded to PNE (19 of 53; implant given to 14).   |
|                               |                       |   |  |  |  | Complications   | 1 had device removed<br>2 lead repositioning<br>1 seroma<br>2 occasional faecal incontinence   | Medtronic quadripolar lead model 3080, pulse generator Medtronic Interstim Model 3031, pulse width 210 $\mu$ s, freq 20 Hz, pulse rate 14, amplitude 0.5–3.5 V.  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                 | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Weil 1998 <sup>529</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 36 (27 F)       | M/F median age 45 years (23–67). 66% urge UI, 17% urgency-frequency, 17% retention. 44% overall had perineal, hypogastric, or scrotal pain with their voiding complaints.<br><br>86% failed prior drug tx, 44% had prior lower urinary tract surgery   | Sacral neuromodulation implant in S3 foramen | Mean<br>38 months (12–60)  | 'Success'<br><br>Mean change in daily symptoms at 6 months<br><br>Complications                                   | 47% good (> 90% improvement)<br>8% partial (> 50% and < 90%)<br>11% no effect<br>33% device removed<br><br>–36% frequency<br>–76% leakage episodes<br>–27% urgency<br>+44% voided volume<br><br>66% had re-operation, 38% for lead problems<br>12% pain at implant site  | Funding: none declared.<br>100 pts screened; therefore 36% had response to PNE.<br><br>Urodynamic findings at 6 months reported for urge UI groups only – data not reproduced here.<br><br>Medtronic electrode 3886 or 3080 used, and implant 7421 or 7422.   |
| Latini 2006 <sup>513</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 41 (36 F)       | M/F mean age 54 years (SD 16) with urge UI refractory to conservative therapy (ie, pharmacologic, behavioural, biofeedback therapy)<br><br>The patients included those who received permanent one-staged or two-staged InterStim implants<br><br>Exclusions: bladder outlet obstruction, neurologic disease, positive urine cytology or culture, prior bladder surgery | Sacral nerve stimulation                     | Median<br>12 months (IQR 12–27) for single-stage and<br>4.5 months (IQR 1.5–12) for staged implants* | Leakage episodes in pts with urge UI (mean change /day)<br><br>Pad usage (mean change/day)<br><br>Adverse effects | –74% (from 8.8 to 2.3 per day, $P = 0.0001$ )<br><br>–83% (from 4.7 to 0.82 per day, $P < 0.0001$ )<br><br>No intra-operative complications<br>2 (4.9%) devices removed (1 infection, 1 owing to ongoing need for MRI)<br>3 reqd re-operation (7.3%); 2 displacement of implanted pulse generator, 1 malfunctioning device)<br>2.4% ( $n = 1$ ) haematoma<br>2.4% pain at generator site<br>2.4% pain in pelvis<br>2.4% pain in gluteal incision<br>10% superficial incisional separation<br>15% superficial wound infection<br>4.9% cellulitis at pulse generator | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective evaluation of cases.<br>Device = Surgical implantation of the InterStim was performed in patients who experienced a greater than 50% reduction in urge incontinence symptoms, (= 90% pts).<br><br>**test stimulation' consisted of percutaneous stimulation unless pt obese, in which case 2-stage permanent implant used (firstly permanent electrode implanted and connected to external stimulator; if successful in alleviating symptoms, it is then connected to a permanent stimulator implanted as a 2nd procedure).<br><br>Implant undertaken 2000 to 2003; older version of electrode sutured to presacral fascia by way of an open approach used Jan 2000 to Sept 2002. More minimally invasive implantation procedure with the tined lead used Oct 02 to July 2003. |

## Augmentation cystoplasty

| Study                                 | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up            | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Awad 1998 <sup>530</sup>              | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 51              | F mean age 44 years (18–69), idiopathic urge UI, symptom duration 3.3 (2–6.5) years. 27 (53%) also had evidence of interstitial cystitis on cystoscopy<br>Other symptoms: 88% frequency, 63% nocturia, 47% stress UI, 41% suprapubic pain<br>Previous tx: 100% drugs, 63% bladder dilatation, 53% DMSO, 47% urethrovesical suspension, 45% sacral nerve block<br>UD findings: 69% DO, 57% capacity < 200 ml | Augmentation ileocystoplasty, with Burch in pts with anatomical evidence of stress UI (47%)* | Mean 63.4 months (range 24–97) | Continence status<br><br>Patient satisfaction<br><br>Additional or further therapy<br><br>Adverse effects | 53% continent<br>25% occasional leaks<br>18% incontinent (regular pad use)<br>Of 45 who still had patch, 33% required CISC regularly (2–3×/day) and 11% occasionally<br><br>53% satisfied<br>39% not satisfied<br>8% unsure<br><br>24% antimuscarinics<br>6% fascial sling suspension<br>4% patch revision<br>8% patch removed owing to persistent UTI and high residual vol.<br>4% ileal conduit<br><br>49% recurrent UTI<br>20% 'frequent' mucus retention, usually relieved with CISC<br>8% partial bowel obstruction<br>12% chronic diarrhoea<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) incisional hernia<br>2% bladder calculus<br>2% augmentation necrosis with perforation and secondary peritonitis 'caused by neglect during CISC' | Funding: none declared.<br>*positive Marshall test and bladder neck hypermobility.   |
| Hasan 1995 <sup>531</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 48 (31 [65%] F) | M/F mean age 46 years (21–87)<br>Symptoms: 100% frequency, 98% urgency, 65% urge UI, 56% enuresis<br>Diagnosis: 35 idiopathic DO (all failed prior conservative treatment with no benefit or intolerable side effects): 13 neurogenic DO<br>Prior procedures: 37 bladder distention, 5  | Clam enterocystoplasty (with colposuspension in 7 with idiopathic DO)                        | Mean 38 ± 18 months (13–78)    | Symptoms<br><br>Urinary symptom scores (max. 14 points)<br><br>Urodynamics ( <i>n</i> = 45), at 3 months  | % with improved symptoms at 3 months: 92% improved frequency<br>90% improved nocturia<br>89% improved enuresis<br>At > 12 months ( <i>n</i> = 46): as 3 months results except sig. increase in nocturia (No numerical data)<br><br>Change from 10 ± 3 (2–14) pre-op to 3 ± 4 (2–14) at 3 months, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br><br>Sig. increase in total bladder capacity and compliance<br>31% had DO post-op   | Funding: none declared.<br>Ileal segment used in 46 pts, and sigmoid colon in 2.<br>Trial CISC performed before deciding on procedure.<br>Visick grading (excellent to worse after op) also quoted, and Nottingham Health Profile. |

| Study                                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up                       | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
|   |                       |                 | sub-trigonal injection   |  |   | Complications   | <p>Early (&lt; 30 days):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15% UTI</li> <li>10% emergency readmission (cause not stated)</li> <li>6% chest infection</li> <li>4% blood transfusion &gt; 2 units</li> <li>2% septicaemia</li> </ul> <p>Late (1–12 months):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8% recurrent UTI</li> <li>2% each: anastomotic perforation, calculus formation, urethral stricture</li> </ul> <p>&gt; 12 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6% incisional hernia</li> <li>37% recurrent UTI (requiring frequent antibiotic tx)</li> <li>15% UTI requiring long-term antibiotic tx</li> </ul> <p>Others (timescale not stated):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>22% increased bowel frequency</li> <li>17% faecal incontinence</li> <li>11% diarrhoea</li> <li>4% constipation</li> <li>11% problems with CISC (no details)</li> </ul> |  |
| Mundy 1985 <sup>532</sup><br>UK study       | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40 (22 [55%] F) | M/F mean age 28 years (6–57).<br>88% had urgency/urge UI, 12% totally wet<br>63% no evidence of neuropathy; 20% overt neuropathy, 13% suspected neuropathy, 5% other diagnosis | Clam enterocystoplasty (with other procedure in 13 [33%]; 5 AUS, 4 unidiversion, 2 bladder neck incision, 1 colposuspension, 1 change in AUS balloon pressure) | Mean 12 months (3–39)                     | Continence<br><br>Complications                             | <p>90% cured (of which 83% spontaneously voiding, 17% using CISC)</p> <p>10% had stress UI</p> <p>18% voiding dysfunction</p> <p>5% recurrent UTI</p> <p>3% (<i>n</i> = 1) AUS problems</p> <p>3% mucus plug retention</p> <p>3% small bowel perforation</p> <p>3% persistent urine leak</p>   | Funding: none declared.<br>Some urodynamic parameters reported for 31 pts; in terms of 'normality' (not defined), presence or absence. |
| Kockelbergh 1991 <sup>533</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45 (31 [69%] F) | M/F median age 45 years (19–79), duration of symptoms 8.2 years; all had urgency and frequency, and 87% had UI.<br>98% previously treated with a variety of                    | Clam enterocystoplasty   | Mean follow-up 20.3 ± 12.4 months (Min 5) | Symptoms (% with pre/post-op)<br><br>Subjective improvement | <p>93/24% urgency</p> <p>89/22 urge UI</p> <p>89/31 any incontinence</p> <p><i>P</i> &lt; 0.001 for all pre- to post-op changes</p> <p>53% cured or much better</p> <p>18% improved</p> <p>27% no better or worse</p> <p>2% (<i>n</i> = 1) died</p>  | Funding: none declared.<br>Clam procedure in coronal plane in 42%, and in sagittal plane in 58%.                                       |

| Study                         | Study type and EL                          | No. of patients     | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
|                               |  |                     | anticholinergics drugs;<br>80% also had other procedures: phenol, Helmstein, transection;<br>Diagnosis: 42 (93%) idiopathic, 7% neurogenic |  |                        | Urodynamics  | No sig. change in any parameter (bladder capacity, residual vol., filling/voiding pressure, flow rate)   |  |
|                               |  |                     |  |  |                        | Complications  | 4% early failures (1 small bowel obstruction, 1 peritonitis)<br>4% each: incisional hernia, urethral stricture<br>22% voiding 'strain' (77% of whom did ISC)<br>51% recurrent UTI<br>100% mucus in urine (51% required bladder washout/carbocysteine)  |  |
| Edlund 2001 <sup>535</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3                      | 30 (26 F)           | M/F mean age 50 (21–71) with urge UI and OAB refractory to conservative measures   | Clam enterocystoplasty (with colposuspension in 8 pts) | Mean 60 months (4–127) | Satisfaction   | 78% (17 of 23 who completed questionnaire)   | Funding: grants from Ferring/Swedish Enuresis Academy and other research foundations.                                    |
|                               |  |                     |  |  |                        | Complications  | 2 reoperation owing to failure (1 resection, 1 AUS)<br>39% used CISC<br>25% increased bowel frequency<br>17% received vit B12 substitution for low levels<br>58% 'sporadic' UTI<br>3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) recurrent UTI requiring long-term antibiotic therapy   | Urodynamics also reported (increase in cystometric capacity and reduction in max. detrusor pressure during filling).     |
| Greenwell 2001 <sup>536</sup> | Case series/<br>narrative review<br>EL = 3 | See comments column | No details of patients or indications  | Entero-cystoplasty                                     | Minimum 5 years (5–17) | Complications in own series (ranges for others in literature)* | Short-term:<br>0.75% bleed (0.6 to 6.7%; 3 studies)<br>1.5% infection (2.1 to 9%; 11 studies)<br>0.4% fistula (0 to 29.7%; 10 studies)<br>1.9% small intestine obstruction (1.5 to 8.7%; 14 studies)<br>1.1% PE/DVT (2.1 to 7.1%; 5 studies)<br>0 MI (1.1 to 2.7%; 3 studies)<br>0 patch necrosis (0 to 1.7%; 3 studies)<br>0 death (0 to 3.2%; 10 studies)<br>Long-term:<br>38% CISC (14 to 100%; 20 studies)<br>16% metabolic disturbance (0 to 19%; 10 studies)<br>2% renal function deterioration (0 to 56%; 13 studies)<br>75% asymptomatic UTI (6 to 100%; 10 studies)<br>20% symptomatic UTI (2 to 43%; 16 studies)<br>13% stones (0 to 30%; 14 studies)<br>0.75% bladder perforation (0 to 9%; 11 studies)<br>NR bowel change (0 to 64; 7 studies) | Funding: none declared.<br>*data presented from another 23 series, ranging in size from 8 to 157, total 1083, median 34. |

## Urinary diversion

| Study                                 | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|---|---|
| Singh 1997 <sup>537</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 93 (63% F)      | M/F mean age 50 (8–78) years who underwent ileal conduit urinary diversion<br><br>76% had neurological disease, 24% unmanageable UI or intractable symptoms of interstitial cystitis | ileal conduit urinary diversion | Minimum 2 years (mean 5) | Complications     | 52% vesical infection and pyocystis; reqd hospitalisation in 48% for bladder irrigation. 5/48 had vesico-vaginal fistula<br><br>None had carcinoma in residual bladder<br>31% stoma problems, most minor (skin reactions, infections). None reqd physician intervention<br>11% parastomal hernia requiring surgery<br>33% upper tract dilatation (44% vs 27% of pts with > 5 vs < 5 years follow-up)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of case notes (1 surgeon's patients). |
| Cox 1987 <sup>538</sup>               | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 18              | F mean age 54 (38–63) stress UI (3 also had bladder instability)   | Ileal loop diversion            | Minimum 1 year           | Complications (n) | Complications related to dysfunctional bladder:<br>10 vaginal discharge<br>3 pyocystitis<br>[8 reqd vesicovaginal fistula 12–18 months (mean 18) after 1st procedure: all eventually underwent cystectomy]<br>8 underwent total of 14 revision operations on loops/stomas (3 for obstruction, 2 each: peristomal hernia, persistent excoriation, persistent leakage, stoma too long, self-inflicted stoma damage, 1 stomal stenosis<br>1 septicaemia<br>1 stomatitis (later had uterosigmoidostomy) | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of case notes (1 surgeon's patients). |

*Detrusor myectomy*

| Study                                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention      | Length of follow-up                      | Outcome measures       | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------|--|--|-------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|
| Kumar 2005 <sup>540</sup>                  | Case series       | 30 (20 women)  | M/F consecutive cases; OAB symptoms refractory to anticholinergics tx;   | Detrusor myectomy | Mean 27 months (12–42) <sup>539</sup>    | Subjective improvement | 7 (26%) cured<br>10 (37%) improved<br>7 (26%) no change   | Funding: none declared. Authors declared no conflict of interest. |
| Swami 1998 <sup>539</sup> 1 year follow-up | EL = 3            | ( <i>n</i> = 27 in initial follow-up, gender not stated) | detrusor myectomy offered as alternative to enterocystoplasty<br>24 (18 F) idiopathic DO, 6 (2F) neurogenic DO |                   | Median 79 months (28–142) <sup>540</sup> | Subjective improvement | Subjective 'continued improvement' in 21 (19 IDO)<br>No DO on UD in 14/17   | Improved = reduction in no. of urgency and/or urge UI episodes.   |
|  |                   |  |  |                   |  | Urodynamics            | Sig. increase in bladder capacity in 24, mean +165 ml, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>No sig. change in detrusor pressure or bladder contractility index   |   |
|  |                   |  |  |                   |  | Complications          | 1 bowel perforation<br>10 CISC after surgery (7 owing to UTI, 2 persisting symptoms, 1 large PVR)<br>3 with IDO had further procedures (2 ileal conduit owing to persistent IDO, 1 colposuspension for stress UI) |   |



## Botulinum toxin – RCTs

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                  | Length of follow-up                         | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Ghei 2005 <sup>548</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 20 (17 F)       | M/F mean age 50 (SD 12), range 18–80 years, refractory DO (3 neurogenic, 17 idiopathic). Median weekly leakage episodes 19; frequency 67.5<br><br>Exclusions: bladder/prostate malignancy, prior bladder surgery, active UTI, major urethral access problems | Botulinum toxin type B 5000 IU diluted up to 20 ml with 0.9% saline | Placebo (20 ml 0.9% saline) | 12 weeks tx (2×6 weeks tx, with no washout) | Mean voided vol. (change in median)*<br><br>Frequency/week (change in median)*<br><br>Leakage episodes/week (change in median)*<br><br>KHQ<br><br>Adverse effects | +83 ml (95% CI 6.1 to 132.4) vs +4.48 ml (95% CI –4.05 to +43.43)<br><br>Median difference +65 ml (95% CI +11 to +121), <i>P</i> = 0.012<br><br>–22.5 (95% CI –32.76 to –10.41) vs –14 (95% CI –20.29 to –5.23)<br><br>Median difference –9 (95% CI –19.5 to –0.5), <i>P</i> = 0.033<br><br>–17 (95% CI –40 to –7.7) vs –8.5 (95% CI –16.5 to –2.0)<br><br>Median difference –12 (95% CI –24 to –5), <i>P</i> = 0.001<br><br>Significant improvements in 5 of 9 domains (impact on life, incontinence impact, physical/social limitations, sleep/energy disturbance, incontinence severity measures)<br><br>10% ( <i>n</i> = 2) retention (resolved after 6 weeks ISC)<br>10% constipation<br>10% dry mouth | Funding: none (not manufacturer).<br><br>Drugs prepared by hospital pharmacy; prepared for administration by nurse, hence pt and surgeon blinded to tx.<br><br>Injections into detrusor at 10 different sites by same surgeon; pts recruited April 2003 to Aug 2004.<br><br>*all paired differences in changes. |

## Botulinum toxin – case series

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Flynn 2004 <sup>545</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 7               | F median age 59 947–82), urge UI failed physical and behavioural therapy and tx with ≥ 1 antimuscarinic drug; 24 h pad weight > 100 g<br><br>Exclusions: correctable or neurogenic cause for UI | Botulinum toxin type A<br>150 units in 0.9% saline                                 | 6 months                     | Leakage episodes/24 h (mean change, [95% CI])<br><br>Frequency/24 h (mean change)<br><br>QOL (UDI-6, IIQ-7), mean change in score (95% CI)<br><br>24 h pad test (mean change, g, [95% CI])<br><br>Urodynamics (6 weeks and 3 months)<br><br>Adverse effects | –61% (–35, –88) at 6 weeks, <i>P</i> = 0.0013<br>–64% (–42, –92) at 3 months, <i>P</i> = 0.0006<br>–12% (+59, –83) at 6 months, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>No sig. change at any time point<br><br>UDI-6:<br>–53% (–26, –80) at 6 weeks, <i>P</i> = 0.003<br>–46% (–22, –70) at 3 months, <i>P</i> = 0.0034<br>–35% (–1, –70) at 6 months, <i>P</i> = 0.045<br>IIQ-7:<br>–64% (–24, –100) at 6 weeks, <i>P</i> = 0.0077<br>–77% (–46, –100) at 3 months, <i>P</i> = 0.001<br>–48% (+23, –99) at 6 months, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>–90% (–76, –100) at 6 weeks, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br>–50% (+42, –100) at 3 months, <i>P</i> = NS<br>+184% (+600, –100) at 6 months, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>No sig. change in voiding function (pressure flow studies) or mean cystometric capacity<br><br>none | Funding: none declared.<br>Botulinum inj. into 10–12 sites of posterior bladder wall (total 3 ml).  |
| Werner 2005 <sup>546</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 26              | F mean age 66 (48–84 years), urge UI and DO, failed to respond to various antimuscarinics<br><br>Exclusions: neurogenic hyperreflexia   | Botulinum toxin type A<br>100 units in 0.9% saline, under GA or spinal anaesthesia | 3 months<br>( <i>n</i> = 20) | Frequency (mean change)<br><br>Cure of leakage<br><br>Urodynamics<br><br>KHQ  | Day frequency –4.5 (38%)<br>Nocturia –1.4 (54%)<br><br>80% subjective<br>65% objective (no detrusor contraction associated with leakage)<br><br>Sig. increase in max. cystometric capacity; compliance, volumes at first and strong desire to void<br><br>Sig. difference in all items (improvement of ≥ 1 category)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Conducted in tertiary referral unit.<br>1 ml injected at 30 locations covering inner surface of bladder.<br>Follow-up to 9 months also reported but only in 5 pts – not reproduced here.<br>2 pts re-injected 5–10 months after initial inj. |

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
|                          |                       |                 |  |   |   | Adverse effects  | 2 had PVR 130–230 ml after 4 weeks, resolved with self-catheterisation for 1 week<br>31% UTI (during follow-up period)   |   |
| Rapp 2004 <sup>541</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 35 (29 women)   | M/F mean age 66 years (41–93), with refractory symptoms of frequency, urgency, and/or urge UI, failed tx with anticholinergics (min 4 weeks without improvement). Mean duration of symptoms 3.7 years<br>6 had neurogenic UI<br>Exclusions: bladder cancer, retention, surgical bladder reconstruction, history of interstitial cystitis | Botulinum toxin type A*<br>300 units inj. into 30 detrusor intramural sites                           | 3 weeks<br><br><br><br><br><br>6 months (n = 24, [3-week responders]) | QOL (IIQ-7, UDI-6), score change vs baseline<br><br>Subjective cure/improvement<br><br>Adverse effects | IIQ-7: -5.5, P = 0.0006<br>UDI-6: -4.0, P = 0.0003<br><br>34% cure<br>26% slight improvement<br>40% no improvement<br><br>7 mild haematuria, pelvic pain, dysuria (all resolved within 3 days of inj.)   | Funding: none declared.<br>*given under IV sedation as outpatient procedure, using cystoscope.                            |
| Kuo 2005 <sup>542</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 20 (7 women)    | M/F mean age 62 years (35–83), idiopathic DO refractory to anticholinergics<br>Exclusions: PVR > 150 ml  | Botulinum toxin type A<br>200 units into 40 suburothelial (posterior and lateral bladder wall) sites* | 12 months   | Subjective cure/improvement<br><br><br><br><br><br>Urodynamics   | 3 months (n = 20):<br>9 cure<br>8 improved<br>3 no improvement<br>In women: 4 cured, 2 improved<br>6 months (n = 20):<br>7 remained cured<br>8 improved<br>5 no improvement<br>12 months:<br>4 remained cured<br><br>Sig. increase in vol. at 1st sensation, bladder capacity, PVR, P ≤ 0.001<br>Sig. reduction in detrusor pressure, P = 0.022<br>No sig. change in max. flow rate or bladder neck opening time | Funding: none declared.<br>*under IV GA, using cystoscope.<br>#all pts in study given 7 days antibiotics after procedure. |

| Study                               | Study type and EL     | No. of patients     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|---|--|---|
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Complications   | Within 2 weeks:<br>1 haematuria<br>6 transient retention<br>10 PVR > 250 ml<br>7 UTI (all had PVR > 100 ml)#<br>'during follow-up': 15 difficulty urinating and residual urine sensation |   |
| Rajkumar 2005 <sup>547</sup>        | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 15                  | F mean age 44 years (20–61), with UD confirmed idiopathic DO, not responded to conservative measures. None had prior major urinary bladder surgery<br>Exclusions: stress-predominant incontinence | Botulinum toxin A, single dose of 300 units  | At 6 weeks, and every 4 weeks until baseline values reached | Frequency   | No numerical data: reported to be reduced in 14 pts; symptoms returned to baseline in 13 pts with follow-up at 9 months (mean 24 weeks, range 10–52)                                     | Funding: none declared.<br>Drug injected intravesically into 30 sites into detrusor muscle under cystoscopic control, in 30 ml saline.  |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Leakage episodes  | No numerical data  | The volume at first desire to void increased in 13 patients ( $P < 0.006$ ), the max. cystometric capacity increased in 10 ( $P < 0.011$ ) and six of the 15 had no evidence of detrusor overactivity; in the remaining eight the volume at first overactive contraction increased in six ( $P < 0.0023$ ) and the volume at first overactivity incontinence increased in 11 ( $P < 0.005$ ). The median modified projected isovolometric pressure decreased significantly ( $P = 0.01$ ), from 69 to 45. |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Urodynamics (cystometry) at 6 weeks                       | Max. cystometric capacity increased in 10 pts; first desire to void increased in 12<br>DO eliminated in 6  |   |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | QOL (BFLUTS, KHQ)   | Improved in all patients (no numerical data)   |   |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Adverse effects   | no 'major adverse effects'   |   |
| Schulte-Baukloh 2005 <sup>543</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 44 (41 [93%] women) | F mean age 66 years (30–91) with idiopathic OAB refractory to several anticholinergics and behavioural or neuromodulating therapy   | Botulinum toxin type A<br>200–300 units inj. into 40–50 sites all over detrusor muscle (and 4 quadrant inj. into sphincter muscle in | 9 months  | Frequency (mean change vs baseline)                       | –12% at 1 month, $P < 0.05$<br>–16% at 3 months, $P < 0.05$<br>–13% at 6 months, $P = NS$<br>–9% at 9 months, $P = NS$   | Funding: none declared.<br>*by cystoscope, under spinal, general or local anaesthetic; diluted in 20 ml normal saline.  |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Maximum voided volume (mean change vs baseline)           | +14% at 1 month, $P < 0.05$<br>+19% at 3 months, $P < 0.05$<br>+25% at 6 months, $P = NS$<br>–3% at 9 months, $P = NS$   |   |
|                                     |                       |                     |   |  |   | Volume at strong desire to void (mean change vs baseline) | +56% at 1 month, $P < 0.05$<br>+37% at 3 months, $P < 0.05$<br>+55% at 6 months, $P < 0.05$<br>–8% at 9 months, $P = NS$   |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up                            | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
|                             |                       |                 |   |   | 22)*   | QOL (UDI-6, SSI, SII, mean change in scores)   | Scores fell at 1 month (16 to 43%), then increased back to baseline values at 9 months   |  |
|                             |                       |                 |   |   |  | Subjective response (no definition)  | 86%  |  |
|                             |                       |                 |   |   |  | Adverse effects  | none   |  |
| Dykstra 2003 <sup>549</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 15              | F mean age 57 years (48–75) with frequency ( $\geq 8$ /day), with or without UI, recruited from Urogynae clinic<br>Exclusions: stress UI, other concomitant tx for OAB, total daily urine vol. > 3 litre, botulinum toxin inj. in past 4 months | Botulinum toxin type B<br>2500 units ( $n = 5$ ), 3750 units (4), 5000 units (2), 10,000 units (2), 15,000 units (3)* | Duration of response (max. 98 days [14 weeks]) | Frequency (mean change/day)<br>Duration of response (reduction in frequency), and correlation between response duration and dose | –5.3 (SE 0.5), $P < 0.001$ vs baseline<br>no response in 1 pt<br>2500 unit dose: 19, 21, 23, 25 days<br>3750: 22, 28, 32, 33<br>5000: 43<br>10,000: 84, 90<br>15,000: 80, 95, 98<br>$r = 0.96$ , $P < 0.001$ | Funding: Elan Pharmaceuticals Inc supplied product.<br>BTX injections given following instillation of 50 ml lignocaine 1%. BTX administered using 23 gauge needle into bladder wall at 10 different sites using a cystoscope, avoiding bladder trigone. BTX drawn up into 6 ml syringe and diluted with 3.5 ml saline (first 3 pts) or preservative free lignocaine (subsequent pts) to total vol. 4 ml.<br>3 days ciprofloxacin given as prophylaxis against infection.<br>1 pt did not respond to 2500 and was given 5000 units. |

## Vanilloid receptor agonists

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Kuo 2003 <sup>551</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 41 (20 women)   | M/F mean age 74 years (43–82), with DO refractory to 6 months anticholinergic <sup>1</sup> tx<br>13 had idiopathic DO, 10 had neurogenic UI; 18 previous transurethral prostatectomy. Symptom duration 3.6 ± 4.5 years | Intravesical resiniferatoxin (10 ml of 100 Nm solution, left in bladder for 40 min)               | Unclear             | Change in leakage<br><br>Video UD ( <i>n</i> = 21 with clinical improvement)<br><br>Adverse effects during instillation | 21 (51%) improved* [5/13 with IDO]<br>18 (44%) no change<br>2 (5%) poor*<br>duration of effect in those with improvement median 5 months (2–9)**<br><br>Sig. increase in cystometric capacity +79 ml (38%) <i>P</i> = 0.001<br>Sig. decrease in detrusor pressure – 6.2 cmH <sub>2</sub> O (18%) <i>P</i> = 0.047<br>no sig. change in maximal flow rate or residual volume<br><br>12 (29%) raised BP<br>5 (12%) bladder pain | Funding: none declared.<br>100Nm solution of resiniferatoxin in 10% ethanol in 0.9% saline solution.<br>*improvement = pts dry or 50% reduction in leakage episodes.<br>Poor = development of exacerbated UI or retention.<br>**10/21 with improvement received repeated instillation but unclear when.<br>Vol. removed from bladder following instillation: median 60 ml (30–400 ml). |
| Palma 2004 <sup>550</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 30              | F median age 56 years (24–88) with idiopathic DO for > 6 months, and no response or adverse effects from antimuscarinic drugs  | Intravesical resiniferatoxin (50 Nm solution, left in bladder for 30 min, volume used not stated) | 30 days             | Urinary symptoms (% with)<br><br>Multi-channel cystometry (change vs baseline)  | 60% urgency (vs 90% baseline, <i>P</i> = 0.0077)<br>50% urge UI (vs 83% baseline, <i>P</i> = 0.0044)<br>no sig. change in frequency, nocturia, enuresis<br><br>40% reduction (–19 cmH <sub>2</sub> O) in max. amplitude of involuntary contractions<br>No sig. change in max. cystometric capacity  | Funding: none declared. RTX supplied by Sigma Co.<br>50Nm solution of resiniferatoxin in 10% ethanol in 0.9% saline solution.  |

## Procedures for stress urinary incontinence – operations to augment sphincter closure

## Intramural bulking agents – controlled trials

| Study                               | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures                                   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Bano 2005 <sup>56</sup><br>UK study | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 50 (49 followed up at 6 weeks, 48 at 6 months) | F mean age 61 years (28–80), UD stress UI<br>9 (18%) had prior continence surgery (3 from silicone grp; 2 pubovaginal sling, 1 colposuspension; 6 from collagen grp; 2 pubovaginal sling, 3 colposuspension, 1 colposuspension followed by sling) | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, transurethral)<br>Mean vol. given 5 ml (2.5–7.5)<br><i>n</i> = 25 | Collagen (porcine dermal implant injection, Permacol; 4 trans-urethrally, 21 peri-)<br>Mean vol. given 8 ml (4.5–12)<br><i>n</i> = 25 | Post-op<br><br>6 weeks and 6 months | Adverse effects<br><br>Objective cure/improvement* | Urinary retention 12% vs 8% (catheterised for 1–3 vs 7 days)<br><i>de novo</i> urge UI 4% vs 4%<br><br>At 6 weeks:<br>Improved: 54% vs 64%<br>cure: 42% vs 60%<br>unchanged 38% vs 32%<br>worse 8% vs 4%<br>At 6 months:<br>Improved: 42% vs 60%<br>cure: 38% vs 60%<br>unchanged 29% vs 28%<br>worse 21% vs 4%<br>relapse 8% vs 4%<br><br>KHQ (% with 'improved score')<br>42% vs 60% at 6 weeks<br>29% vs 56% at 6 months<br><br>Change in Stamey grading<br>% with improvement of ≥ 1 grade:<br>46% vs 64% at 6 weeks<br>42% vs 58% at 6 months | Funding: none declared.<br>Follow-up of participants ongoing.<br>Collagen injections administered under cystoscopic control, using 'Macroplastique Injection System' inj. ceased when proximal urethral lumen closed or negative stress test.<br>Inj. silicone using 'macroplastique injection system', ceased when negative cough test achieved.<br>*ICS 1 h pad test; dry if ≤ 2 g urine loss.<br>[EL = 1–] No details of randomisation, limited baseline data, no definition given for improvement on pad test, unclear whether ITT analysis used.<br>No statistical analysis reported. |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                         | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Maher 2005 <sup>557</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 45              | F mean age 63–65 (34–84), stress UI secondary to ISD (MUCP ≤ 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O), failed to respond to conservative treatments<br>80% had prior continence surgery (67% vaginal hysterectomy/repair, 22% abdominal hysterectomy, 9% retropubic continence surgery, 7% needle suspension, 7% 'other')<br>Exclusions: requiring prolapse surgery, prior sling procedure | Silicone injection (Macroplastique; placed transurethral under GA) (n = 23) | Pubovaginal rectal sling* (n = 22) | 6 months            | Subjective outcomes<br><br>Objective cure (no leakage on UD)<br>QOL (SUDI, IIQ; median post-op scores [range])<br><br>1 h pad test (median post-op scores)<br><br>Peri-operative measures (median [range]) | Cure (< 1 leakage episode/week): 77% vs 90%, P = NS<br><br>Satisfaction (100 mm VAS): 60% vs 81%, P = NS<br><br>9% vs 81%, P < 0.0001<br><br>SUDI: 14 (0–100) vs 11 (0–44), P = NS<br>IIQ: 5 (0–85) vs 9 (0–85), P = NS<br><br>5 (0–57) vs 2 (0–20), P = NS<br><br>Theatre time (mins): 22 (10–41) vs 60 (35–105)<br>Inpt stay (days): 1 (1–2) vs 4 (3–8)<br>Blood loss (ml) 0 vs 200 (100–500)<br>Duration catheterisation (days): 1 (0–7) vs 5 (2–42)<br>Return to normal activities (days): 28 (0–35) vs 4 (0–42)<br>P < 0.0001 for all comparisons | Funding: none declared. Uroplasty provided<br>Macroplastique free of charge to women without health insurance.<br><br>*combined abdominal-vaginal approach; 11–12 cm sling harvested from rectus sheath and positioned suburethrally at proximal urethra and secured to rectus sheath without tension.<br><br>Silicone introduced using urethroscope, vials discharged using a ratchet gun, administered until bladder neck closed<br>SUDI acronym not explained.<br><br>#median time since surgery 61 months (range 42–71). |



| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                          | Outcome measures                                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|
|                            |                   |  |  |  |   |  | Repeat /further surgery                                | In silicone grp: 5 had 2nd inj. 2 had further surgery (1 sling followed by tension-free tape; 1 transurethral collagen inj.)   |   |
|                            |                   |  |  |  |   |  | Adverse effects (%)                                    | <i>de novo</i> DO: 0 vs 4.5% ( <i>n</i> = 1)<br>voiding dysfunction: 4% vs 18%<br>UTI 8.7 vs 13.6%<br>incisional hernia 0 vs 4.5%  |   |
|                            |                   |  |  |  |   | 5 years (telephone follow-up), <i>n</i> = 27 | Symptoms <sup>#</sup>                                  | No sig. difference in % with frequency, nocturia, urgency, urge UI, stress UI, voiding difficulty; satisfaction with surgery 29% vs 69%, <i>P</i> = 0.057  |   |
| Corcos 2005 <sup>560</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 133 randomised (15 refused to participate after randomisation, 2 vs 13; further 5 withdrew or lost to follow up) ITT analysis done | F aged > 30 years (mean 58) stress or mixed UI<br>Exclusions: contraindications to surgery or collagen injections, associated conditions, or POP, neurogenic bladder, interstitial cystitis, prior pelvic radiation, prior collagen tx | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen<br>Up to 3 injs at 1 month intervals<br><i>n</i> = 66 | Surgery (left to surgeon's choice and experience)*<br><i>n</i> = 67 (54 had surgery)* | 12 months                                    | Success (dry [ <i>&lt;</i> 2.5 g wt gain] in 24 h pad) | ITT analysis: 52% vs 55%<br>mean difference: – 3.71% (95% CI – 20.61, +13.2), <i>P</i> = NS<br>analysis per protocol with verbal update: 53% vs 72%<br>mean difference: – 19.1% (95% CI – 36.1, –2.0), <i>P</i> = 0.01 | Funding: Canadian Institute for Health Research, and Bard Canada.<br>6 centres.<br>collagen inj. at 3, 6, 9 o'clock positions until coaptation of the urethral mucosa obtained; injected under LA as outpatient procedure. Mean 2.9 injections per pt; mean vol. 9.7 ml.<br>*6 transvaginal |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                                 | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                              |                   |                                  |  |   |   |   | Satisfaction (% pts NOT satisfied)                                    | 32.8 vs 20.4%<br>mean difference<br>12.4% (95% CI –<br>5.1, +27.8), <i>P</i> = NS   | endoscopic bladder neck suspension; 19 retropubic bladder neck suspension; 29 fascial pubovaginal sling placement.  |
|                              |                   |                                  |  |   |   |   | QOL   | No sig. difference between grps in changes in SF36 or IIQ scores  | # straining for < 30 days post-op.  |
|                              |                   |                                  |  |   |   |   | Adverse effects   | % with ≥ 1 AE:<br>36% vs 63%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.003<br><br>Urogenital AE (%):<br>urinary retention (> 48 h post intervention): 2% vs 13%, <i>P</i> = 0.001<br><br>Transient voiding difficulty# 17% vs 36%, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br><br>Urinary infection 0% vs 6%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.002<br><br>Transient haematuria 12% vs 12% |   |
| Andersen 2002 <sup>558</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 52 randomised,<br>46 followed up | F mean age 57 years (zirconium grp), 50 years collagen grp. UD stress UI owing to ISD (ALPP ≤ 90 cmH <sub>2</sub> O). Baseline | Carbo coated zirconium beads (Durasphere), transurethral<br><i>n</i> = 25<br>no. inj. not | Bovine collagen (Contigen), transurethral<br><i>n</i> = 21<br>no. inj. not stated | Mean 2.6 vs 2.8 years (overall mean 2.7, range 1.5– | Mean change in Stamey grade<br>% with improvement of ≥ 1 Stamey grade | –1.28 (60%) vs –0.86 (39%), <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>80% vs 62%,<br><i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>No. of inj. sites depended on degree of closure during procedure (2, 4, 8, or 10 o'clock positions).<br>Volume given at initial inj. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|                              |                   |  | Stamey UI grade 2.12 vs 2.19<br>100% had prior tx for UI; mean ~2.2 interventions; 85% vs 92% PFMT<br>81% vs 91% behavioural training<br>23% vs 15% drug tx<br>31% vs 15% continence surgery<br>Exclusions: prior urethral bulking agent therapy, uncontrolled bladder instability, drug tx affecting the evaluation of UI, grade 0 UI (Stamey) | stated   |  | 3 years)  | % cured ('dry')  | 40 vs 14.3%,<br><i>P</i> = NS  | 4.5 ml vs 4.2 ml.<br>Adverse effects/ complications not reported.<br>[EL = 1–] No information on methods of randomisation, allocation concealment, or blinding. Researcher and pt, not clinical investigator and pt, blind to treatment allocation. Fewer pts followed up than randomised.   |
| Lightner 2001 <sup>559</sup> | DB RCT<br>EL = 1– | 355; 235 completed 12 months follow-up | F mean age 57 years (26–84). Stress UI owing to ISD, all patients had ALPP < 90 cmH <sub>2</sub> O (mean 51). Duration UI ~10 years; all failed prior conservative or surgical treatment  | Carbon-coated zirconium oxide beads (Durasphere; trans-urethral) ( <i>n</i> = 178; 115 analysed) | Bovine collagen (Contigen; trans-urethral) ( <i>n</i> = 177; 120 analysed) | 12 months (mean 14, range 9–30)<br>Mean 11 months (1–26) for adverse events | Change in Stamey continence grade<br><br>1 h pad test (ICS; mean change from baseline, g)<br><br>Adverse effects ( <i>n</i> = 355) | Improvement of ≥ 1 grade: 66.1 vs 65.8%, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>–60 vs –64%,<br><i>P</i> = NS<br><br>Urgency 24.7 vs 11.9%, <i>P</i> = 0.0001<br>Acute retention 16.9 vs 3.4%,<br><i>P</i> = 0.01 (90% vs 65% resolved by study end) | Funding: Carbon Medical Technologies.<br>10 centres.<br>Anaesthesia used at discretion of investigator.<br>Mean no. inj. 1.69 vs 1.55, <i>P</i> = NS. Volume at initial inj. 4.83 (0.5–9.1) vs 6.23 (2–12.5), <i>P</i> < 0.001;<br>Mean total vol. 7.55 ml (0.5–22) vs 9.58 ml (2–30), <i>P</i> < 0.001.<br>[EL = 1–] Only completers analysed. No explanation for missing patients.<br>Baseline characteristics reported to be comparable – limited data shown. |

| Study                                  | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chrouser 2004 <sup>562</sup>           | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | 86              | F mean age 67 years, treated with either injectable for stress UI<br>Mean no. inj. 1.6 both grps.<br>47% vs 56% had pre-op urgency; 63% vs 54% hysterectomy; 21% vs 23% had prior continence or prolapse procedures  | Carbo coated zirconium beads (Durasphere), transurethral<br>( <i>n</i> = 43)                         | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (trans-urethral)*<br>( <i>n</i> = 43)                    | Min 18 months; median 37 months (IQR 34, 40) vs 52 (45, 58)** | Continence status<br><br>Time to tx failure<br><br>Satisfaction (pt perception of tx success)                               | Initial success (1 week): 63% vs 63%<br><br>Tx effective in 35/33/21% at 12/24/36 months vs 33/19/9%<br><br>RR 0.78 (95% CI 0.50 to 1.20), <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>37% vs 35%  | Funding: none declared.<br>Materials injected under cystoscope guidance with intravenous sedation.<br>*age-matched cohort randomly selected.<br>**Owing to sig. differences in follow-up duration, survival analysis used to model time to failure.   |
| Schulz 2004 <sup>565</sup><br>UK study | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 40*             | F median age 59 years (35–79), genuine stress ( <i>n</i> = 36) or mixed UI (4); SUI for ≥ 1 year, conservative tx for ≥ 3 months<br>Exclusions: UTI, bladder capacity < 250 ml or PVR > 100 ml, neurogenic bladder, grade 3 cystocele uterine prolapse or rectocele, taking alpha-agonist or alpha-antagonist, previous urethral bulking agent | Hyaluronic acid /dextran copolymer (trans-urethral, under LA or GA)<br>Up to 3 inj., within 3 months | Hyaluronic acid /dextran copolymer (peri-urethral, under LA or GA)<br>Up to 3 inj., within 3 months | 1 year*   | Subjective cure (100% improvement and no leakage episodes), mean<br><br>% subjective improvement (pts quantification), mean | 9/20 (45%) vs 4/19 (21%) at 1 month<br>3/19 (16%) vs 4/18 (22%) at 3 months<br>3/18 (17%) vs 3/18 (17%) at 6 months<br>3/17 (18%) vs 1/17 (6%) at 12 months, <i>P</i> = NS all comparisons<br><br>68% vs 62% at 1 month<br>52% vs 52% at 3 months<br>39% vs 52% at 6 months<br>36% vs 37% at 12 months<br><i>P</i> = NS all comparisons | Funding: none declared.<br>Both inj. guided by cystoscope. Periurethral inj. at 3 and 9 o'clock positions; trans- at 3, 9, 12 o'clock positions.<br>'Type' of SUI: 16 vs 9 hypermobility, 4 vs 11 ISD, <i>P</i> = 0.05. Results also analysed according to hypermobility/ISD subgrps – no sig. differences in outcomes found.<br>15 vs 16 had LA. Mean vol. injected 3.5 vs 3.9 ml. 12 vs 10 had 2 inj., 2 vs 3 had 3 inj. (mean 1.7 inj./per person per grp).<br>*3 pts each grp lost to follow-up; 20 pts |

| Study                       | Study type and EL  | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                             | Intervention                         | Comparison                            | Length of follow-up                             | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
|                             |  |                 |   |                                      |                                       |   | Post-op urinary retention   | 1 vs 6 (5% vs 30%), $P < 0.05$<br>mean vol. injected in pts with retention: 3.4 vs 5.1 ml, $P = 0.02$  | terminated study early owing to recurrent or persistent UI, at a median follow-up 5 months (1–9).<br>Retention = if residual > 200 ml  |
| Faerber 1998 <sup>564</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2–<br>(Retrospective analysis of women according to method of inj.) | 45              | F mean age ~66 years (42–80) stress UI owing to ISD | Collagen (peri-urethral)<br>$n = 21$ | Collagen (trans-urethral)<br>$n = 24$ | Mean 8.8 months<br>peri,<br>6.3 months<br>trans | Continence*<br><br>Daily pad use (mean)<br><br>VLPP (unclear how measured), mean cmH <sub>2</sub> O<br><br>Adverse effects/ complications | 33% vs 46% dry<br>67% vs 50% improved<br>0% vs 4% no change<br>$P = NS$ for all comparisons<br><br>1 vs 0.8 $P = NS$<br>(baseline 3.5 vs 3.8)<br><br>95 vs 90, $P = NS$<br>(baseline 42 vs 45)<br><br>Transient haematuria 10% vs 8%<br>UTI 5% vs 4% | Funding: none declared.<br>Choice of delivery method determined by surgeon preference; both methods under cystoscope guidance, 3, 6, 9 o'clock for peri-urethral, and 3, 9 and occasionally 6 o'clock for trans-urethral.<br>*based on severity scale of 0–3; 0 dry, 1 leakage on moderate/severe exertion, 2 leakage on standing/walking, 3 total incontinence unrelated to physical activity.<br>Improved = reduced pad use or pt report of improvement in UI grade.<br>No. injections: mean 1.3 both grps. Vol. injected 10.1 ml (5–20) vs 4.7 ml (1.5 vs 12.5), $P < 0.01$ .<br>[EL = 2–] Only age and severity info given for both grps at baseline, unknown if different in other ways; duration of follow-up different. |

## Silicone bulking agent – case series

| Study                                   | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Henalla 2000 <sup>566</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40           | F > 18 years, UD stress UI, PVR < 100 ml. 70% had no prior continence surgery (no details for other 30%)<br><br>Exclusions: neurogenic or unstable bladder, moderate/severe prolapse, previous urethral bulking therapy, history of intra-urethral devices/haematuria | Silicone injection (Macroplastique; transurethral)<br><br>5 ml given per tx                            | 3 months              | Success at 3 months*<br><br>Success at 6 months (after retreatment at 3 months in <i>n</i> = 18)<br><br>Post-op adverse effects | 19 (48%) at 6 weeks<br>21 (53%) at 3 months<br><br>Overall 29/39 (74%)<br>with mean 1.35 implantations<br>In retreated grp: 12/17 (71%)<br><br>89% mild/moderate pain on implantation (from pain scores)<br>63% 'transient haematuria and dysuria'<br>18% urinary retention > 48 h, 2 with persistent reqd indwelling catheterisation                                       | Funding: none declared. Uroplasty assisted in developing study protocol.<br><br>*investigator rating of dry or markedly improved.<br><br>Primary aim of study was to evaluate new implantation device for the product.<br><br>2.5 ml given at six o'clock position, 1.25 ml at each of 10 and 2 o'clock. 5 ml retreatment offered at 3 months of required (retreatment in 14/19 'failures, and 4/13 of the markedly improved grp). |
| Usman 1998 <sup>567</sup><br>UK study   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 102          | F mean age 59 years (33–83) stress UI (UD diagnosis in 86%)<br><br>30% had prior continence surgery (anterior colporrhaphy or Stamey)   | Silicone injection (Macroplastique; transurethral), single injection under GA<br><br>5 ml given per tx | Mean 3.2 months (3–5) | Success (cure or marked improvement)<br><br>Success in subgroups<br><br>Post-op adverse effects                                 | 68%<br>and at mean followup 17.6 (11–44) months ( <i>n</i> = 84): 48%<br><br>Primary vs secondary procedure 66% vs 71%, <i>P</i> = NS (48% vs 46% at 17.6 months)<br>Cystocele ( <i>n</i> = 26), 69% success, 67% vs 75% for primary vs secondary procedure<br><br>100% haematuria and dysuria for 24–48 h<br>7% urinary retention for 2–7 days, 0 reqd indwelling catheter | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Injn guided by cystoscope, at 6, 3, and 9 o'clock positions.<br><br>Cure or marked improvement: no further tx reqd<br>slight or no improvement: further tx reqd.  |

| Study                                   | Study type and EL                                  | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|--|--------------|--|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Gurdal 2002 <sup>568</sup>              | Case series (retrospective chart review)<br>EL = 3 | 29           | F mean age 57 (48–79), stress UI owing to ISD (52%) or ISD and hypermobility (48%)<br>Stamey grade 1 (7%), 2 (28%), 3 (66%)<br>62% had prior continence surgery (10 bladder neck suspension, 5 anterior colporrhaphy, 2 retropubic urethropexy, 1 in situ vaginal wall sling placement)<br>Exclusions: genital prolapse, moderate/severe cystocele, DO, bladder capacity ≤ 250 ml, neurologic disorders, bladder outlet obstruction, urge UI, detrusor hypocontractility | Silicone injection (Macroplastique), per-urethral<br>Single injection | Mean 29 months (24–36) | Continence<br><br>Post-op complications (all transient) | At 3 months:<br>55% cure<br>24% improvement (> 50% vs baseline)<br>21% failure<br>At 24 months:<br>45% cure<br>17% improvement<br>41% failure<br><br>45% haematuria<br>79% dysuria<br>72% frequency<br>3% temporary retention | Funding: none declared<br>Injection guided by cystoscope.<br>Mean vol. injected 3.5 ml (3–5) at 4 and 8 o'clock positions (and 12 o'clock if necessary) to achieve satisfactory coaptation. No repeat injection given.   |
| Sheriff 1997 <sup>569</sup><br>UK study | Case series (consecutive pts)<br>EL = 3            | 34           | F mean age 53 years (26–77), stress UI on video-urodynamics, failed prior continence surgery. 94% had ISD. 21% also had vesical descent, 6% had neurogenic bladder   | Silicone injection (Macroplastique)<br>5 ml dose                      | 1–36 months            | Continence<br><br>Complications                         | 'success' (dry or rare leakage, not requiring protection): 90% at 1 month, 75% at 3 months, 48% at 2 years*<br><br>All transient (resolved within 36 h):<br>12% retention<br>53% dysuria<br>68% haematuria<br>76% frequency   | Funding: none declared.<br>One surgeon undertook all procedures.<br>Inj. given under LA or GA or spinal anaesthetic, at 3, 6, 8, (and 12 if necessary) o'clock positions.<br>*failed in all F with bladder descent/neurogenic UI.<br>18% had re-injection after at least 3 months. |
| Radley 2001 <sup>570</sup>              | Case series (Prospective)<br>EL = 3                | 60           | F mean age 53 years (26–81), stress UI owing to ISD (shown on video UD)<br>68% prior continence  | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, transurethral)                    | Mean 19 months (6–50)  | Subjective outcome (telephone q),<br>n = 56             | 20% cured<br>39% improved (no definition)<br>41% unchanged or worse   | Funding: none declared.<br>One surgeon.<br>Inj. under cystoscope guidance at 3   |

| Study  | Study type and EL                         | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|---|--------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
|  |   |              | surgery, 40% prolapse repair, 60% prior hysterectomy  | Up to 3 inj.  | Mean 16 months (6–52) | Objective outcome (video UD), $n = 41$   | Of 17 improved/cured after inj., 9 were cured on video UD  | or more sites (2, 6, 10 o'clock positions). 2 further tx offered if initial unsuccessful (43% had 2nd, 3% a 3rd).  |
|  |   |              |   |   | Post-op               | Complications  | 6% UTI<br>12% acute retention  | Mean vol. at each tx 6.73 ml (3.5–10).   |
| Tamanini 2003 <sup>571</sup> and 2004 <sup>572</sup> | Case series (consecutive cases)<br>EL = 3 | 21           | F mean age 47 years (33–54) with UD stress UI, Stamey grade 2, owing to ISD (VLPP < 90). 81% also had frequency, and 48% urgency<br><br>Mean duration UI 12 years (2–220). 19% had prior continence surgery<br><br>Exclusions: prior injection therapy, nocturnal enuresis, severe genital prolapse, neurogenic bladder | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, peri-urethral)  | 1 and 2 years         | Subjective cure (Stamey grade 0)<br><br>Objective cure<br><br>KHQ<br><br>Adverse effects | Pt vs surgeon opinion:<br>57% vs 38% at 1 year<br>48% both at 2 years<br><br>1 h pad test (at 1 year only):<br>62% cure<br>19% improved ( $\geq 50\%$ reduction)<br>19% failed<br><br>UD (VLPP), $n = 20$ :<br>40% cured at 1 year<br>50% cured at 2 years<br><br>Sig. improvements in all domains at 1 and 2 years<br><br>100% transient dysuria and pain at implant site<br>10% transient retention<br>3% ( $n = 1$ ) loss of material though injection site | Funding: Uroplasty provided the injection system.<br><br>All pts treated by single surgeon on a day case basis, under LA. Inj. at 3 sites via implanter device.<br><br>8 (38%) had 2nd inj. at 3 months.<br>Mean vol. injected 6.3 ml (SD 1.9 ml). |
| Barranger 2000 <sup>573</sup>                        | Case series<br>EL = 3                     | 21           | F median age 68 years (46–83) stress UI owing to ISD (MUCP < 30). 6 (29%) also had bladder neck mobility.<br><br>All had prior continence or prolapse surgery   | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, trans-urethral) | 1, 16 and 31 months   | Subjective cure/improvement<br><br>Stamey grading  | At 1 month:<br>2 (10%) dry<br>9 (42%) improved<br>10 (48%) failed<br><br>At 16 and 31 months:<br>2 (10%) dry<br>8 (38%) improved<br>11 (52%) failed*<br><br>Change of $\geq 1$ :<br>Fell in 43% at 16 months, 62% at 31 months<br>unchanged in 52%, 38%<br>increased in 5%, 0  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Inj. under LA, by cystoscope guidance at 3 points. Mean vol. injected not stated. 2 (10%) had 2nd injection at 3 and 5 months.<br><br>*including 2 who had repeat injection.  |



| Study                                   | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------|---|---|--|
|   |                       |              |  |   |                      | MUCP  | No sig. change from baseline at 1 month (-4%)   |  |
|   |                       |              |  |   |                      | Adverse effects   | None during or after surgery  |  |
| Koelbl 1998 <sup>574</sup>              | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32           | F mean age 64 years (39–85) stress UI owing to ISD (VLPP < 65).<br>88% had ≥ 1 prior continence surgery (colposuspension, anterior colporrhaphy, slings)<br>Exclusions: genital prolapse, neurologic disorders, PVR > 50 ml, UTI, DO | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, trans-urethral) | 6 and 12 months      | Cure (subjective and objective [clinical stress test])<br>MUCP at rest (at 12 months) | 75% at 6 months<br>59% at 12 months<br>+26% (from 25 cmH <sub>2</sub> O),<br>P = 0.027 vs baseline  | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj. under GA, by cystoscope guidance at 3 points. Mean 3.9 ml (1.5–15 ml) used to occlude urethra. 4 (13%) had 2nd injection at 3 months.  |
|   |                       |              |  |   |                      | Adverse effects   | 6% (n = 2) transient UTI<br>Mean time to PVR < 50 ml<br>3.4 days (1–7)<br>No pts had <i>de novo</i> DO  |  |
| Harriss 1996 <sup>575</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40           | F median age 50 years (27–74) UD stress UI. 38% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: DO   | Silicone injection (Macroplastique, peri-urethral)  | 3 months and 3 years | Subjective cure/improvement   | 3 months:<br>16 (40%) dry<br>13 (33%) improved<br>11 (27%) unchanged<br>At 3 years:<br>16 (40%) dry*<br>7 (18%) improved<br>17 (42%) unchanged (offered colposuspension)<br>*includes 4 pts who had 2nd injection at 3 months, thus 4 pts deteriorated from 3 month follow-up | Funding: Bioplasty provided materials free of charge.<br>Inj. as day case under GA.<br>Inj. by cystoscope guidance at 4 points. 2–7 ml per inj. (actual vol. injected not stated). 4 (10%) had 2nd injection at 3 months.<br>25 had UD at 3 months – limited data reported. 3 of 3-months 'improved' group had DO on UD, successfully treated with anticholinergics. |
|   |                       |              |  |   |                      | Adverse effects   | 'almost all had dysuria at 48 h'  |  |

## Glutaraldehyde linked collagen – case series

| Study                                   | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up                         | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Richardson 1995 <sup>576</sup>          | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 42              | F mean age 64 years (28–88) stress UI owing to ISD, Stamey grade 1 ( <i>n</i> = 1); grade 2 ( <i>n</i> = 20), grade 3 ( <i>n</i> = 21)   | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen, trans- or peri-urethral* | 46 months (10–66) after 1st inj.            | Change in Stamey grade (mean no. injs; mean vol. injected) | 40% dry (grade 0); (2.3; 15 ml)<br>12% 'greatly improved' (by ≥ 2 grades) (2.6; 25.7 ml)<br>31% improved by 1 grade (4.3; 42.8 ml)<br>7% unchanged (4.0; 40.2 ml)<br>10% worse (3.5; 28.1 ml)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test to collagen 1 month before 1st inj.<br>Inj. guided by cystoscope at 3 and 9 o'clock positions.<br>*median no injections 2 (1–8).<br>Adverse effects/complications not reported.  |
| Cross 1998 <sup>577</sup>               | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 139             | F median age 72 years, with stress or mixed (40%) UI owing to ISD (abdominal LPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O). Mean duration of UI 3.5 years, 73% grade 3 UI (Stamey); pad use 4.6/day.<br>63% prior incontinence procedure, 14% no previous pelvic surgery or trauma<br>Exclusions: grade 3 or 4 prolapse abdominal LPP > 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, urethral hypermobility on videourodynamics | Collagen (trans-urethral under LA)<br>3 injs                         | Mean 18 months after last inj. (range 6–36) | Improvement (% pts)<br><br>Adverse effects                 | 74% substantial improvement (≥ 70% reduction in daily pad usage, or grade 0 UI)<br>21% improved (50–70% reduction in pad usage, or min 1 grade improvement in UI)<br>5% failed<br><br>28% <i>de novo</i> DO (22% of substantially improved, 41% improved, 57% failed grps). 21% had continued urge UI<br>1 (0.7%) transient haematuria<br>2 (1.4%) UTI requiring tx<br>5 (3.6%) transient retention | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test to collagen 1 month before 1st inj. (2% had erythema at inj. site).<br>Collagen inj. at 4 and 8 o'clock positions. Injections given every 4–8 weeks. If tx failed after 3 injs, offered alternative tx; if initially improved, offered a 4th inj. (12% had 4th). |
| Khullar 1997 <sup>578</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 28              | F > 60 years (mean 76, range 62–90), UD stress UI. 43% had prior vaginal and suprapubic surgery<br>Exclusions: DO, positive  | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (para-urethral under GA)  | 1 and 2 years                               | Subjective cure (months 1, 6, 12, 24)                      | 1 inj.: 96, 64, 61, 36%<br>2 injs: 100, 54, 50, 43%<br>3 injs 83, 67, 67, 67%<br>Overall: 61% at 1 year, 43% at 2 years   | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test to collagen done 14 days prior to 1st inj.<br>Injn guided by cystoscope at 3 and 9 o'clock positions. Reinjection if   |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up       | Outcome measures                              | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|--|--|
|  |                       |                 | skin reaction to collagen, UTI  | Up to 3 inj.  |                           | Objective cure/improvement/failure* (overall) | Month 1: 76/5/19%<br>Month 6: 58/6/32%<br>Month 12: 52/14/34%<br>Month 24: 48/9/43%  | significant increase in pad test loss; 28 had 1 inj. (mean vol. 13.2, range 5–17.5 ml); 14 had 2 inj (mean vol. 11.7, range 9.4–17.5 ml), 6 had 3 inj (mean vol. 11.7, range 5–15).  |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                           | Adverse effects                               | <i>de novo</i> DO: 39% after 1st inj., no additional cases on 2nd/3rd inj.<br>21% urinary retention, 3 (11%) developed voiding difficulties (PVR > 150 ml)   | *cure < 1 g loss on short pad test, improvement ≥ 50% reduction.<br>MUCP on VCU (mean change from baseline, cmH <sub>2</sub> O at months 3, 12) also reported.   |
| Bent 2001 <sup>579</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 90              | F mean age 61 years (35–86) with stress UI (for ≥ 12 months) and urethral hypermobility, resistant to 3 months conservative therapy<br><br>Exclusions: prior tx with a periurethral bulking agent; predominant urge UI, bladder capacity < 250 ml, PVR > 50 ml, grade 3 or 4 uterine prolapse or cystocele, neurogenic bladder, fistula, skin test results positive to collagen | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (peri- or trans-urethral)<br><br>Up to 3 inj given in 6 months   | 12 months after last inj. | Subjective cure (Stamey grade 0)/improvement  | At 6 months:<br>33% dry<br>27% improved<br><br>At 12 months, of 58 completers*:<br>33% dry<br>33% improved<br><br>ITT at 12 months:<br>21% dry<br>21% improved<br>58% not improved or withdrawn from study | Funding: Bard Urological Division.<br>6 centres participated in study.<br>26% had 1 inj.; 51% had 2; 23% had 3 inj. Mean injected vol. 6.8 ml SD3, (range 1.5–15); mean vol. injected per pt 13.4 ml (SD 7.6 (range 2.5–37.5).<br><br>*32 withdrew before study completion (14 pt choice, 14 lack of improvement, 4 lost to follow-up). All pts enrolled analysed (withdrawals considered not improved). |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                           | Adverse effects                               | 11% urinary retention<br>12% UTI<br>1% ( <i>n</i> = 1) abscess at inj. site  | Cure/improvement also reported by Stamey incontinence grade.<br>QOL also assessed, but this does not appear to be using a validated questionnaire.   |
| Monga 1995 <sup>580</sup> and 1997 <sup>139</sup><br><br>UK study (data for older age group reported separately; Stanton 1997 <sup>581</sup><br><br>5 year follow- | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 61              | F mean age 65 years (21–91), with UD stress UI declined major surgery (failed prior [82%] or too frail). Symptoms for 0.5 to 60 years<br><br>Exclusions: acute cystitis, psychogenic incontinence, uncontrolled DO, history of anaphylaxis or contigen allergy  | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (peri-urethral under LA, day case procedure)<br><br>Up to 3 inj. | 2 and 5 years             | Subjective cure/improvement                   | At 1 year:<br>40% cure<br>37% improved<br><br>At 2 years:<br>48% cure<br>20% improved<br><br>At 5 years ( <i>n</i> = 53*):<br>26% improved   | Funding: Bard provided materials.<br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure<br><br>Injn guided by cystoscope at 3 and 9 o'clock positions, given until proximal urethra occluded. At 5 years, 54% had 1 inj., 25% ×2, 20% ×3. Mean injected vol. 11.5 ml (3.75–30) per session; median total vol. per pt 19 ml (4–65 ml). <sup>582</sup><br>Objective cure = no SUI on provocative        |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                           | Objective cure                                | 54% at 1 year<br>48% at 2 years  |  |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|------------------------|--|--|--|
| up:Gorton 1999 <sup>582</sup>  |                       |                 |   |   |                        | 1 h pad test (mean change)   | -72% at 2 years  | cystometry and/or a negative pad test. Subjective improvement; from daily to intermittent UI; cure = dry.  |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                        | Bladder diary  | No sig. change in frequency or nocturia at 1 or 2 years  | *known failures or had follow-up > 5 years. 8 had died, and 7 had further continence surgery.  |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                        | UD ( <i>n</i> = 54)  | Sig. incr. in MUCP (stress), and pressure transmission ratio   |  |
|  |                       |                 |   |   |                        | Complications  | 18% retention (< 24 h in 15%)<br>26% UTI (during year 1)<br>3% haematuria (no abnormality on investigation)<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) flu-like symptoms 24 hs after inj.   |  |
| Stanton 1997 <sup>581</sup><br>UK study<br>(Results for older population of Monga study <sup>580 139</sup> ) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32              | F > 65 years (mean 75, range 66–90), UD stress UI. 88% had prior continence surgery, mean 1.7 operations (0–4)<br>Exclusions as Monga 1995 <sup>580</sup> | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (peri-urethral under LA, day case procedure)<br>Up to 3 inj. | 2 years                | Subjective cure /improvement<br><br>Objective cure*<br><br>MUCP (mean change from baseline, cmH <sub>2</sub> O at months 3, 12)<br><br>Adverse effects | Cure or improved: 79% at 1 year, 69% at 2 years<br>Cured 43%, 39%<br>Improved 36%, 30%<br><br>50% at 1 year (cystometry and pad test)<br>54% at 2 years (pad test only)<br><br>At rest -2, -2<br>At stress +7 ( <i>P</i> < 0.05), +6<br><br><i>n</i> = 6 retention < 24 h, 1 reqd catheter for 8 days<br>2 transient haematuria<br>7 UTI | Funding: Bard provided materials. Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br>19 had 1 inj.; 9 had 2 inj.; 4 had 3 inj. Mean injected vol. 11.5 ml, mean collagen injected per pt 17.6 ml.<br>*no UI on MC cystometry, and/or negative 1 h pad test. |
| Corcos 1999 <sup>583</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40              | F mean age 62 years (38–82), UD stress UI, 50% had 'significant' bladder neck mobility  | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen (peri-urethral under LA [spinal in 2])                       | Mean 50 months (47–55) | Cure/ improvement<br><br>Re-injection ('top-up') rate  | 12 (30%) cured<br>16 (40%) improved<br>12 (30%) tx failed<br><br>4/12 in cured grp<br>5/16 in improved grp<br>0 in failed grp  | Funding: none declared. Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br>Injn guided by cystoscope at 3 and 9 o'clock positions. Endpoint of tx was cure or max. 4 injns in 6 month period.   |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures            | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
|   |                       |                 |  |  |                       | Adverse effects             | 0 post-op retention<br>3 (8%) UTI<br>4 (10%) <i>de novo</i> urgency   | Cure = complete symptomatic improvement with negative pad test and no leak on VLPP test; improvement = pt satisfaction with no desire for further injections or treatments; VLPP and pad test results no more than 50% of baseline.<br><br>Mean no. inj/pt and total vol. inj./pt: cured grp: 2.3 and 8.8 (1.5–15) improved: 1.9 and 10.1 (2.5–19) failed: 2.6 and 8.3 (4–19). |
| Herschorn 1997 <sup>585</sup> and 1996 <sup>584</sup> (same report published twice) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 187             | F mean age 63 (15–94), UD stress UI secondary to hypermobility. 3% had neurogenic UI, 17% bladder instability.<br><br>63% had prior continence surgery                   | Collagen (peri- or trans-urethral)<br>Up to 3 inj.   | Mean 22 months (4–69) | Subjective cure/improvement | 23% cured (dry)<br>52% improved (decrease in Stamey grade)<br>25% failed<br><br>Probability of staying dry (survival analysis: 71% at 1 year, 58% at 2 years, 46% at 3 years)   | Funding: Bard Canada, and Sunnybrook Health Science Centre.<br><br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br><br>Inj. under LA or GA as outpatients, under cystoscope guidance. Mean vol. in cured/improved pts 9.65 ml (2.5–50); mean no tx's 2.5 (1–10); 3.8 ml mean vol. per tx.  |
|   |                       |                 |  |  |                       | Adverse effects             | 1% transient retention<br>0.5% ( <i>n</i> = 1) UTI  |  |
| Winters 2000 <sup>586</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 58              | F mean age 73 (65–86), stress UI. 64% urethral hypermobility (rotation > 30° on Q-tip); 85% ISD (ALPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br><br>Exclusions: prior pelvic radiation | Collagen (peri-urethral, under LA)<br>mean 1.9 inj. (1–4)*                                 | Mean 24 months        | Continence                  | At 2 months:<br>48% cure#<br>31% social continence (minimal leakage, reqd ≤ 1 pad/day)<br>21% failure<br><br>At 2 years: 27 (47%) cure or social continence<br>#9/28 had recurrence at mean 8 months (2–16), 8 given further inj. | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br><br>Inj. at 4 and 8 o'clock positions.<br><br>*mean volume to achieve 'success' 14.6 ml (further inj. given after 1 month until continence achieved or further inj. deemed unlikely to provide success).  |
| Stricker 1993 <sup>587</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 50              | F, age not stated, UD stress UI, prior continence surgery (mean 1.8 prior operations)  | Collagen (per or trans-urethral [71 vs 29%], under LA or GA)<br>Up to 5 inj. or max. 30 ml | Mean 11 months (1–21) | Continence                  | 21 (42%) cure<br>20 (40%) improved (desired no further tx)<br>7 (14%) failed<br>2 awaiting top-up injections  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure<br><br>Mean 1.9 inj. (> 1 in 42%). Mean vol. injected 14.4 ml.  |
|   |                       |                 |  |  |                       | Complications               | 5 (10%) temporary retention<br>4 (8%) temporary urge UI   |  |

| Study                                 | Study type and EL     | No. of patients          | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Homma 1996 <sup>588</sup>             | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 97 (78 F with stress UI) | M/F with UI (78 F with stress UI or 5 F with ISD*); all 14 men had ISD). Mean age 57 in stress UI grp, 64 in ISD grp<br>Exclusions: active UTI, history of hypersensitivity to collagen material, obvious cystocele | Glutaraldehyde cross-linked (GAX) collagen ('most' trans-urethral under LA) | 2 years# after procedure (all results for 60 F with stress UI with follow-up data at 2 years) | Leakage episodes (proportion with, of <i>n</i> = 60)<br><br>Subjective improvement | 6.7% none<br>16.7% < once/week<br>26.7% < once/day<br>50% daily<br><br>vs baseline:<br>72% improved<br>15% unchanged<br>13% worse.<br>vs 1 year post-op:<br>37% improved<br>25% unchanged<br>37% worse<br>2% unknown | Funding: none declared.<br>*ISD included pts with incontinence owing to overt damage of external sphincter muscle, e.g. prostate surgery.<br>#by mail questionnaire.<br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure (positive in 2.1%).<br>Injn under cystoscope guidance, into 3 and 9 o'clock positions (and 6 if reqd). Max. vol. per inj. 30 ml, and reinjection performed if reqd.<br>No. inj. and vol. injected in SUI grp: 2.2 ± 1.3; 40.1 ± 34.7 ml. |
| Elsergany 1998 <sup>589</sup>         | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 33                       | F mean age 64 years (19–97), stress UI. 36% failed prior surgery. 33% had DO  | Collagen (trans-urethral)   | Mean 18.8 months (2–33)   | Subjective cure/improvement  | 49% cure (dry)<br>33% improved (change in Stamey grade)<br>18% unchanged   | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br>Inj. guided by cystoscope at 5 and 7 o'clock positions. Mean total vol. per pt 4.12 ml for cured/improved cases (others not stated). Repeat inj. given if necessary after 1–3 months. Of cured/improved grp ( <i>n</i> = 27), 44% had 1, 33%×2, 23%×3 inj.  |
|                                       |                       |                          |   |   |   | Bladder diary  | Frequency –39%, <i>P</i> = 0.005<br>Nocturia –64%, <i>P</i> = 0.001  |  |
|                                       |                       |                          |   |   |   | Adverse effects  | 6% temporary retention (catheterised for < 1 month)  |  |
| Tschopp 1999 <sup>590</sup>           | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 99                       | F mean age 60 years (26–84), stress UI  | Collagen (peri- or para-urethral under LA)                                  | Mean 5 months (0–24)  | Time to 50% considered failures*   | 4.7 months (95% CI 2.4 to 5.9)<br>*failure: any 1 of: pt not satisfied; pt satisfied but surgeon considered UI to be unchanged or worse; or pt rating of success lower than at baseline                              | Funding: St Joseph's hospital and Home.<br>Retrospective review.<br>Skin test to collagen done 1 month prior to procedure.<br>Inj. at 3 and 9 o'clock positions. Mean 2.64 ml/session.   |
| Swami 1997 <sup>591</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 111 (107 available for)  | F age 33–90, UD stress UI, unwilling or unfit for surgical intervention. 70% failed prior   | Collagen (para-urethral)<br>Up to 3 inj.                                    | Mean 3.2 years (2–5.8)  | Subjective cure/improvement  | 25% cured (dry)<br>40% improved (reduced pad usage)<br>35% unchanged*  | Funding: Bard UK.<br>Skin test 1 month prior to procedure (positive in 3/115).   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention              | Length of follow-up                    | Outcome measures                               | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|                              |                       | analysis)       | surgery<br>Exclusions: uncontrolled DO  |                           |  | 1 h pad test (mean change from baseline)<br>UD | Sig. reduction of 81% in successful grp. No sig. change in failed grp (+48%)<br>No sig. change in MUCP or PTR; sig. reduction in max. flow rate  | Inj. under LA (90%) at 3 and 9 o'clock positions. Mean vol./session 7.5 ml (2.5–12.5); mean 1.7 sessions/pt.<br>*45% of whom underwent surgery.  |
|                              |                       |                 |   |                           |  | Adverse effects                                | 10% transient retention (none needing long-term catheterisation)<br>2% UTI   |  |
| Stothers 1998 <sup>592</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 337             | F, age not stated, UD stress UI   | Collagen<br>Up to 6 injs  | Mean<br>32 months (12–65)              | Complications                                  | 5% transient (< 48 h) gross haematuria<br>2% retention, requiring catheterisation (resolved in 48 h)<br>13% <i>de novo</i> urgency with urge UI, lasting 4 weeks or more (21% of whom did not respond to anticholinergics) | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test to collagen 2 weeks prior to procedure.<br>Inj. given under LA as outpatient/day case.  |
| Smith 1997 <sup>593</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 96              | F mean age 67, stress UI owing to ISD (abdominal LPP < 65). 70% failed prior continence surgery.  | Collagen (peri-urethral)  | Median<br>14 months (range not stated) | Subjective cure/improvement                    | 38% cured (dry; mean duration of success 11.9 months)<br>29% socially continent (minimal leakage, max. 1 pad/day)<br>33% unchanged   | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test 1 month prior to injection.<br>Inj. under cystoscope guidance in 4 and 8 o'clock positions, under LA (GA in 2).<br>Repeat until dry or pt satisfied; 34% had 1 inj., 23%×2, 21%×3, 21%×4. Mean no. 2.1 in successful grp, 3.2 in unchanged; mean vol. 11.9 and 16.1 ml, respectively. |
|                              |                       |                 |   |                           |  | Complications                                  | 4% transient retention (< 48 h)<br>1% simple cystitis<br>1% self-limiting gross haematuria   |  |
| Ang 1997 <sup>594</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 105             | F mean age 46 (26–76) years; clinical stress UI. Urodynamics done in 33% to exclude DO.<br>9% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: type 2 UI | Collagen (trans-urethral) | Mean<br>20 months (3–56)               | Subjective cure/significant improvement        | At 3 months:<br>61% cure<br>29.5% sig. improvement<br>At 12 months:<br>46.7% cure<br>35.2% sig. improvement  | Funding: none declared.<br>Skin test 1 month prior to injection.<br>Inj. under cystoscope guidance in 3, 6, 9, 12 o'clock positions. 7.6% had second injection. Mean vol. 7.4 (2–15 ml).   |
|                              |                       |                 |   |                           |  | Relapse  | 22%  | Significant improvement = occasional leakage but able to lead normal lifestyle.  |
|                              |                       |                 |   |                           |  | Time to relapse                                | Mean 13.3 months (3–40)  |  |
|                              |                       |                 |   |                           |  | Complications                                  | 5.7% transient retention<br>2% UTI   |  |

## Hyaluronic acid/dextranomer copolymer – case series

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Stenberg 1999 <sup>595</sup> and 2003 <sup>596</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 20              | F genuine stress UI; mean age 67, median 74.5 years, range 38–90. Mean duration of UI 9.4 years. 2 (10%) had prior continence surgery<br><br>Exclusions: neurological UI, prior pelvic radiation, urinary retention  | Hyaluronic acid/dextranomer copolymer (transurethral) | 3–7 months (17 min of 6 months, 3 min 3 months) <sup>595</sup>   | Subjective cure/improvement (cure: dry, and leakage not > tenth of baseline VAS)   | 8 (40%) cure<br>40% improved<br>20% unchanged   | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Inj. under cystoscope guidance at 9 and 4 o'clock positions (and 5/6 o'clock if needed to occlude urethra).<br><br>Mean vol. per inj. 5.2 ml (1.5–12 ml). Mean 1.6 inj. per pt (9 had 1, 10×2, 1×3). Repeat inj. after min 3 months.<br><br>Objective cure < 8 g/24 h on 48 h pad test, or < 1 g on 1 h test; improvement = 50% reduction in 48 h pad test and/or short pad test.<br><br>No adverse effects reported.<br><br>*4 had died for reasons unrelated to this condition/intervention. |
|  |                       |                 |  |   | 5–6 years (mean 78 months, range 73–85) <sup>596</sup> (n = 16)* | Objective cure/improvement   | 45% cure<br>40% improved<br>15% unchanged   |   |
| Van Kerrebroeck 2004 <sup>597,598</sup>              | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 42              | F mean age 52 years, stress UI shown on coughing/Valsalva, failed conservative treatment, and no prior invasive tx<br><br>Pathophysiology of SUI not determined<br><br>Exclusions: mean voided vol. < 200 ml, PVR > 100 ml, urge UI, DO, medication for SUI, recurrent UTI | Hyaluronic acid/dextranomer copolymer (transurethral) | 12 months  | Change in cough-induced LPP  | At 3 months (n = 31):<br>42% no leakage<br>32% improved (increased LPP)<br>26% worsened (decreased LPP)   | Funding: Q-med AB<br><br>Inj. administered using 'Implacer', which injects product into 2, 4, 8, and 10 o'clock positions; under GA or LA. 32 received 4×1.0 ml inj, and 10 4×0.7 ml inj.<br><br>18 pts (43%) had 1 repeat inj. owing to insufficient response; mean interval between inj, 49 days (24–65).<br><br>no numerical data for leakage episodes (graph only) – reported to be sig. reduced from baseline<br><br>*no, some very minor, some minor, minor, some severe, some very severe, many severe problems.       |
|  |                       |                 |  |   |  | Leakage (on provocation pad test [20 jumping jacks or vigorous coughs with 300 ml saline in bladder]; change in pad weight at 3 and 12 months vs baseline) | At 12 months (n = 22)<br>64%, 18%, 18%  |   |
|  |                       |                 |  |   |  | Subjective improvement   | No leak: 14% at 3 months, 24% at 12 months<br>Leakage decreased to ≤ 5 g: 31%, 17%<br>Leakage decreased to > 5 g: 31%, 36%<br>No change: 24%, 24%<br>Overall sig. change in leakage vs baseline, P < 0.0001 |   |



| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
|                             |                       |                 |   |  |                     | KHQ <sup>597</sup>   | Sig. improvement in 7 of 10 domains: incontinence impact, role/physical/social limitations, emotions, severity measures, urinary symptoms. (Not in personal relationships, sleep/energy, general health perceptions) |  |
|                             |                       |                 |   |  |                     | MUCP, max. cystometric capacity  | No sig. change in either parameter   |  |
|                             |                       |                 |   |  |                     | Adverse effects  | Transient:<br>12% UTI<br>10% haematuria<br>7% urethral disorder<br>7% decreased urinary flow<br>7% temporary catheterisation for PVR > 100 ml (pts with tx-related adverse effects)                                  |  |
| Chapple 2005 <sup>599</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 142             | F mean age 56 years (27–86) with stress UI (hypermobility and/or ISD) who had failed prior conservative tx. 21% taking oestrogen at baseline<br>No prior surgery<br>Exclusions: poor bladder function, DO or neurological conditions, grade III POP, fistulae, UTI, interstitial cystitis | Hyaluronic acid/dextranomer copolymer<br>Up to 2 treatments permitted (2nd at week 8); 43% pts | 1 year              | Positive test on provocation test* (≥ 50% reduction from baseline)<br>24 h pad weight (change in median)<br>Leakage episodes (change in median)<br>Frequency (change in median)<br>QOL (KHQ) | 77%<br>–89%, $P < 0.0001$<br>–67%, $P < 0.001$<br>–0.4 (6%)<br>Sig. improvement in 6 of 9 domains  | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj.: 4×0.7 ml injections via implanter device. 89% received antibiotic prophylaxis after procedure.<br>*bladder filled to 300 ml prior to exercise routine<br>24% withdrew, mainly (59%) because of lack of efficacy.<br>**of which 70% considered serious (catheterisation required hospitalisation). |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                       | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |                     | Adverse effects ('majority transient') | 20% retention**<br>12% UTI<br>12% urgency<br>8% dysuria<br>7% vaginal discomfort<br>6% cystitis<br>4% injection-site pseudocyst (resolved median 25 weeks)<br>4% injections-site pain<br>2% injection-site infection<br>4% fever<br>4% frequency |                     |

## Carbon-coated zirconium beads – case series

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients           | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Pannek 2001 <sup>600</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 20 (13 F)                 | M/F mean age 63 years. F had ISD (abdominal LPP < 80), and all had prior continence surgery                                  | Carbon-coated zirconium beads (transurethral) | Mean 10 months       | Subjective improvement ( <i>n</i> = 13 F)  | At 6 months: 77% 'significant (dry or reduction in UI leading to use of only 1 pad within 24 h) or slight'<br>23% unchanged<br>At 12 months:<br>33% significant improvement, 0 slight, 67% unchanged (vs baseline) | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj. under regional anaesthesia, at 3,6,9, o'clock positions (and 12 if reqd).<br>Mean vol. 6 ml (2–7) per tx. 2 women had repeat inj. with no improvement.<br>*seen on 2 of 6 pts who were X-rayed when referred back to unit for further tx; in the male, beads had migrated to submucosal lining of urethra and to regional lymph nodes; in F migration to regional and distant lymph nodes. |
| Madjar 2003 <sup>601</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 70 (46 [66%] followed-up) | F mean age 69 (46–83) with ISD (VLPP < 90)<br>33% had failed prior continence surgery, 63% also had urge UI, 11% also had DO | Carbon-coated zirconium beads (transurethral) | Mean 9 months (3–18) | Subjective cure/improvement<br>24 h pad test ( <i>n</i> = 36 [78%])<br>Adverse effects | 13% cured<br>52% improved<br>35% failed<br>50% urine loss ≤ 8 g<br>6% 9–20 g<br>44% > 20 g<br>(no baseline data)<br>No cases of urinary retention  | Funding: none declared.<br>Series = single centre initial experience with the product.<br>Inj. under cystoscope guidance under LA as outpatient. Vol. injected not stated.   |

## Polytetrafluoroethylene – case series

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Schulman 1983 <sup>602</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 56              | F mean age 59 years (30–86), stress UI. 14% had prior continence surgery  | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, transurethral)                 | Mean 12 months (3–25) | Cure/improvement   | 39 (70%) cured: 29 after 1 inj., 8 after 2, 2 after 3<br>9 (16%) improved (no definition); 5 after 1 inj., 3 after 2, 1 after 3<br>8 (14%) failed; 2 after 1, 4 after 2, 1 after 3, 1 after 4                                  | Funding: none declared.<br>Mean 1.5 injections per pt.<br>Mean vol. injected (unclear whether vol. per person or per injection) 9.6 ml.<br>Non-specific details of complications.  |
| Kiilholma 1991 <sup>607</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 22              | F mean age 58 years (48–79), UD stress UI<br>73% had prior continence surgery (anterior colporrhaphy in 11/16)  | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon; under LA or GA; transurethral) | Up to 5 years         | N cured or 'sufficiently continent' (not defined)<br><br>Complications   | 7 (32%) at 1 year<br>6 at 3 years<br>4 at 5 years<br><br>7 (32%) burning around urethra after inj.<br>3 (14%) paraurethral infection (became abscess in 1, 1 developed urethral diverticulum)<br>1 (5%) foreign body granuloma | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj. given via dedicated endoscopic injector, submucosally at 4 sites (3, 6, 9, 12 o'clock). Mean vol. (unclear whether vol. per person or per inj.) 7.3 ml (4–9).<br>Inj. repeated in 7 pts in 'few months' owing to inadequate response.  |
| Herschorn 2000 <sup>135</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 46              | F mean age 69 years (26–88), stress UI<br>59% had prior continence surgery; 46% also had prior urethral injections (at least 2 years prior to study)<br>2 (4%) had MS, 1 extrophy | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, peri-urethral)                 | Various*              | Subjective cure or improvement (*mean follow-up 18 months cured grp, 16 improved, 9 failed)<br><br>Complications (*mean follow up 28 months [11–38]) | 30% cure<br>41% improved<br>28% failure<br><br>11% acute retention<br>4% UTI<br>2% voiding difficulty  | Funding: Mentor provided material. First author had financial relationship with Mentor.<br>6 ml inj. under LA as outpatients, at 3 and 9 o'clock positions guided by cystoscope. Reinjection after 2–3 months when necessary.<br>Cure = dry; improvement = reduced number of pads and subjective improvement.<br>No sig. difference between cure/improved/failed groups in pre-op LPPs |
| Beckingham 1992 <sup>603</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 26              | F mean age 63 (27–77), UD stress UI. 42% had prior pelvic surgery   | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, peri-urethral)                 | Mean 3.5 years (3–5)  | Subjective cure/improvement  | 7% dry<br>20% improved<br>73% failed (of whom 68% underwent other surgery)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Mean 9 ml injected at 12, 3, 6, 9, o'clock positions. 19% had 2nd inj.; 4%×3  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                    | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---|----------------------|--|---|--|
|                              |                       |                 |   |   |                      | Complications  | 31% acute retention (24–48 h); 4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) for > 1 week<br>38% urethral discomfort or dysuria (15% for > 1 week)<br>12% passage of Teflon plug via urethra | guided by cystoscope.  |
| Deane 1985 <sup>604</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 46 (28 F)       | M/F, all F had stress UI, all M post-prostatectomy sphincter damage<br>39% F had prior colposuspension or anterior repair | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, peri-urethral) | 3 months to 2 years  | Subjective cure/improvement (F only)<br>Complications                        | 39% cure<br>29% improved<br>32% failed<br>'pyrexia and transient voiding difficulties common' (no definition)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj. guided by cystoscope into 3, 6, 9, o'clock positions; mean 10 ml per pt, repeated in 60% pts.  |
| Harrison 1993 <sup>606</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 36*             | F mean age 55 years (34–79), stress UI (UD done in 83%)<br>58% had prior continence surgery                               | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, peri-urethral) | 5.1 years (2–7)      | Subjective cure/improvement  | 33% cure or much improved<br>17% slight improvement<br>33% unchanged<br>17% had further surgery   | Funding: none declared.<br>7 ml injected in 3, 6, 9 o'clock positions.<br>22% had 2 injections, 11%×3; 3 of the 12 were cured/improved, other failed.<br>No information on adverse effects.<br>*73% of a series of 49 who were followed-up by questionnaire. |
| Vesey 1988 <sup>605</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 36              | F mean age 55 years (32–80), UD stress UI<br>50% prior failed continence surgery (mainly anterior colporrhaphy)           | Polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon, peri-urethral) | Mean 9 months (3–36) | Subjective cure/improvement<br>Urodynamics ( <i>n</i> = 18)<br>Complications | 56% cure<br>11% improved<br>33% failed<br>No sig. change in MUCP or urine flow rate<br>1 (3%) UTI<br>3% acute retention   | Funding: none declared.<br>Inj. under GA; 7–14 ml past into 3, 6, 9 o'clock positions guided by cystoscope.<br>Repeat inj. in 8 (22%), 6 of whom were cured or improved.   |

*Hydroxylapatite – case series*

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Mayer 2001 <sup>608</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 10              | F mean age 68 years (60–82), stress UI with ISD, who had failed conservative treatment | Calcium hydroxylapatite (transurethral) | Mean 12 months (3–25) | Subjective (pad usage) at 1 year | 3 no pads<br>4 many fewer pads<br>2 fewer pads<br>1 no change | Funding: Convatec/Bristol-Meyers Squibb.<br>Inj. given via ratchet gun, mean vol. injected 3.9 ml (1.9–5.5). |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics          | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                           | Effect size   | Additional comments                                    |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | 60% had prior continence surgery |              |                     | Telephone review at mean 37 months (22–43) | 6 satisfied (2 dry; 4 used pads variably)                       | 2nd injection given to 7 after mean 8.4 months (6–12). |
|       |                   |                 |                                  |              |                     | Complications                              | 3 transient UTI<br>5 transient retention<br>0 <i>de novo</i> DO |  |

*Autologous fat – controlled trials*

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                            | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures            | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Lee 2001 <sup>561</sup>  | DB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 68              | F mean age ~57 years, stress UI; 27% had urethral hypermobility<br><br>Exclusions: other diagnoses of incontinence e.g DO | Autologous fat (peri-urethral), up to 3 inj<br><br><i>n</i> = 35 | Placebo (saline)<br><br><i>n</i> = 33 | 3 months after last inj. | Cure or improvement*        | 22.2 vs 20.7%  | Funding: Physicians Sources Inc.<br>Pts and research nurse blinded to tx allocation.<br><br>*cure = no leak on 1 h pad test, none seen on coughing, and incontinence questionnaire score of 0;<br>Improvement = reduction in continence questionnaire score by ≥ 5 points.   |
|                          |                   |                 |   |  |                                       |                          | Other outcomes              | No sig. change from baseline in either grp in UI score, pad weight, MUCP, LPP  |  |
|                          |                   |                 |   |  |                                       |                          | Complications               | Of 189 procedures:<br>3% acute retention<br>5% UTI<br><br>Of total no pts<br>13% short-term urgency<br>1 death from fat embolism | Inj. as outpatients; 30 ml fat harvested from anterior abdominal wall or buttock. Inj. guided by cystoscope under LA (some GA), into 3 and 9 o'clock positions using ratchet-type injection gun. Reinjection offered at months 1,2,3 if wet; 100% in saline grp had 3 inj.; in fat grp, 7%×1, 10%×2, 82%×3.<br><br>All except 6 inj. done by single surgeon. |
| Haab 1997 <sup>563</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | 67              | F mean age 64 (SD 9) years, stress UI owing to LSD. Mean no of prior failed procedures                                    | Autologous fat (peri-urethral), up to 3 inj<br><br><i>n</i> = 45 | GAX-linked collagen (peri-urethral)   | mean 7 months            | Subjective cure/improvement | Cure 14% vs 24%<br>Improved 30% vs 62%<br>Failure 57% vs 14%<br><i>P</i> < 0.001   | Funding: none declared.<br>Fat harvested from lower abdomen using liposuction, under LA. Peri-urethral inj. under cystoscope   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                                    | Intervention | Comparison    | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--------------|---------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|       |                   |                 | 1 vs 1.43<br>Exclusions: uninhibited detrusor contractions |              | <i>n</i> = 22 |                     | Pt-rated subjective improvement (VAS 0 to 100%, none to total)<br>Complications | 22% vs 64%<br>60% overall (12% UTI, 10% transient irritative voiding symptoms)<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) in fat grp subcutaneous abdominal wall haematoma<br>4% vs 9% reqd ISC for 2 weeks postop | guidance at 3 and 9 o'clock positions ; mean 1.67 (SD 0.5) inj., mean 12 (SD3) ml.<br>Skin test to collagen 1 month before procedure. Collagen inj. under cystoscope guidance at 3 and 9 o'clock positions, mean 1.9 inj., mean vol. 7.1 (SD 3) ml. |

*Artificial urinary sphincters*

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up                    | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Costa 2001 <sup>609</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 206 (13% neurogenic bladders)<br>Results reported for 168 with idiopathic UI | F genuine stress UI owing to ISD, with a negative Marshall test<br>Mean age idiopathic grp 59 years (24–80); 18% had prior prolapse surgery, 51% prior failed continence surgery (no further details) | Silicone artificial urinary sphincter (AMS 800)<br>Device activation after 6 weeks | Mean 3.9 (SD 2.4) years, range 0.3–9.3 | Subjective continence status ( <i>n</i> = 168 idiopathic UI)<br>Peri-operative complications ( <i>n</i> = 168)<br>Post-operative adverse effects ( <i>n</i> = 168) | 89% cure<br>8% social continence (few drops but no pad use)<br>4% leakage with pad use<br>28% injury (13% vaginal, 11% posterior neck, 3% anterior neck, 0.5% urethral)<br>8.3% device removal, 12/14 owing to erosion at median 1 month (14.3 ± 14.6, range 1–54)<br>7% incisional hernia<br>5.4% urgency ± leakage<br>4% haematoma of labia majora and scar<br>3.6% mechanical complications (1 tube leakage, 3 cuff leakages, 1 balloon leakage, 1 pump malfunction)<br>1.2% urinary retention<br>1% phlebitis | Funding: none declared but ≥ 1 author had financial relationship with American Medical Systems Inc.<br>If present, prolapse was corrected during the procedure<br>AMS 800 implanted through a transverse abdominal approach. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Diokno 1987 <sup>610</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32                                 | F mean age 55 years (32–82), idiopathic stress UI, failed suspension procedures (mean no. 2.2)<br>44% also had urgency and urge UI (16% DO)<br>28% abnormal bladder emptying symptoms   | AS800 in 66%<br>AS 791/792 in 22%<br>AS 742/761 in 13% | 9% 6–11 months,<br>31% 1–2 years,<br>9% 2–3 years,<br>25% 3–4 years,<br>6% 4–5 years,<br>19% ≥ 5 years | Continence<br><br>Complications                                   | 91% cure (no pads) <sup>#</sup><br>6% using 1/3 pads<br>3% incontinent (device removed)*<br><br>19% mechanical (2 loose cuffs, 2 cuff leaks, 2 tubing kinks, 1 connector leak)<br>6% transient retention<br>3% superficial wound dehiscence<br>3% pelvic abscess (device removed)*                                   | Funding: none declared.<br>#device kept deactivated in 3 as continent after procedure.  |
| Webster 1992 <sup>611</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 25 (24 followed-up, 1 died of CVA) | F mean age 61 (19–79) with type III stress UI.<br>84% had prior continence surgery, 24% also had DO   | Artificial urinary sphincter (AS792 in 2, AS800 in 23) | Mean 2.6 years (up to 8.9 years)   | Subjective cure<br><br>Satisfaction (n = 15)<br><br>Complications | 92% cure<br>8% minor activity-related leakage<br><br>12 excellent<br>3 above-average<br><br>4 (17%) reqd revisions for device malfunction (of cuff or pump)  | Funding: none declared.<br>AUS implanted abdominally with sphincter cuff placed at the bladder neck.<br>1 pt also underwent ileocaecocystoplasty for DO |
| Appell 1988 <sup>612</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 34                                 | F aged 24–65 years, type III UD stress UI<br>All had ≥ 2 prior continence procedures  | Artificial urinary sphincter (AS800)                   | n = 19 (56%) have follow-up of ≥ 3 years   | Continence<br><br>Complications                                   | Cure – 91% 'initially', 100% long-term<br><br>3 (9%) required revision (2 cuff replacement, 1 connector leak)<br>4 (12%) ISC   | Funding: none declared.<br>Cuff implanted transvaginally. Device not activated until at least 6 weeks post-op.  |
| Light 1985 <sup>613</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 39                                 | F mean age 63 years (39–78), with severe persistent UI following corrective surgery for UI (mean 2.2 procedures/pt)<br>61% totally incontinent in the erect position, with 46% incontinent in the supine position; the remaining 39% used multiple pads/day<br>Exclusions: neuropathic bladder dysfunction, post-traumatic incontinence | Artificial urinary sphincter (no description or name)  | Mean 38 months (3–72)  | Continence status<br><br>Complications                            | 87% dry or using ≤ 1 pad/day<br>5% reqd 2–3 pads/day<br><br>36% reqd mean of 1.5 additional procedures each; indications were mechanical failure (9), non-mechanical (11), and infection (1)<br>10% device removal (1/4 for infection, 3/4 for primary erosion of cuff); reimplantation done in 2/4; successful in 1 | Funding: none declared.   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients      | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up                     | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|--------------|---|--|--|---|
| Petero 2006 <sup>614</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 108 (55 [51%] women) | M/F mean age 59 years (SD 15) who had AUS for stress UI. Some had neurogenic disease (proportion not stated)<br><br>Of the 55 women, 89% had prior continence surgery, and 5% failed AUS | AUS AMS 800  | Mean 8.1 years (SD 5.6)<br>9.3 in women | Duration and aetiology of AUS failure (in women)<br><br>Continen- ce measures (in women) | 56% same device in situ<br>9% device removed with replacement<br>35% had revisions<br>in 16% women device in deactivated state owing to achieving continence<br>overall 40% failure rate (22% mechanical, 14% nonmechanical, 4% iatrogenic)<br>Median duration of implanted device: 11.2 (SD 1) year<br><br>84% satisfactory continence<br>64% dry | Funding: none declared; author financial interest with some pharmaceutical companies.<br><br>Review of cases undertaken between August 1983 and January 2004. |



## Procedures for stress urinary incontinence – operations to suspend the vaginal wall

## Open vs laparoscopic colposuspension

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|---------------------|--|--|---|
| Ankardal 2005 <sup>624</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 211             | F mean age ~35–39 years, stress or mixed UI (predominant stress)<br>Exclusions: recurrent incontinence | Burch colposuspension<br>( <i>n</i> = 79 randomised, 63 [80%] analysed)* | Laparoscopic colposuspension with sutures<br>( <i>n</i> = 53 randomised, 49 [92%] analysed)*<br>Lap colposuspension with mesh and staples<br>( <i>n</i> = 79 randomised, 72 [91%] analysed)* | 1 year              | Objective cure<br><br>Subjective cure<br><br>Bother (0–100 mm VAS, lowest- highest satisfaction)<br><br>'QOL' on 100 mm VAS<br><br>Satisfaction (100 mm VAS)<br><br>Hospital parameters (mean) | < 8 g/24 h on 48 h pad test: 92 vs 91% vs 76%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>< 5 g on stress test: 92 vs 90% vs 63%, <i>P</i> < 0.05 open vs mesh<br><br>94 vs 88% vs 63%, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>56 vs 55% vs 26% no leak, no bother <i>P</i> < 0.05 Burch/suture vs mesh<br>41 vs 40% vs 60% improvement in score, <i>P</i> < 0.05 Burch/suture vs mesh<br>3 vs 4% vs 13% no improvement/worse, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>No sig. difference in improvements in physical activity, working ability, social life, sexual life<br><br>90 vs 90 vs 72 mm<br>87 vs 90% vs 79% would recommend to friend<br><br>Anaesthesia time 112 vs 132 vs 122 min, <i>P</i> < 0.05 lap suture vs Burch surgery time 66 vs 84 vs 74 min, <i>P</i> < 0.05 lap suture vs Burch duration bladder drainage 5.9 vs 6.2 vs 1.9 days, <i>P</i> < 0.05 Burch/lap suture vs mesh<br>duration hospital stay 3.9 vs 3.3 vs 2.1 nights, <i>P</i> < 0.05 mesh vs Burch/lap colpo | Funding: Swedish Medical Research Council and Goteborg Medical Society Fund.<br><br>*owing to changing mind about surgery or not meeting incl/excl criteria (11% overall; 50% of which from Burch grp), or loss to follow-up (3; lap mesh grp).<br><br>[EL = 1–] Only completers analysed, no attempt made to discuss implications of withdrawals. Unclear method of randomisation; especially as all pts randomised to Burch or lap colpo with mesh and staples were also included in Ankardal 2004 <sup>948</sup> which is not considered here owing to 'double-counting' of pts.<br><br>abstract publication of this study included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br><br>4% underwent concomitant surgery (posterior colporrhaphy, sterilisation, adnexal surgery).<br><br>**2 bladder perforations, 3 technical problems, 1 anaesthetic complications. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                 | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |   |                     | Complications                    | <i>n/a</i> vs 8% vs 3% conversion to open colposuspension**<br>5 vs 8% vs 1% bladder perforation<br>2 vs 2% vs 0% haematoma requiring op<br>23 vs 26% vs 0% UTI (within 1 month)<br>3 vs 2% vs 1% wound infection<br>27 vs 39% vs 8% urinary retention > 5 days, $P < 0.05$ Burch/lap suture vs mesh |   |
| Fatthy 2001 <sup>625</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 74              | F mean age ~40–43 (range 30–65) years, UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: DO, underactive detrusor, ISD (VLPP < 90), limited vaginal mobility, stage 3 or 4 vaginal prolapse, contraindications to laparoscopy and surgery in general | Open Burch colposuspension ( $n = 40$ ) | Laparoscopic colposuspension with sutures, ( $n = 34$ ) | 18 months           | Cure (subjective and objective*) | 90 vs 90.9% at 6 months, $P = NS$<br>85 vs 87.9% at 18 months, $P = NS$ (negative stress test 77.5 vs 84.8%, $P < 0.001$ )   | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br>UD follow-up done by surgeon blinded to procedure performed.  |
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |   |                     | Hospital parameters              | Mean operating time 53 (SD 10) vs 70 (SD 16.5) mins, $P < 0.001$<br>Mean blood loss 250 (SD 35) vs 42 (SD 7.2) ml, $P < 0.001$<br>Mean hospital stay 76 (SD10) vs 36 (SD6) h, $P < 0.001$  | *subjective = dry or rarely needing pad and pt satisfied; obj cure negative stress test, no leak on Valsalva during UD, and significant increase in MUCP.<br>No concomitant surgery reported. |
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |   |                     | Complications                    | Peri-operative:<br>Bladder injury 2.5 vs 2.9%<br>bladder perforation 0 vs 2.9%<br>Post-operative ( $P = NS$ for all):<br>wound infection 5% vs 0%<br>retropubic haematoma 2.5% vs 0%<br>spontaneous voiding 90% vs 91%<br><i>de novo</i> DO 7.5 vs 5.9%  |   |
| Cheon 2003 <sup>626</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 90              | F mean age 51 years, UD stress UI<br>30% vs 15% open vs lap also had DO<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery,   | Open Burch colposuspension ( $n = 43$ ) | Laparoscopic colposuspension (sutures) ( $n = 47$ )     | 1 year              | Objective success                | 86 vs 85.1%, $P = NS$ (dry during cough on UD)   | Funding: none declared.<br>All procedures done by 2 senior urogynaecologists (done min 15 laparoscopic colposuspensions prior to study).<br>37% vs 15% underwent                              |
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |   |                     | Subjective success               | 86 vs 80.9%, $P = NS$  |   |
|                            |                   |                 |  |   |   |                     | Satisfaction                     | 85.3 vs 97.9%, $P = NS$  |   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                                 | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|                           |                   |                 | conditions that may reduce flexibility of vaginal wall e.g. fibrosis; ISD                                    |  |   |   | Hospital parameters   | Mean operating time 29 vs 42 min, $P < 0.0001$<br>Mean blood loss 327 vs 125 ml, $P = 0.001$<br>Mean hospital stay 9.6 (3.9) vs 9.7 (5.0) days, $P = NS$   | concomitant hysterectomy (before colposuspension).<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br>*1 reqd conversion to open.  |
|                           |                   |                 |  |  |   |   | Complications (all $P = NS$ )   | Bladder injury 0 vs 4.3%*<br>UTI 6.9 vs 2.1%<br>wound complication 2.1 vs 2.3%<br>DVT 0 vs 2.1%<br><i>de novo</i> DO 11.6 vs 25.5%<br>obstruction (peak flow rate < 15) 37.2 vs 27.7%<br>enterocele 4.7 vs 2.3%<br>dyspareunia 9.3 vs 6.4% |   |
| Ustun 2005 <sup>627</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 52              | F mean age 43–47 years, UD stress UI<br>None had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: DO                  | Open Burch colposuspension* ( $n = 26$ ) | Laparoscopic colposuspension* (sutures) ( $n = 26$ )    | Mean 13 months open grp, 14 months lap (range 3–24) | Cure (dry on UD, no pads used)<br>Hospital parameters (median [min, max.])      | 80.8 vs 80.8%<br>at 3 and 12 months<br>Operating time 60 (30–100) vs 90 (45–140) mins, $P < 0.001$<br>Hospital stay 6.5 (3–13) vs 2 (1–8) days, $P < 0.001$<br>Duration catheterisation 3 (3–3) vs 3 (1–5) days, $P = 0.002$               | Funding: none declared.<br>*both with other gynaecologic procedures (4 vs 3 vaginal hysterectomy, 8 vs 7 posterior colporrhaphy, 9 vs 9 tube ligation, 2 vs 4 salphingo-oophorectomy, 3 vs 3 cyst extirpation.<br>**not stated whether transient or persistent. |
| Su 1997 <sup>628</sup>    | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 92              | F mean age ~42–44 years, UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: pathological conditions limiting flexibility of vaginal | Open Burch colposuspension* ( $n = 46$ ) | Laparoscopic colposuspension with sutures* ( $n = 46$ ) | 6 months  | Objective cure (dry on severe cough and bouncing on UD testing)<br>1 h pad test | 95.6% (95% CI 89.7 to 100) vs 80.4% (68.9, 91.9), $P = 0.044$<br>No sig. differences between groups in reduction in urine loss   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] patients randomised except where preference expressed for Burch, in which case choice given and next pt allocated lap colpo then randomisation continued. This   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Comparison                                 | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
|                               |                   |  | wall; uterine prolapse or cystocele > 1st degree, DO, underactive detrusor or outflow obstruction, prior continence surgery or prior hysterectomy   |  |  |                     | Hospital parameters  | Operative time 73 vs 67 min $P = NS$<br>Duration bladder drainage 6.8 vs 3.9 days, $P < 0.001$   | applied to 'few patients'.<br>All procedures by senior gynaecologist.<br>Power calculation based on 152 pts.   |
|                               |                   |  |   |  |  |                     | Complications  | 4.3 vs 4.3% outflow obstruction<br>6.5 vs 4.3% DO<br>4.3% vs 0% haematuria<br>2.2 vs 2.2% UTI  | *30% from both grps also underwent abdominal hysterectomy – in the Lap colpo grp the laparotomy for hysterectomy was done immediately after the laparoscopic procedure.  |
| Kitchener 2006 <sup>629</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 291; data on subjective outcomes in 88%, and objective in 83%, but impact of losses considered | F mean age ~50 years for whom colposuspension was chosen to treat UD stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: prior retropubic surgery (although 7% had); DO, 'grossly obese' women considered unsuitable for surgery | Open Burch colposuspension ( $n = 147$ ) | Laparoscopic colposuspension ( $n = 144$ ) | 2 years             | Objective cure* (data for 79.6 vs 85.4%)<br><br>Subjective cure# | 70.1 vs 79.7%<br><br>Satisfaction#: 54.6 vs 54.9%<br>By symptoms (never leaks/leaks < 1 month): 53.1 vs 55.4%  | Funding: MRC<br>6 UK centres; surgeons at each had 'extensive' experience of both techniques.<br>No concomitant surgery undertaken.<br>*negative 1 h pad test (gain of $\leq 1$ g.)  |
|                               |                   |  |   |  |  |                     | Operative care   | Hospital stay mean 6 vs 5 days, $P = NS$   | #a response of 'perfectly happy/pleased' to question 33 of BFLUTS.   |
|                               |                   |  |   |  |  |                     | Time to return to work (~50%)                                    | 10.54 vs 9.42 weeks, $P = NS$  | Aim of study was to show that laparoscopic colposuspension is non inferior to open colposuspension.  |
|                               |                   |  |   |  |  |                     | Complications (peri-operative)                                   | 0.7 vs 2.8% bladder injury<br>0 vs 0.7% bowel injury<br>1.4 vs 0.7% haemorrhage > 500 ml<br>1.4% vs 0% wound dehiscence<br>7.8 vs 0.7% wound infection<br>5 vs 5.7% UTI<br>5 vs 3.5% chest infection | Of 144 in lap grp, 11 received open surgery, 2 received no surgery; of 147 in open grp, 1 underwent the lap procedure, and 3 no surgery at all.<br><br>Condition-specific questionnaire not used to assess QOL (only SF36) |

## RCTs comparing different suturing methods for laparoscopic suspension

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Persson 2000 <sup>630</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | <i>n</i><br>randomised unclear.<br>161 treated and analysed at 1 year | F mean age ~50 years, UD stress UI with bladder neck hypermobility. 39% vs 41% had mixed UI<br>Exclusions: urge UI, SUI owing to low UCP (< 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O), > grade 1 cystocele, failed prior vaginal repair, recurrent UI | Laparoscopic colposuspension using double-bite sutures ( <i>n</i> = 83; 80 followed-up to 1 year) | Laparoscopic colposuspension using single-bite suture ( <i>n</i> = 78; 77 followed-up to 1 year) | Median 12 months (9–24) | Objective cure (no leak on 'ultrashort' pad test; improved if leakage ≤ 1/3 of pre-op leakage)<br>Subjective cure<br>Operating time (median)<br>Complications | 83% vs 58% cured<br>12% vs 27% improved<br>5% vs 15% failed<br><i>P</i> = 0.001 for all comparisons<br>89% vs 65% cured<br>7% vs 32% improved<br>4% vs 3% failed<br><i>P</i> < 0.001 for all comparisons<br>77 (45–110) vs 60 (35–121) mins, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>Immediate:<br>0% vs 1% osteitis<br>4% vs 6% cystitis<br>0% vs 1% pyelonephritis<br>2% vs 0 superficial wound infection<br>1% vs 1% abdominal wall haematoma<br>4% vs 3% abdominal pain causing prolonged hosp stay<br>6% vs 6% transient urgency<br>Post-operative:<br>5% vs 3% recurrent UTI (≥ 4 per year)<br>1% vs 0% dyspareunia<br>2% vs 3% cicatricial hernia<br>10% vs 3% new onset recto/enterocele<br>4% vs 1% slow bladder emptying<br>5% vs 8% new onset/worsened urge symptoms<br>0% vs 3% persisting pelvic discomfort | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1-] Enrolment stopped after analysing results for 108 women at 1 year (when another 60 had been treated), which showed a sig. difference in favour of double-grip sutures. Not all pts evaluated for all outcomes – several refused pad test<br>Sutures made of PTFE.<br>37% vs 41% had additional gynae surgery. |
| Ross 1995 <sup>631</sup>    | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 69  | F mean age ~51 years (37–75), UD stress UI with hypermobility  | Laparoscopic colposuspension using sutures  | Laparoscopic colposuspension using   | 1 year                  | Objective cure*   | 91% vs 94%<br>(5 failures owing to: 2 recurrent SUI, 2 DO, 1 intrinsic sphincter dysfunction)  | Funding: none declared.<br>*negative Q-tip test, ultrasound, cough stress test, and UD   |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
|  |                   |                 | (positive Q-tip test)<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, DO inferred ISD   | ( <i>n</i> = 35)  | mesh and staples<br>( <i>n</i> = 34)   |                     | Complications   | 3% vs 0% haematuria<br>6% vs 6% UTI<br>6% vs 3% cystotomy<br>0% vs 3% thrombophlebitis<br>0% vs 3% retention  | negative for DO.<br>One surgeon.  |
| Zullo 2001 <sup>633</sup> ,<br>634 and<br>Piccione 2001 <sup>632</sup><br>(3<br>publicati<br>ons of<br>same<br>study)<br>3 year<br>follow-<br>up in<br>2004 <sup>635</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 60              | F mean age<br>~53 years, UD<br>stress UI, mild to moderate<br>Exclusions: severe UI (VAS);<br>POP ≥ 2nd degree, prior pelvic or continence surgery, severe abdo-pelvic infections, DO and/or ISD, other gynaecologic pathologies, BMI > 30 | Laparoscopic colposuspension using sutures<br>( <i>n</i> = 30; 27 analysed) | Laparoscopic colposuspension using mesh and staples<br>( <i>n</i> = 30; 26 analysed) | 3 years             | Objective failure (positive stress test)<br><br>Subjective failure (no change or worsening of score on VAS)<br><br>Hospital parameters<br><br>Complications | 10.7% vs 25% at 1 year<br>29.6 vs 57.7% at 2 years<br>42.3 vs 61.5% at 3 years<br>all <i>P</i> < 0.05 between grps<br><br>3.3 vs 13.3% at 1 year<br>20.0 vs 36.7% at 2 years<br>33.3 vs 53.3% at 3 years<br>all <i>P</i> < 0.05 between grps<br><br>Mean operating time 68 vs 82 min<br>Post-op stay 1.7 vs 1.6 days<br><br>3.7 vs 3.8% bladder injury<br>7.4 vs 11.5% DO | Funding: none declared.<br>Only completers analysed in 2001 paper; ITT used in 3 year follow-up.<br>Transperitoneal laparoscopic Burch performed. No concomitant surgery performed.<br>One surgeon. |

## Burch colposuspension vs MMK procedure

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                 | Comparison                    | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| McCrery 2005 <sup>636</sup>  | SB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 138 with > 6 months follow-up, <i>n</i> randomised unclear | F mean age ~48–51 (29–77), stress UI and anterior wall prolapse, with urethral hypermobility (Q-tip > 30° from horizontal)<br>UD diagnosis in 64%: 78% stress UI, 22% mixed UI<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, cough LPP < 60, or MUCP < 20 | Open Burch colposuspension* ( <i>n</i> = 66) | MMK* ( <i>n</i> = 72)         | Mean 24 months (7–55)<br>Burch grp, 28.8 (6–60)<br>MMK grp | Subjective cure/improvement/failure   | ITT analysis:<br>59.1 vs 48.6% cure<br>25.8 vs 15.3% improvement<br>15.2 vs 36.1% failure <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>Excluding losses to follow-up:<br>65 vs 57.4% cure<br>28.3 vs 18.0% improvement<br>6.7 vs 24.6% failure <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>In 64% who had pre-op UD:<br>ITT analysis:<br>14 vs 42.2% failure <i>P</i> = 0.005<br>Excluding losses to follow-up:<br>10% vs 35% <i>P</i> = 0.008   | Funding: none declared.<br>Randomisation by coin toss in the operating room.<br>9% vs 15% lost to follow-up.<br>*both with concomitant paravaginal defect repair; 55% vs 68% also had hysterectomy, 30% vs 33% abdominal sacral colpopexy, 50% vs 49% posterior repair, 33% vs 30% abdominal cystocele repair, 82% vs 85% culdoplasty. |
| Colombo 1994 <sup>637</sup><br>Colombo 1998 <sup>949</sup><br>reported long-term follow-up of the MMK group (and another 29 pts)** | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 80   | F mean age ~50–51 years, UD stress UI with moderate or severe symptoms (daily leakage episodes range 13–21)<br>Exclusions: MUCP < 30, DO, POP 2nd degree or greater, urethral diverticula, urogenital fistulas, prior failed continence surgery      | Open Burch colposuspension ( <i>n</i> = 40)  | Modified MMK ( <i>n</i> = 40) | 2–7 years (mean 3.1 Burch, 3.5 MMK)                        | Objective cure (negative stress test)<br>Subjective cure or improvement*<br>Hospital parameters (mean, SD)<br>Complications<br>Long-term complications in MMK grp ( <i>n</i> = 69)** at mean follow-up 4.2 years <sup>949</sup> | 80% vs 65%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Cure 92% vs 85%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Improvement 8% vs 15%<br>Days catheterisation 8.5 (7) vs 13.4 (6.9), <i>P</i> = 0.002<br>Days hospital stay 6.3 (1.4) vs 7.4 (1.5), <i>P</i> = 0.001<br>0% vs 5% haematoma<br>5% vs 10% <i>de novo</i> DO (2.5% vs 10% urge UI)<br>MMK grp only:<br>19% voiding difficulties<br>9% worsening of pre-existing urge UI<br>7% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>7% chronic urinary retention (6% had urethral dilation)<br>7% developed genital prolapse<br>3% recurrent UTI | Funding: none declared.<br>*reduction in severity score of ≥ 50%.<br>35% vs 20% had concomitant culdoplasty.   |

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients                               | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                           | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Quadri 1999 <sup>638</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 30  | F mean age 58 vs 63 years, stress UI with low urethral pressure (MUCP ≤ 20), and hypermobility (> 30° on Q-tip)<br><br>23% had prior vaginal surgery for anterior vaginal prolapse and stress UI | Open Burch colposuspension<br>(n = 15) | MMK<br>(n = 15)   | 1 year              | Objective cure (negative stress test)<br><br>Subjective cure<br><br>Complications                                   | 80% vs 86% at 2 months<br>53% vs 93% at 1 year, <i>P</i> = 0.017<br><br>80% vs 100% at 2 months<br>66% vs 100% at 1 year, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br><br>7% vs 20% cystitis<br>13% vs 13% fever<br>mean (SD) time to normal voiding 6.5 (3.3) vs 20.5 (13.4) days, <i>P</i> < 0.001 | Funding: none declared.<br>Abstract publication of study included in Cochrane review. <sup>638</sup><br>MMK under cystoscopic control.<br>Sig. difference in 'flow times' at baseline, 232.2 vs 14.1 s, <i>P</i> = 0.004.<br>Procedures performed by 2 surgeons.   |
| Liapis 1996 <sup>639</sup><br>Liapis 1996 <sup>950</sup><br>reports Burch and AC arms only at 3 year follow-up; <i>n</i> = 81) – data not reproduced here, believed to be the same patients as in | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 170 randomized, 155 (91%) followed to 5 years | F mean age 51 years (36–75) UD stress UI   | Burch colposuspension*<br>(n = 54)     | MMK*<br>(n = 51)<br>Anterior colporrhaphy* (with Kelly plication, n = 50) | 4 years             | Objective and subjective cure (no definition, other than 'by urodynamic study'<br><br>Complications/adverse effects | 95 vs 85% vs 78% at 2 months<br>89 vs 67% vs 56% at 4 years ( <i>P</i> < 0.001 for Burch grp vs others)<br><br>7 vs 14% vs 10% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>4 vs 6% vs 6% urge UI   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] No baseline data or comparisons for grps; no definition of urodynamic cure; only completers analysed; differences in other procedures undertaken.<br>*posterior colporrhaphy also performed in Burch and AC grps; and in MMK if 'there was a degree of rectocele' (n not stated). |



## Colposuspension vs anterior colporrhaphy – RCTs

| Study                             | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                      | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Colombo 2000 <sup>640</sup>       | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 71<br>randomised, 68 evaluated (3 lost to follow-up) | F mean age ~55 years, UD stress UI and concomitant grade 2 or 3 cystocele, urethrovesical junction hypermobility (> 30° max. straining angle on Q-tip test)<br>Exclusions: DO, prior continence or prolapse surgery, concomitant pelvic disease requiring laparotomy                           | Burch colposuspension* (n = 37 randomised, 35 analysed) | Anterior colporrhaphy* (n = 34 randomised, 33 analysed) | Min 8 years; mean 14.2 (9–17)<br>Burch vs mean 13.9 (8–17) AC | Objective cure (negative stress test)<br>Subjective cure<br>Recurrent prolapse<br>Complications          | 74% vs 42%<br>OR 3.9 (95% CI 1.3 to 12.5), P = 0.02<br>86% vs 52%<br>OR 5.6 (95% CI 1.6 to 21.6), P = 0.005<br>At vaginal site: 54% vs 54%<br>Cystocele grade 2/3 with or without prolapse at other vaginal sites: 34% vs 3%, OR 16.7 (95% CI 2.0 to 368.1), P = 0.003<br>Not listed as such: 24% vs 35% had not voided spontaneously before hosp discharge, but did so within 2 weeks                        | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane reviews. <sup>616,620</sup><br>*total abdominal hysterectomy performed in Burch grp, and vaginal hysterectomy in colporrhaphy grp. 34% vs 100% also had posterior colporrhaphy and perineorrhaphy.  |
| Kammerer-Doak 1999 <sup>641</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 35   | F mean age 45 years<br>Burch vs 53 years<br>colporrhaphy grps (P = 0.02); UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder, DO, prior radical pelvic surgery, pelvic radiation, ISD (abdominal LPP < 65 and MUCP < 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O), history of interstitial cystitis or urethral syndrome | Burch colposuspension* (n = 19)                         | Modified anterior colporrhaphy* (n = 16)                | 1 year  | Objective cure<br>Subjective cure<br>QOL (IIQ) scores at 1 year<br>Hospital parameters and complications | dry on cough and 265rethra265 in supine/ standing positions with full bladder: 89% vs 31%, RR 0.15 (95% CI 0.04 to 0.59)<br>pad weight < 1 g on 20 min test: 83% vs 40%, RR 0.28 (0.09, 0.85)<br>95% vs 19%<br>RR 0.16 (95% CI 0.04 to 0.58)<br>0.32 (0.6) vs 0.91 (0.9), P = 0.04<br>Duration of hospital stay and post-op catheterisation not sig. different (no data given)<br>21% vs 50% urgency symptoms | Funding: none declared.<br>All except main author blind to procedure until day of surgery.<br>1 pt in Burch grp had prior anterior colporrhaphy.<br>*women also had hysterectomy or cystocele repair if required – unclear now many did, and what procedures were used in total; there were sig. differences in % who had anterior colporrhaphy to repair cystocele (16% vs 100%) or paravaginal defect repair (42% vs 6%). |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|--|---|--|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Bergman 1989 <sup>642</sup> and Klutke 1999 <sup>643</sup> (latter is analysis of urodynamic data; only available for 53%) | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 298 analysed (88% of those randomised)             | F mean age 57 years (31–80), stress UI and 'pelvic relaxation' (cystorectocele) requiring surgery<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery; mixed UI; gynaecologic conditions requiring laparotomy   | Open Burch colposuspension*<br>(n = 101) | Modified Pereyra procedure*<br>(n = 98)<br>Anterior repair*<br>(n = 99)                       | 3 months and 1 year | Objective and subjective cure (neg. stress test on UD, no history, no urine loss at any post-surgery assessment)<br>Urodynamics (changes in UCP, abdominal pressure transmission ratio) | 89 vs 81% vs 80% at 3 months<br>87 vs 70% vs 69% at 12 months, P ≤ 0.02 Burch vs other grps<br><br>No sig. changes in either parameter in any group vs baseline  | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane reviews. <sup>616,619</sup><br>Postmenopausal women (66%) given oestrogen vaginal cream ~6 weeks prior to UD and surgery, and encouraged to continue its use.<br><br>*all women had vaginal hysterectomy and cystorectocele repair (or vaginal cystorectocele correction if had prior hysterectomy [6% of the 342 screened for inclusion]).<br><br>[EL = 1–] Number randomised unclear; 339 'eligible', and 41 lost to follow-up, so only data reported for completers. No baseline data given (except for UCP, functional urethral length and abdominal PTR) and no comment on whether similar across groups. |
| Bergman 1989 <sup>644</sup> and 1995 <sup>645</sup> (latter is follow-up of pts cured at 1 year)                           | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 127 randomised, 107 [84%] followed-up and analysed | Women who were ineligible for Bergman 1989 <sup>642</sup> study because hysterectomy not required were entered into this study protocol<br>F mean age 55 years (29–77), UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: indication for laparotomy or hysterectomy | Open Burch colposuspension<br>(n = 38)   | Modified Pereyra procedure<br>(n = 34)<br>Anterior repair (with Kelly 266rethra 266n, n = 35) | 1 year and 5 years  | Objective and subjective cure (neg. stress test on UD, no history, no urine loss at any post-surgery assessment)  | 92 vs 82% vs 80% at 3 months<br>89 vs 65% vs 63% at 12 months, P < 0.05 Burch vs other grps<br>At 5 years (n = 64 [82%] of 78 cured at 1 year):<br>82 vs 43% vs 37%, P ≤ 0.05 Burch vs other grps<br>If losses to f/up assumed cured:<br>84 vs 50% vs 43%, P ≤ 0.05 Burch vs other grps<br>If losses to f/up assumed failed:<br>71 vs 38% vs 31%, P ≤ 0.05 Burch vs other grps | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane reviews. <sup>616,619</sup><br>Postmenopausal women (58%) given oestrogen vaginal cream ~6 weeks prior to UD and surgery, and encouraged to continue its use.<br><br>No attempt to describe outcomes of pts lost to follow-up at 1 year, unclear how many lost from each group; only data reported for completers. No baseline data given (except for UCP, functional urethral length and abdominal PTR) although said to be similar in age, parity,   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments                              |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Urodynamics (changes in UCP, abdominal pressure transmission ratio) at 1 year | Sig. increase in PTR with each procedure. No other sig. changes | menopausal status.<br>*of those cured at 1 year. |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Days of catheterisation post-op (mean, SD)                                    | 4.1 (1.9) vs 4.3 (1.7) vs 3.9 (2.1)                             |  |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            |                     | Complications between years 1 and 5   | 3 pts <i>de novo</i> DO*  |  |

## Colposuspension vs needle suspension – RCTs

| Study                               | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Comparison                                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Athanassopoulos 1996 <sup>646</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 51  | F mean age 50 (20–78), UD stress UI; Stamey grading: 10% grade 1, 51% grade 2, 39% grade 3              | Burch colposuspension (n = 27) | Stamey (n = 24)                              | 8–27 months         | Objective cure (UD – no details)<br>Subjective improvement*/failure<br>Hospital parameters<br>Complications | 74% vs 71%<br>15 vs 12.5% improved<br>11 vs 16.5% failed<br>Mean hospital stay 5.8 (4–11) vs 3 (6–12) days<br>15% vs 17% haematoma<br>7 vs 12.5% retention<br>7% vs 0% abscess<br>11% vs 4% urgency (none leading to urge UI and none with DO)   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] Randomisation by date of birth, baseline data not reported per pt group (only overall).<br>*by ≥ 1 Stamey grade.<br>Included in Cochrane systematic reviews. <sup>616,619</sup> |
| Mundy 1983 <sup>647</sup>           | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 51  | F mean age 48 years (29–70), UD stress UI with no evidence of DO<br>56% had prior continence surgery    | Burch colposuspension (n = 26) | Stamey (n = 25)                              | Minimum 1 year      | Subjective 'success'/failure<br>Complications   | Success 88% vs 76%<br>Failure 12% vs 24%<br>None   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] quasi-randomisation (alternate); no baseline data for patients.<br>1 surgeon (author)<br>included in Cochrane systematic reviews. <sup>616,619</sup>                            |
| Gilja 1998 <sup>648</sup>           | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 204 randomised; 146 (72%) followed up for 3 years and are subject of report | F mean age 36 years (28–48), UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, neurological disease | Burch (retropubic), n = 56     | Raz (n = 46)<br>Burch (transvaginal), n = 44 | 3 years             | Objective cure (on UD)<br>Subjective cure<br>Complications  | 94.6 vs 91.3 vs 93.2% at 1 year, P = NS<br>91.1 vs 89.1 vs 93.2% at 2 year, P = NS<br>89.3 vs 80.4 vs 86.4% at 3 year, P = NS<br>96.4 vs 93.5 vs 97.7% at 1 year, P = NS<br>92.9 vs 91.3 vs 93.1% at 2 year, P = NS<br>92.9 vs 84.8 vs 90.9% at 3 year, P = NS<br>6.8% overall had <i>de novo</i> DO | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>619</sup><br>One surgeon undertook procedures.<br>War in country given as explanation for losses to follow-up.  |
| German 1994 <sup>649</sup>          | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 50  | F mean age 50/53 years, UD stress UI  | Vagina/obturator shelf         | Modified Stamey needle                       | Mean 2 years (12–   | Subjective cure   | 71% vs 58%<br>for 58% in whom these were primary procedures: 86% vs 53%, P < 0.05  | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane reviews. <sup>616,619</sup>  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention       | Comparison          | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | 42% prior continence surgery (no details)<br>60% had 'urge syndrome' | procedure (n = 24) | suspension (n = 26) | 44 months           | Hospital stay and convalescence<br>Complications | Hosp stay 8.3 vs 7.0 mean days<br>Convalescence 10.4 vs 7.9 weeks<br>4% vs 8% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>25% vs 12% wound infection<br>17% vs 0% voiding problems (no definition)<br>46% vs 73% post-op pain | Single centre<br>[EL = 1-] randomisation method not stated, grps only compared at baseline in terms of age and weight. |

## Colposuspension vs other interventions

| Study                            | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Comparison                                    | Length of follow-up         | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Colombo 1996 <sup>651</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 36              | F socially disabling, UD stress UI, with grade 1 urethrocytocele resulting in uni- or bilateral paravaginal defect; daily leakage episodes 9–19<br><br>Exclusions: MUCP < 20, DO, prior failed abdominal continence surgery | Burch colposuspension (n = 18) | Abdominal paravaginal defect repair* (n = 18) | Mean 2.2 vs 2.3 years (1–3) | Objective cure (negative stress test)<br>Subjective cure<br>Hospital stay (mean, SD)<br>Complications | 100% vs 61%, <i>P</i> = 0.004<br>100% vs 72%, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>5.2 (0.8) vs 5.0 (0.9) days, <i>P</i> = NS<br>67% vs 94% resumed spontaneous voiding before discharge<br>28% vs 3% required ISC for mean 8 vs 7 days (1 [3%] Burch grp reqd surgery for retention)<br>17% vs 11% persistent voiding difficulties<br>6% vs 0% <i>de novo</i> DO (with urge UI)<br>11% vs 3% recurrent grade 1 urethrocytocele (median 8 months) | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br>*study discontinued after 36 F recruited as 'no longer ethical' to conduct a paravaginal repair to treat stress UI.<br>78% vs 89% underwent hysterectomy concomitantly, and 56% vs 72% culdoplasty. |
| Enzelsberger 1996 <sup>657</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 72              | F mean age 58 years (45–72), recurrent stress UI after hysterectomy plus anterior repair  | Open Burch colposuspension     | Lyophilised dura mater sling (n = 36)         | 32–48 months (mean)         | Cure (subjective and objective [negative stress test])  | 86% vs 92%  | Funding: none declared.<br>(Quasi-randomisation [even/odd numbers] but baseline characteristics reported to be  |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients                      | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                    | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|--|
|  |                   |                                      |  | (n = 36)  |                               | 35 vs 37)            | Hospital parameters   | 6.4 vs 12.4 days to spontaneous voiding, $P < 0.05$<br>7 vs 15 days catheterisation<br>8 vs 16 days hospital stay   | similar in the 2 grps).<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br>One surgeon performed all procedures.  |
|  |                   |                                      |  |   |                               |                      | Complications   | Peri-op/immediate post-op:<br>6% vs 3% bladder laceration<br>5% vs 13% <i>de novo</i> urgency/urge UI<br>3% vs 13% voiding difficulty $P < 0.05$<br>6% vs 22% retention (PVR > 100 ml), $P < 0.01$<br>11% vs -5% developed rectocele (changed vs pre-op),* $P < 0.05$ | *from 2 to 13% in Burch grp, and from 8 to 3% in sling grp.  |
| Berglund 1996 <sup>652</sup> and 1997 <sup>653</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 45 (43 [95%]) in long-term follow-up | F mean age 50 years (34-62), stress UI<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, age > 65 years, other gynae disorders requiring surgical treatment | Burch colposuspension (retropubic urethrocytopeny) (n = 30) | Pubococcygeal repair (n = 15) | 1 year and 5-7 years | Objective cure ( $\leq 2$ g gain pad weight)<br>Subjective cure | 67% vs 47% at 1 year<br>73% vs 80% at 1 year (27% vs 20% improved)<br>43% vs 60% at 5-7 years (all others considered failures)  | Funding: Kemp foundation and Faculty of Medicine, University of Umea.<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>616</sup><br>Postmenopausal women treated with oestrogen for $\geq 3$ months prior to surgery.  |
| Lalos 2000 <sup>654</sup> 5-7 year follow-up         |                   |                                      |  |   |                               |                      | Median hospital stay<br>Post-op complications                   | 6 (range 5-21) vs 11 (7-18) days<br>7% vs 47% UTI<br>5 (3-18) vs 8 (6-13) days bladder drainage (median)  | [EL = 1-] All seen by physio and had PFMT prior to surgery; F with none or poor pelvic muscle contraction on digital assessment were excluded from pubococcygeal grp (n not stated); casts doubt over whether study was randomised, as no description of randomisation given.<br>7/30 in Burch grp operated on by other, less experienced surgeon.<br>Urodynamic findings also reported at 5-7 years; not reproduced here. |

## Needle suspension vs other interventions

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Hilton 1989 <sup>656</sup>     | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 20              | F mean age 57 vs 53 years, UD stress UI with or without other symptoms, considered unsuitable for colposuspension owing to surgical scarring, or marked atrophic narrowing of the vagina<br>60% both grps had prior continence surgery (total 11 vs 12 procedures; mostly anterior repair) | Stamey endoscopic bladder neck suspension (n = 10)          | Porcine dermis suburethral sling (n = 10)           | 2 years                             | Objective cure (on urodynamics)<br>Subjective cure<br>Hospital stay (mean, SD)<br>Complications (mean [SD] or % pts) | 80% vs 90% at 3 months<br>90% vs 90% at 3 months<br>70% vs 90% at 2 years<br>7 (0.3) vs 20 (12.9) days, <i>P</i> < 0.05<br>Blood loss 37 (28.3) vs 700 (469)ml, <i>P</i> < 0.05<br>Wound drainage 0 vs 197 (12.9)ml<br>Bladder injury 20% vs 10%<br>infection (wound/UTI) 0% vs 70%, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>pulmonary embolism 0% vs 10%<br><i>de novo</i> DO 10% vs 20% | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane review. <sup>619</sup><br>Randomisation by random number chart; even nos Stamey, odd nos sling.<br>Urinary symptoms at 3 months also reported, and pre- and post-op UD data. |
| Di Palumbo 2003 <sup>655</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 80              | F stress UI (Blaivas type 1 and 2), with grade 3–4 cystocele<br>50 vs 42,3% had urge UI at baseline  | Four-corner bladder and urethral suspension (Raz)* (n = 28) | Anterior colporrhaphy (Nichols technique)* (n = 52) | Range 280–1670 days (0.8–4.5 years) | Failure (not dry on stress test)<br>Hospital stay (mean, range)<br>Complications                                     | 14.3 vs 26.9%, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>5 (4–34) vs 6 (4–20), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Time to spontaneous voiding mean 3.62 (2–9) vs 4.78 (3–9) days, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Urinary retention (> 5 < 10 days) 3.6 vs 1.9%   | Funding: none declared.<br>*93% vs 90% also had hysterectomy.<br>limited info on baseline UI parameters in both grps.<br>Single centre.  |

## Colposuspension vs synthetic slings

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                     | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                                 | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Ward 2002 <sup>659</sup><br>2 year follow-up <sup>660</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1++   | 344 randomised; 316 (92%) received tx as randomised | F mean age 50 years (42–59) who had completed their family; UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: DO, vaginal prolapse requiring tx; prior continence or prolapse surgery, major voiding dysfunction (voiding pressure > 50 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, PVR > 100 ml), neurological disease* | Tension-free vaginal tape (n = 175; 170 [97%] received tx as allocated, 167 [95%] followed up at 6 months; 78% at 2 years) | Open colposuspension (n = 169; 146 [86%] received tx as allocated, 137 [81%] followed up at 6 months; 64% at 2 years) | 6 month s <sup>659</sup> and 2 years <sup>660</sup> | Objective cure (neg stress test on UD and < 1 g change in weight on 1 h pad test) at 6 months | 66% vs 57%; (95% CI for difference – 4.7%, +21.3%)<br>(81% vs 67% neg stress test<br>73% vs 64% neg pad test)  | Funding: Ethicon Ltd.<br>14 centres (gynae or urology, uni teaching or DGHs).<br>target 436 pts for power calculation.<br>tape under LA and sedation (96%), colpo according to standard procedure of units (99% under GA). All investigators underwent training for tape insertion at a recognised centre.<br>*5 who had surgery violated protocol (4 DO, 1 voiding dysfunction); were included in analysis.<br>Baseline characteristics of pts who withdrew same as others, except for smaller reduction in pad weight for withdrawals vs those undergoing surgery.<br>LOCF = last observation carried forward. |
|   |                   |   |  |  |   |   | Objective cure (< 1 g on 1 h pad test) at 2 years   | 81% vs 80% (OR 1.67, 95% CI 0.59 to 2.06) [completers analysed] with assumptions for withdrawals:<br>OR 1.67 (1.09, 2.58) if all failures, P = 0.02<br>OR 0.86 (0.47, 1.58) if all cured<br>OR 1.64 (1.01, 2.65) with LOCF<br>OR 0.93 (0.54, 1.60) with LOCF and if presurgery withdrawals cured (best and worst case cure rates for both arms 63–85% TVT, 51–87% colposuspension) |  |
|   |                   |   |  |  |   | 6 month s <sup>659</sup>                            | Symptoms (bladder diary)  | No sig. difference between grps in changes in leakage episodes, frequency, voided volume   |  |
|   |                   |   |  |  |   | 6 month s <sup>659</sup> and 2 years <sup>660</sup> | 1 h pad test  | No sig. difference between grps in reduction in pad weight at 6 months or 2 years  |  |
|   |                   |   |  |  |   | 6 month s <sup>659</sup> and 2 years <sup>660</sup> | QOL   | BFLUTS (6 months and 2 years): sig. improvement in both grps in 21/30 questions (13/20 urinary, 6/6 lifestyle, 2/4 sexual)<br>SF-36:<br>less improvement in colposuspension grp in 4/8 domains (emotional role, social functioning, mental health, energy/vitality) at 6 months; still true for role emotional and mental health at 2 years  |  |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up                               | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|------------|---|---|---|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            | 6 months <sup>659</sup>                           | Time to return to (median, IQR)   | To normal activities 3 (2–4) vs 6 (4–8) weeks $P < 0.001$<br>To work 4 (3–7) vs 10 (8–12) weeks $P < 0.001$   |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            | 6 months <sup>659</sup>                           | Satisfaction  | 85% vs 82% satisfied or very satisfied<br>4% vs 3% dissatisfied<br>84% vs 82% would recommend to friend   |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            | 6 months <sup>659</sup>                           | UD  | No sig. difference between grps in changes in cystometry or UPP variables   |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            | 6 months <sup>659</sup>                           | Hospital parameters   | Theatre time (median, IQR, mins):<br>anaesthetic room 15 (10–50) vs 17 (14–25), $P < 0.001$<br>operating theatre 40 (30–48) vs 50 (35–60), $P < 0.001$<br>recovery area 41 (31–60) vs 85 (65–115), $P < 0.001$<br>Duration catheterisation:<br>38% vs 100% 1–7 days<br>5% vs 33% 8–28 days, $P < 0.001$<br>3% vs 13% 29 days to 6 months, $P < 0.001$<br>> 6 months 2% vs 8%, $P = NS$<br>Median hospital stay:<br>1 (1–2) vs 5 (5–7) days, $P < 0.001$ |                     |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |            | 6 months <sup>659</sup> and 2 years <sup>60</sup> | Post-op complications, up to 6 months <sup>659</sup> (all $P = NS$ unless otherwise stated) | 39 vs 44.5% total<br>22% vs 32% UTI (in 6 weeks postop)<br>9% vs 2% bladder injury (perforation/trauma) $P = 0.013$<br>3% vs 0% vaginal perforation<br>2% vs 7% wound infection<br>1% vs 5% fever, $P = 0.027$<br>0% vs 2% DVT<br>N/A vs 2% incisional hernia<br>2% vs 0% retropubic haematoma<br>1% vs 0% vascular injury<br>1 vs N/A tape erosion   |                     |

| Study                      | Study type and EL                    | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                           | Comparison  | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|--|
|                            |                                      |                             |   |  |   |                          | Complications and further procedures occurring between 6 months and 2 years ( $P = NS$ unless otherwise stated)                                       | 5.9 vs 2.1% symptoms of recurrent UTI voiding disorder requiring ISC 0 vs 2.7%, $P = 0.0045$<br>1.8 vs 3.4% surgery for UD SUI<br>0 vs 4.8% surgery for uterovaginal prolapse, $P = 0.0042$<br>$n/a$ vs 3% incisional hernia repair<br>2% vs $n/a$ division or trimming of tape<br>5% vs 3% 274rethra274n274<br>2% vs 0% urethral dilatation<br>0.6% ( $n = 1$ ) vs 0 caesarean section<br>2 vs 0.7% abdominal hysterectomy |  |
| Liapis 2002 <sup>661</sup> | RCT (quasi randomisation)<br>EL = 1– | 71                          | F mean age ~47 years (32–64), UD stress UI with competent intrinsic urethral sphincter<br>Exclusions: greater than first degree prolapse, prior surgery for SUI, DO | Tension-free vaginal tape ( $n = 35$ ) | Open Burch colposuspension ( $n = 36$ )                   | 2 years                  | Objective cure/improvement*<br>Hospital parameters<br>Complications   | Cure 84% vs 86%<br>Improvement 7% vs 6%, $P = NS$<br>Duration of procedure (range, mins) 16–25 vs 46–70, $P < 0.01$<br>Hospital stay (mean, days) 2.1 vs 5.7, $P < 0.05$<br>Return to normal activity 10 vs 21 days (Mean), $P < 0.05$<br>11% vs 0% bladder perforation<br>14% vs 6% UTI<br>17% vs 14% DO<br>6% vs 3% sensory urgency<br>0% vs 6% haematoma<br>0% vs 9% retention<br>0% vs 11% pain at incision site        | Funding: none declared.<br>Surgeon blinded.<br>[EL = 1–] procedures done alternately (= not true randomisation). Baseline data (age, parity, weight) shows no difference between grps.<br>*cure = pad weight difference $< 1$ g on 1 h test; improvement $\geq 50\%$ reduction in leakage. |
| Wang 2003 <sup>662</sup>   | RCT<br>EL = 1+                       | 98 randomised (90 analysed) | F mean age 52 (34–73) years, UD stress UI without POP<br>Exclusions: bladder outlet obstruction, prior continence surgery   | Tension-free vaginal tape ( $n = 49$ ) | Modified Burch colposuspension ( $n = 49$ ; 41 analysed*) | Median 22 months (12–36) | Objective cure/improvement (cure: $\leq 2$ g on 1 h pad; improvement $> 50\%$ reduction; failure $> 2$ g)<br>Subjective success (cure or improvement) | Cure 82% vs 76%<br>Improvement 8% vs 12%<br>Failure 10% vs 12% ( $P = NS$ all comparisons)<br>92% vs 93% $P = NS$   | Funding: none declared.<br>Fewer analysed than randomised in Burch grp; *all pts who withdrew moved abroad.<br>Tape procedure under LA; modified Burch under regional anaesthesia.<br>90 pts required for power calculation; this based on   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                    | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                              | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
|                              |                   |                 |  |                                 |  |  | Complications   | 'no sig. complications' with either procedure; no further details given  | obstructive outcomes, not cure.<br>Subjective cure: no urine loss during physical exercise; improvement > 50% reduction in leakage; failure: reduction of < 50%.<br>Voiding also reported on Blaivas-Groutz nomogram as a measure of obstruction. |
| El-Barky 2005 <sup>663</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1-    | 50              | F mean age 50 years (SD 14) with UD stress UI<br>Exclusions: high grade cystocele, prior surgical failure for SUI, uninhibited detrusor contraction during bladder filling on urodynamic study and incompetent internal sphincters | Burch colposuspension (n = 25)  | TVT (n = 25)   | At least 2 years but results given at 3-6 months | Subjective assessment of continence status (at 3-6 months)<br>Operative care<br>Complications | 72% vs 72% 'completely' cured<br>16% vs 20% improved (had occasional UI)<br>12% vs 8% no improvement, P = NS for all<br>Mean operating time 57 vs 20 min<br>Mean hospital stay 6.2 vs 3.1 days<br>Return to normal activity 21 vs 10 days<br>0% vs 8% bladder perforation<br>12% vs 20% retention<br>12% vs 8% de novo urgency<br>12% vs 20% UTI<br>8% vs 0% wound infection | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1-] No details of randomisation, whether ITT done, nor whether groups balanced at baseline in parameters other than age, parity, and duration of symptoms.   |
| Bai 2005 <sup>658</sup>      | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 92              | F mean age 56-58 (SD ~3) years, UD stress UI, of Stamey grade 1 or 2<br>Exclusions: DO, UTI, ISD, POP > grade 2  | Burch colposuspension (n = 33), | Tension-free vaginal tape (n = 31)<br>Pubovaginal sling using autologous rectus muscle fascia (n = 28) | 12 months  | Cure (symptom-free and negative stress test)<br>Complications                                 | 88 vs 87% vs 93%<br>P < 0.05 for sling vs Burch or TVT<br>9% vs 0 vs 0 <i>de novo</i> DO<br>3% hesitancy (difficulty initiating voiding)<br>0 vs 13% vs 7% urinary retention   | Funding: none declared.<br>One surgeon performed all the procedures.<br>Some % cure rates in text differ from those in tables (at 3 months).  |

| Study  | Study type and EL   | No. of patients                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                                | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures                            | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|------------------------|---|---|--|
| Valpas 2004 <sup>664</sup> and 2003 <sup>665</sup> for complications | RCT<br>EL = 1+  | 128 randomised (121 operated on)* | F age 29–68 (means 50 and 48) UD stress UI recruited from gynaecological outpatient clinics<br>Exclusions: age > 70, prior continence surgery (except colporrhaphy), > 3 UTIs in past 3 years, UCP < 20, PVR < 100 ml | Polypropylene (tension-free vaginal tape)<br><i>n</i> = 70 | Lap mesh colposuspension<br><i>n</i> = 51 | 12 months              | Objective cure                              | Negative stress test: 86% vs 57%, (95% CI for difference 12.7 to 43.9), <i>P</i> = 0.000<br>Negative 48 h pad test (< 8 g/24 h): 73% vs 59% (–2.8, +30.4) < <i>P</i> = NS                                       | Funding: none declared.<br>Recruited fewer pts than required by power calculation (176).<br>Tape procedure under LA; lap suspension under GA, by senior gynaecologist who had performed ≥ 20 of each procedure.<br>*7 withdrawals: 4 refused surgery, 2 refused results of randomisation, 1 treated outside study centres. Of 121 treated, 6 lost to follow-up or withdrew (4 vs 2). |
|  |   |                                   |   |  |   |                        | Severity scores at 12 months                | UISS (0–20): 1.1 vs 2.7, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>VAS (1–10): 0.9 vs 2.2 <i>P</i> = 0.000   |  |
|  |   |                                   |   |  |   |                        | KHQ at 12 months                            | No sig. difference in general health perception, or sleep/energy<br>Sig. lower scores in TVT grp for incontinence impact, role/physical/social limitations, personal relationships, emotions, severity measures |  |
|  |   |                                   |   |  |   |                        | Satisfaction (whether met pts expectations) | totally 83% vs 59%<br>partially 11% vs 28%<br>not at all 0% vs 6%, <i>P</i> = 0.001 between grps  |  |
|  |   |                                   |   |  |   |                        | Hospital parameters <sup>665</sup>          | Operating time 29 (14–153) vs 47 (19–120) mins, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>theatre time 60 (35–183) vs 91 (50–190) mins, <i>P</i> < 0.001  |  |
| Complications <sup>665</sup>   | 1% vs 2% (both <i>n</i> = 1) bladder perforation<br>3% vs 4% prolonged retention<br>0% vs 2% port site infection<br>1% vs 2% wound infection<br>0% vs 1% haematoma<br>4% vs 2% UTI<br>3% vs 0% urge symptoms<br>0% vs 4% other pain |                                   |   |  |   |                        |   |   |  |
| Paraiso 2004 <sup>666</sup>  | RCT<br>EL = 1+  | 72 randomised (71 treated)        | F mean age ~54 years (38–80), UD stress UI<br>No prior continence   | Tension-free vaginal                                       | Lap Burch colposuspension                 | Mean 21 (SD 8), median | Leakage episodes (mean)                     | 1 year: 1.8 vs 0.4, <i>P</i> = NS<br>2 years: 0 vs 0.3, <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>Trial stopped early because of slow recruitment and lack of   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison                                 | Length of follow-up                                  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|                           |                   | as randomised)*<br><i>n</i> = 63<br>(88%)<br>at 1 year, 33 (46%)<br>at 2 years | surgery, no DO on UD, no anterior vaginal wall prolapse to or beyond hymen.<br>47% vs 25% prior hysterectomy, 6% vs 3% prior anticholinergic tx | tape<br><i>n</i> = 36                                      | <i>n</i> = 35                              | 18 months,<br>range 12–43 months                     | QOL (UDI, IIQ; mean scores)<br><br>Urodynamics ( <i>n</i> = 63; % with)             | UDI: 1 year: 6 vs 4<br>2 years: 4 vs 4, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>IIQ: 1 year: 49 vs 38<br>2 years 33 vs 47, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>SUI: 3% vs 19%, <i>P</i> = NS (hence objective cure: 97% vs 81%)<br>DO: 19% vs 6% (with UI 3% vs 0%), <i>P</i> = NS<br>Voiding dysfunction 15% vs 15%   | funding (recruited fewer pts than required by power calculation, <i>n</i> = 130).<br>Tape procedure under LA, GA or spinal; lap suspension under GA<br>*6 withdrawals: 1 colpo grp refused surgery. Of those treated, 2 both grps lost to follow-up, 1 from tape grp died (unrelated to surgery).<br>32 vs 35 concomitant procedures were performed (mainly hysterectomy [9 vs 8]; sig. difference in lysis of adhesions, 11% vs 32%; others included colpoorrhaphy, adnexal surgery, tubal ligation, bladder biopsy<br>24% vs 36% taking anticholinergics after surgery<br>**costs also calculated<br>Actual values rather than % change reported because no baseline data given. |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |  |  | Satisfaction scores (VAS 0–10)  | 1 year: 8.5 vs 8.4, <i>P</i> = NS<br>2 years: 8.2 vs 9.0, <i>P</i> = NS  |  |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |  |  | Hospital parameters   | Total operating time 79 vs 132 min, <i>P</i> = 0.003**   |  |
|                           |                   |  |   |  |  |  | Complications   | <i>Intraoperative:</i><br>Tape: 3% blood transfusion, 6% cystotomies<br>Colpo: 3% bowel injury (repaired), 9% converted to open surgery<br><i>Postoperative:</i><br>both groups, 3% haematoma, 3% pelvic abscess<br>Tape: 3% vaginal erosion of mesh, 6% transection for voiding<br>Colpo: 3% postop ileus, 3% PE, 3% pyelonephritis |  |
| Ustun 2003 <sup>667</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 46   | F mean age ~46 years (SD 10–11), UD stress UI<br>17% in tape group vs 0 in colposuspension grp had prior continence surgery                     | Polypropylene (tension-free vaginal) tape<br><i>n</i> = 23 | Lap Burch colposuspension<br><i>n</i> = 23 | Range 3–24 months<br><br>Mean 11.3 tape;<br>13.5 lap | Cure (subjectively dry, negative stress test, dry on UD)<br><br>UD (pre vs post-op) | 83% vs 83%<br><br>Sig. incr. in VLPP in both grps, <i>P</i> ≤ 0.02 vs baseline (126% vs 105%)<br>Sig. reduction in max. flow rate in TVT grp (13%, <i>P</i> = 0.01)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Tape procedure under LA, GA or spinal; lap suspension under GA.<br>[EL = 1–] No info on randomisation or allocation concealment, no description of methods of analysis. No attempt  |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison                         | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
|  |                   |  |   |   |                                    | colpo  | Hospital parameters   | Operating time (mean, mins): 31 vs 82<br>$P = 0.001$<br>Duration catheterisation (median, range): 1 (0–7), 3 (1–5), $P = 0.03$<br>Hospital stay (mean, days): 2 vs 3.4, $P = 0.003$   | to adjust for differences in mean follow-up between grps.  |
|  |                   |  |   |   |                                    |  | Complications   | Total: 22% vs 22%<br>Incomplete info: in TVT grp<br>2 (9%) retention<br>2 (9%) bladder lacerations<br>1 (4%) <i>de novo</i> DO<br>In laparoscopy grp:<br>2 (9%) conversions to laparotomy (1 bleeding, 1 bladder laceration)  |  |
| Sand 2000 <sup>668</sup><br>(3 months follow-up)<br>Culligan 2003 <sup>669</sup><br>(longer-follow-up) | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 37 randomised, 36 operated on (1 excluded owing to cardiac risk) | F mean age ~60–61 years, UD stress UI, urethral hypermobility (MUCP $\leq 20$ in sitting position) and low-pressure urethra.<br>41% sling vs 95% Burch group had DO ( $P = 0.01$ ); mean PVR pre-op 12.3 vs 25.4 ml<br>$P = 0.03$ . 9 vs 7 (47% vs 41% had undergone a total of 8 vs 10 continence procedures)<br>Exclusions: significant anterior or apical pelvic support defects | Suburethral polytetrafluoroethylene sling* ( $n = 17$ ) | Burch colposuspension ( $n = 19$ ) | 3 months and longer-term ( $n = 28$ ): mean 72.6 months (33–116) | Objective cure (no leak on cough/Valsalva on UD)<br>Subjective cure (no urine loss during activities that incr. intra-abdominal pressure)<br>Hospital parameters<br>Complications | 100% vs 90% $P = NS$ at 3 months<br>longer-term ( $n = 28$ ): 100 vs 84.6%, $P = NS$<br>100% vs 95% $P = NS$ at 3 months<br>Longer-term ( $n = 28$ ): 84% vs 93%, $P = NS$<br>Mean stay 5.1 (1.2) vs 5 (1.4) days, $P = NS$<br>Time to catheter removal 23.3 (24) vs 13.8 (16) days, $P = NS$<br>24% vs 5% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>100% vs 61% persisting DO (of those who had DO at baseline)<br>0% vs 5% cystotomy<br>Longer-term:<br>2 (12%) vs 0 partial sling erosion<br>1 (6%) vs 0 reqd urethrolisis owing to prolonged urinary retention | Funding: none declared.<br>*Gore-Tex soft tissue patch, running from rectus fascia into the retropubic space and beneath urethra at level of urethrovesical junction.<br>Op in association with other procedure in 12% vs 21%. |

## Colposuspension vs anterior repair or needle suspension – cohort studies

| Study                              | Study type and EL | No. of patients                             | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                    | Comparison  | Length of follow-up               | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Tamussino 1999 <sup>670</sup>      | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 544 treated, 327 (60%) evaluated at 5 years | F median age ~51–53 (31–76) years, stress UI<br>84% primary surgery for SUI; in 16% recurrent surgery (primary procedure mainly anterior colporrhaphy) | Burch colposuspension (n = 106) | Anterior colporrhaphy (n = 107)<br>Anterior colporrhaphy with needle suspension (n = 121) | 5 years                           | Cure (believed to be subjective cure)<br><br>Complications  | 79 vs 61% vs 49% (P < 0.05 Burch vs other grps)<br>In pts with MUCP > 20 (93%): 81 vs 61% vs 49%, P < 0.01 Burch vs other grps<br>In pts with MUCP ≤ 20 (7%): 69 vs 57 vs 46, P = NS<br><br>6 vs 2% vs 7% post-op catheterisation > 14 days<br>Overall 39% recurrent SUI: 23 vs 10% vs 5% failed owing to <i>de novo</i> DO (P = NS)<br>Reoperation rate 1 vs 5% vs 11% (for condition or complications); overall 5% (64% of which were colposuspension) | Funding: none declared.<br>40% did not respond, had moved, died or declined exam.<br>[EL = 2–] Sig. differences between groups in: % having primary surgery (58 vs 100% vs 94%); severity of UI (36% in AC grp had mild vs 0 in others), owing to surgeon choice – mild SUI cases underwent AC, moderate AC with needle suspension, severe Burch; BMI sig. higher in needle suspension grp (27.9 vs 26.4/26.9).<br>AC done routinely with hysterectomy and colpoperineorrhaphy. |
| Cosiski Marana 1996 <sup>671</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 183 treated, 109 (60%) evaluated at 5 years | F, age not stated, stress UI; 50% had urgency  | Burch* (n = 52)                 | Anterior colporrhaphy* (n = 57)   | Mean 5 years (range 54–66 months) | Cure (believed to be subjective cure)<br>Prolapse (prevalence)<br>Urge UI (incidence in 50% with urgency at baseline) | 60% vs 21% P < 0.01<br><br>38% vs 88%, P < 0.001<br><br>46% vs 59%   | Funding: none declared.<br>*both with posterior colpoperineoplasty. Burch undertaken when cystocele grade 1 present, and AC for grades 2 or 3.<br>Grps similar at baseline in age, parity, delivery methods, and UI severity.   |

| Study                          | Study type and EL | No. of patients                               | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Comparison                      | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Van Geelen 1988 <sup>672</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 90 treated, 88 (98%) followed up at 5–7 years | F mean age 46 vs 43 years, UD stress UI, none had prior surgery for UI or for prolapse. UI severity similar in both grps<br><br>Exclusions: other causes of UI; UTI | Burch colposuspension (n = 34)* | Anterior colporrhaphy (n = 56)* | 5–7 years              | Cure (subjective and objective [no leak during straining with bladder vol. 300 ml])<br><br>Complications | At 3 months:<br>100% vs 74% cure<br>0% vs 20% improved<br>0% vs 6% failed<br><br>At 1–2 years:<br>85% vs 45% cure<br>12% vs 36% improved<br>3% vs 22% failed<br><br>At ≥ 5 years:<br>76% vs 31% cure<br>13% vs 31% improved<br>11% vs 38% failed<br><i>P</i> < 0.001 Burch vs AC at all time points<br><br>3% vs 0% bladder lacerations<br>3% vs 0% PE<br>3 vs 3.6% haemorrhage requiring exploration<br>3 vs 3.6% pyrexia > 3 days<br>6% vs 11% delayed voiding (≥ 3 days)<br>9 vs 1.7% recurrent cystitis<br>0 vs 3.6% recurrent prolapse<br>6 vs 1.7% urgency/urge UI<br>3% vs 0% dyspareunia | Funding: none declared.<br>*combined with hysterectomy in 26% vs 32%.<br><br>Choice of procedure based on degree of genital prolapse and mobility of anterior vaginal wall. Sig. more pts in AC grp had grade 2 or 3 prolapse (21% vs 64%).<br>86/90 procedures done by 1 surgeon.<br><br>UD pressure profiles and PTRs also reported – not reproduced here.<br>PE = pulmonary embolism. |
| Luna 1999 <sup>675</sup>       | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 103   | F mean age 51 vs 60 ( <i>P</i> < 0.05) years, stress UI, treated surgically as a primary procedure  | MMK (n = 26)*                   | Anterior colporrhaphy (n = 77)* | Mean 11.3 years (1–17) | Subjective cure<br><br>Recurrence  | 58% vs 55%, <i>P</i> = NS (100% in both grps 1 month post-op)<br><br>10% vs 17% (remaining 32% vs 28% persistence)<br><br>Mean time to recurrence 58 vs 12 months  | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2–] Retrospective chart review. Unclear why sample chosen, and whether it included all women who had surgery.<br>AC undertaken in women   |



| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                             |                   |  |  |  |  |                     | Immediate post-op complications                             | 0% vs 9% retention<br>0% vs 1% cystitis<br>4% vs 0% pyelonephritis<br>0% vs 1% anaemia<br>0% vs 1% haematoma   | with SUI and genital prolapse; MMK in those with other gynae diseases other than prolapse, necessitating laparotomy.<br>*with other procedures in 92% vs 99% of pts; mainly hysterectomy (vaginal or abdominal).  |
| Demirci 2002 <sup>673</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 95 treated, 25 (37%) followed up at 10 years   | F, age not stated, stress UI   | MMK ( <i>n</i> = 28; 14 of 21 followed-up at 10 years) | Anterior colporrhaphy ( <i>n</i> = 67; 21 of 34 followed-up at 10 years)   | 10 years            | Subjective cure   | At 3 months:<br>23/28 (82%) vs 50/67 (75%)<br>At 40 months:<br>21/28 (75%) vs 34/63 (54%)<br>At 10 years:<br>9/14 (64%) vs 8/21 (38%)<br><i>P</i> = NS at all time points  | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2–] Continence status assessed by telephone interview; only those who were continent at 40 months followed-up. No explanation for missing pts.<br>Mean body wt had increased sig. from 40 month follow-up; +5.8 vs +8.8 kg; postmenopausal status of women increased sig. too. |
| Park 1988 <sup>674</sup>    | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 660 (60% followed to 5 years, 24% to 10 years) | F mean age 43–45 years, UD stress UI.<br>Initial SUI procedure in 63 vs 99% vs 83%; repeat in 37 vs 1% vs 17%<br>Exclusions: neurogenic UI, hypotonic bladder, | MMK ( <i>n</i> = 227; 51% at 5 years, 13% at 10 years) | Anterior colporrhaphy with Kelly<br>281rethra281n ( <i>n</i> = 336; 63% at 5 years, 22% at 10 years)<br>Pereyra ( <i>n</i> = 97; 70% at 5 years, | 10 years            | Success rates (cure or some urine loss but not troublesome) | At 5 years (assumed):<br>72 vs 70% vs 58% ( <i>P</i> < 0.0001 MMK and AC grps vs Pereyra)<br>If only primary procedures considered:<br>78 vs <i>n/a</i> vs 62%<br>As repeat procedure:<br>62 vs 70% vs 41%<br>Cure rates declined with time in each group (shown in graph) | Funding: none declared.<br>Most suitable procedure chosen for pts, based on urodynamic 'philosophy' or concomitant gynaecologic disease; AC undertaken in type 1 UI.<br>[EL = 2–] Differences between grps in % initial/repeat procedure; Green type 1 or 2 UI (23  |

| Study                           | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison          | Length of follow-up                   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                 |                   |   | medical conditions making a pt a poor surgical risk   |                                     | 57% at 10 years)    |                                       | Complications*  | 4.3 vs 3.0 vs 11.2% wound/cuff infections, $P < 0.005$<br>8.3 vs 7.4 vs 16.5% excessive blood loss (transfused), $P = 0.02$<br>0.4 vs 0 vs 7.1% suture in bladder<br>2.2% vs 0 vs 0 osteitis pubis, $P < 0.01$<br>2.2 vs 2.1 vs 7.1% cystitis $P = 0.02$ | vs 65% vs 5%; 77 vs 35% vs 95%). Concomitant hysterectomy done in 42 vs 82% vs 69%; prior hysterectomy in 57 vs 16% vs 29%.<br><br>Pts included in only the years in which they responded. Pts who had subsequent repairs considered failures.<br><br>*although $P$ values quoted for complications, not clear whether these apply to Pereyra vs other grps. |
| Giberti 1995 <sup>676</sup>     | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 109   | F mean age 53–54 years (24–82), stress UI<br><br>Primary surgery in 74% vs 94%; repeat (2nd or more) in 26% vs 6%<br><br>Degree of UI (not defined); 1st* 15% vs 18%, 2nd 67% vs 76%, 3rd 18% vs 6% | Burch colposuspension ( $n = 76$ )* | Raz ( $n = 33$ )*   | Mean 90 months (12–180) vs 36 (12–50) | Success (subjective cure or improvement [sporadic loss])<br><br>Complications | 96% vs 90% at 2 years (70% at 7 years in Burch grp; equivalent follow-up not available for Raz grp)<br><br>Only reported among 'healed pts' – data not reproduced here.  | Funding: none declared. [EL = 2–] unclear whether grps similar at baseline. Retrospective review of case notes.<br><br>*other procedures undertaken: hysterectomy 5% vs 24%; anterior colporrhaphy 0% vs 39%, colpoperineoplasty 0% vs 18%.  |
| Christensen 1997 <sup>677</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 182; questionnaire sent to surviving 169 (93%), of whom 141 (83%) replied | F mean age 55 vs 60 (range 32–82), $P = 0.014$ . 57% vs 39% pure stress UI, 40% vs 59% mixed UI, 0% vs 2% urge UI, undergoing   | Burch colposuspension ( $n = 99$ )  | Stamey ( $n = 83$ ) | Median 7 years (2–10)                 | Subjective cure (questionnaire)<br><br>Satisfaction                           | 33% vs 32% cured<br>29% vs 39% improved<br>38% vs 29% failed (unchanged, worse or using ISC)<br><br>38% vs 47% very satisfied<br>26% vs 23% satisfied<br>36% vs 30% dissatisfied   | Funding: none declared. 'greatly obese' pts, pts on anticoagulation or scarred/short vagina, or history of prior continence surgery predominantly treated with Stamey. 25% vs 6% also underwent  |

| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Comparison           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                          |                   |                 | primary surgery for stress UI<br>28% both grps had prior hysterectomy, 25% vs 20% prior colporrhaphy  |                                     |                      |                     | Further surgery required                            | 22% vs 16% patients $P = NS$<br>29% vs 18% no. procedures $P = NS$<br>2.2% vs 2% required ISC  | hysterectomy. Cystocele requiring treatment was generally treated by surgery prior to continence surgery.<br>[EL = 2-] unclear whether grps similar at baseline. Retrospective review of case notes, Burch done in gynae dept, Stamey in urology dept.  |
| Wang 1996 <sup>678</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 503             | F mean age 52 years (29-71), UD stress UI<br>needle suspension undertaken predominantly for pts with significant uterovaginal prolapse, and those with UCP > 70 or flow rates < 15 ml/s; abdominal approach for isometric contraction and supine UCP > 20 | Burch colposuspension ( $n = 294$ ) | Stamey ( $n = 209$ ) | Minimum 2 years     | Failure<br><br>Complications<br><br>Further surgery | Objective ( $n = 389$ [77%]); < 1 g weight gain on pad test:<br>15 vs 20%<br>Subjective ( $n = 114$ [23%]):<br>14% vs 10%<br><br>10% vs 16% voiding dysfunction* $P = 0.03$<br>4% vs 4% wound infection<br>6% vs 0% enterocele<br>2% vs 2% suprapubic pain<br>6% vs 12% DO ( $P = NS$ )<br>0% vs 2% suture pledget pull-through<br>0.7 vs 0.5% haemorrhage<br>0% vs 1% urethral injury<br>2% vs 0% cystotomy<br>2% vs 2% dyspareunia<br>0.3% vs 0% vesicovaginal fistula<br>7% vs 13% UTI<br><br>Removal of sutures for prolonged delay of spontaneous voiding:<br>0.3% vs 10% | Funding: none declared. Retrospective analysis of cases, with repeat of UD after min 2 years in 72% vs 85% of pts; remaining 23% answered questionnaire.<br>*residual vol. > 20% of vol. voided 3 weeks after catheter removal.<br>[EL = 2-] no baseline data for grps.<br>Other procedures done concomitantly (e.g. hysterectomy, anterior or posterior colporrhaphy) not reported for each grp. |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients                               | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Riggs 1986 <sup>679</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 742<br>(complete follow-up available for 86%) | F stress UI, mean age 44 vs 49 years; 22% vs 50% postmenopausal | Modified MMK (n = 490; 411 [84%] followed-up) | Modified Pereyra combined with anterior colporrhaphy (n = 252; 225 [89%] followed-up) | Up to 17 years      | Subjective cure or improvement (In % pts within certain categories of duration of follow-up) | <p>Cure:<br/>95% vs 83% up to 6 months<br/>88% vs 91% 6 mo to 5 years<br/>86% vs 78% 5–10 years<br/>82% vs 66% 10–15 years<br/>67% vs 50% 15–17 years</p> <p>Improved:<br/>0% vs 9% up to 6 months<br/>4% vs 8% 6 mo to 5 years<br/>10% vs 10% at 5–10 years<br/>6% vs 25% at 10–15 years<br/>33% vs 50% at 15–17 years</p> <p>Failed:<br/>5% vs 9% up to 6 months<br/>9% vs 2% 6 mo to 5 years<br/>4% vs 12% 5–10 years<br/>3% vs 9% 10–15 years</p>   | <p>Funding: none declared. [EL = 2-] Differences between groups in procedures undertaken. Pereyra with anterior colporrhaphy for POP; MMK performed if there were indications for abdominal surgery (e.g. uterine fibroids, ovarian masses, endometriosis). Posterior colporrhaphy also performed in 42% vs 95%.<br/>*abdominal or vaginal retropubic.</p> |
|                           |                   |   |   |   |   |                     | Immediate post-operative complications   | <p>No sig. differences reported between grps in any complications</p> <p>Common complications were:<br/>2% vs 2% wound complications<br/>0% vs 3% vaginal granulation tissue</p> <p>All other complications reported were uncommon:<br/>prolonged catheterisation, pelvic haematoma, retropubic haematoma, wound separation/dehiscence, incisional hernia; post-op bleeding, urethritis and/or cystitis, pneumonia, phlebitis, ileus, coronary insufficiency, depression; osteitis pubis, 'rent in bladder', urethral obstruction, 284rethra-vaginal fistula, vaginal synechia, urine extravasation</p> |  |

| Study  | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                       | Comparison              | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|---|--|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|
|  |                   |                 |   |  |                         |   | Further surgery*                                    | 5% vs 20%   |  |
| Spencer 1987 <sup>680</sup><br>Clemens 1998 <sup>681</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 95              | F mean age 55 years, stress UI (26% vs 22% Stamey grade 1; 60% vs 61% grade 2, 13% vs 17% grade 3)<br>41% vs 44% had prior continence surgery (mainly anterior colporrhaphy)<br>44% vs 51% had frequency with or without urgency (with urge UI in 15% vs 24%) | MMK ( <i>n</i> = 54; 67% with long-term follow-up) | Stamey ( <i>n</i> = 41) | Median 68 months (21–118)<br>MMK vs 46 (22–102)<br>Stamey, <i>P</i> < 0.005<br>Long-term: median 16.8 (13.2–21.9) vs 15 (9.4 vs 19.9) years | Subjective cure or improvement<br><br>Complications | Cure:<br>85% vs 88% at 6 months<br>57% vs 61% at ≥ 21 months<br><br>Longer-term*:<br>33% vs 44% cure<br>8% vs 16% improved<br><br>5.5% vs 7% chronic retention<br>0% vs 10% chronic suprapubic pain<br>7% vs 7% new onset urge UI<br>28% vs 70% urgency<br><i>P</i> = 0.004 | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective analysis of cases.<br>Baseline characteristics of pts similar; type of procedure determined by pt and physician preference.<br><br>*Kaplan–Meier curves show more rapid loss of continence years 0–5; at 5 years, actuarial cure rates 62% vs 65%; at 10 years 59% both; 15 years 41% vs 48%. |

*Burch or MMK colposuspension – case series*

| Study                                   | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention          | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| Alcalay 1995 <sup>682</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 366 treated, 109 (30%) followed up at ≥ 10 years* | F mean age 47 years (29–70), UD stress UI with urethral sphincter incompetence, bladder neck descent, and adequate vaginal capacity and mobility<br>30% had prior bladder neck surgery (mostly anterior repair) | Burch colposuspension | Mean 13.8 years     | Objective cure**<br><br>Subjective cure<br><br>Further surgery<br><br>Complications | 20% at 10–20 years<br><br>94% at 3 months<br>80% at 5 years<br>72% at 10–20 years<br><br>26% cystocele repair<br>5% enterocele repair<br>4% urethrotomy for persistent voiding difficulties and recurrent UTI<br>10% surgery for recurrent SUI (13 bladder neck procedures undertaken)<br><br>15% <i>de novo</i> DO at 3 months<br>29% urgency at 10–20 years<br>23% urge UI<br>5% recurrent UTI | Funding: none declared.<br>*161 did not reply/had difficulty attending, 71 could not be traced, 25 died.<br>**no UI during clinical exam and on provocative UD<br>Changes in UD parameters also reported, not reproduced here, and success in relation to age, parity, menopausal status, weight, blood loss. |

| Study                           | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                                  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up       | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Herbertsson 1993 <sup>683</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 100 treated, 72 had complete follow-up*          | F mean age 46 years (29–65) at operation, 55 (39–75) at follow-up, stress UI   | Retropubic colpourethrocystopexy (Burch colposuspension) | Mean 9.2 years (8–12)     | Objective cure**<br><br>Complications  | 97.3% at 1 year<br>91.7% at 5 years<br>90.3% at mean 9.2 years<br><br>11% cystocele<br>11% rectocele<br>4% enterocele<br><br>40% (20/50) <i>de novo</i> urgency (not associated with surgery in 'at least' 15; mean duration symptoms 2.4 years prior to follow-up; in 6 urgency related to hysterectomy, in 2 related to surgery for prolapsed intervertebral disc)<br>41% (9/22) cured of pre-existing urgency   | Funding: none declared.<br>*4 not traced, 6 stayed abroad, 19 declined.<br>**symptom-free, dry on all occasions without objective urine loss during clinical and UD testing with provocation at bladder vol. 300 ml.<br>Changes in UD parameters also reported, not reproduced here. |
| Ladwig 2004 <sup>684</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 374; 318 (85%) responded to postal questionnaire | F mean age 50 years (27–88); 28% postmenopausal, stress UI<br>28% also underwent hysterectomy<br>28% had prior continence surgery (mainly anterior repair) | Burch colposuspension                                    | Mean 9.2 years (2.1–15.8) | Satisfaction (n = 190, 51%)<br><br>Complications (n = 237 max. for q's; 63%)<br>(new or recurrent symptoms or further treatment) | 52% very satisfied<br>17% moderately satisfied<br>13% some relief<br>3% poor relief<br>7% quite unsatisfactory<br><br>31% reqd further surgery (at mean 5.4 years [0–14]; mean no of ops 1.9 [1–5])<br>29% req medical tx<br>47% sought advice for persistent, <i>de novo</i> , or recurring symptoms<br>Sig. increase in following symptoms (% with; % needing further help for symptom):<br>stress UI (58%, 28%)<br>urgency (48%; 38%)<br>difficulty emptying bowel (30%, 18%)<br>pressure in lower abdomen (29%, 15%)<br>drag in lower abdomen (19%, 12%)<br>vaginal 'lump' (22%, 22%)<br>frequency (no sig. incr., 24% needing help with day freq, and 21% with night) | Funding: none declared.<br>Peri- and immediate post-op complications listed – not reproduced here.   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                             | Patient characteristics  | Intervention           | Length of follow-up                                     | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Eriksen 1990 <sup>685</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 91;<br>79 (87%)<br>followed up at 5 years)* | F mean age 53 years (26–83) pre op; 54% stress UI, 46% mixed UI symptoms; UD diagnosis 72% SUI, 28% MUI<br><br>69% had stable bladder pre-op<br><br>11% had prior hysterectomy, 10% prior anterior repair; 8% UI after anterior repair | Burch colposuspension  | 5 years   | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br>(n = 86)<br><br>Symptoms<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>UD findings<br>(n = 76 [84%]) | 67% cured (71% in pure SUI grp, 57% MUI)<br>21% improved significantly<br>8% unchanged<br>4% worse<br><br>13% stress UI, 20% mixed UI, 15% urge UI; 52% symptom-free<br><br>25% (14/55) <i>de novo</i> DO<br>67% (14/21) cured of pre-existing urge UI<br><br>Sig. increase in % with:<br>post-void fullness (+24.4%), stranguria** (+10.5%), rectocele (+8.1%)<br><br>Sig. reduction in % with:<br>frequency (-20.9%), daily leakage (-72.1%), cysto-urethrocele (-41.9%)<br><br>No sig. change in % with urgency, nocturia, rectocele<br><br>57% normal<br>16% stress UI<br>11% mixed UI<br>18% urge UI | Funding: none declared.<br>*2 died, 3 lost to follow-up, 7 declined (latter had telephone follow-up).<br>Changes in UD parameters also reported, not reproduced here<br>**Poor stream and straining during voiding. |
| Kiilholma 1993 <sup>686</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 186   | F mean age 52 (22–78) stress UI (27% grade 1, 44% grade 2, 29% grade 3)<br>24% had prior continence surgery<br>19% also had urgency/urge UI  | Burch colposuspension* | 2 years (continence status)<br><br>1 year complications | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Complications   | 76% cure<br>16% improved<br>8% failed<br><br>In women undergoing primary procedure: 81%/14%/5% cure/improved/failed<br>In women undergoing repeat procedure: 62/20/18%<br><br>Post-op:<br>14% transient retention<br>14% UTI<br>4% wound infection<br>3% wound haematoma<br>1% DVT<br><br>At 1 year:<br>12% symptomatic rectocele/enterocele or both (all underwent surgical repair)<br>19% had urgency/urge UI (as at baseline)<br>9% voiding difficulty   | Funding: in part by Grant from Paulo Foundation, Finland.<br>*with hysterectomy in 44%, and correction of enterocele by vaginal or abdominal route in 6%.   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL  | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention            | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures                       | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Akpinar 2000 <sup>687</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3  | 50 (64% of 78 treated replied to follow-up questionnaire/ telephone call)              | F mean age 45 years (25–67); stress UI (76% mixed)<br>12% prior failed continence surgery   | Burch colposuspension   | Mean 50 months (38–94)     | Subjective cure<br><br>Complications   | 52% cure<br>24% urge UI<br>8% socially continence<br>16% failed<br><br>0 ISC<br>4% significant (> 100 ml) PVR urine and obstructive urine flow<br>16% cystocele (10% mild, 2% moderate, 4% severe*)<br>60% rectocele (40% mild, 18% moderate, 2% severe)*<br>30% uterine prolapse (10% mild, 4% moderate)*  | Funding: none declared.<br>*mild = descent above level of introitus with strain, moderate = descent to level of introitus with strain, severe = descent through the introitus with or without strain. |
| Feyereisl 1994 <sup>688</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3  | 87 (92% of the 95 treated*)  | F mean age 50 years, stress UI with grade 1 cystocele and hypermobile urethrovesical junction (Q-tip > 30°), no DO<br>40% prior continence surgery (most common anterior colporrhaphy or MMK) | Burch colposuspension   | Minimum 5 years (up to 10) | Cure**<br><br>Complications            | 82%<br>(81% in women undergoing primary SUI surgery; 83% in those undergoing repeat if all losses to follow-up considered failed, cure rate = 75%)<br><br>30% rectocele grade 1 or 2<br>16% PVR > 60 ml<br>15% DO<br>5% 'late voiding difficulties'<br>2% pain in groin at site of hitch, requiring intermittent analgesic therapy<br>1% (n = 1) enterocele with partial vaginal vault prolapse requiring abdominal sacropexy | Funding: none declared.<br>*3 died, 5 lost to follow-up.<br>**dry, symptom free, dry on stress test and demonstrable positive UCP during stress provocation.  |
| Kjølhed 2005 <sup>689</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Further information on these patients provided in Kjølhed | 190 (220 sent questionnaire after 10 years [91% of 243 treated*]; 190 [81%] responded) | F mean age ~49 (28–75), stress UI   | Burch colposuspension** | Median 14 years (10–18)    | Subjective cure<br><br>Further surgery | 19% dry<br>25% UI a few times a year<br>56% UI at least monthly (26% SUI, 17% urge UI, 42% mixed, 15% atypical UI)<br><br>37% surgery for prolapse<br>29% hysterectomy<br>12% bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy<br>3% faecal incontinence surgery   | Funding: Ostergötland County Council.<br>*19 died, 4 lost to follow-up.<br>**with other surgery in 10%, mainly hysterectomy<br>#In these refs the patient group was matched with 316                  |



| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients               | Patient characteristics  | Intervention            | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures                             | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2005 <sup>#690,691</sup>   |                       |                               |  |                         |                         | Complications                                | 36% had $\geq 1$ symptom of voiding difficulty: 12% difficulty starting, 11% straining at voiding, 30% difficulty emptying<br>11% recurrent UTI ( $\geq 3$ per year)   | age-matched controls from the public register, and symptoms of pelvic floor dysfunction compared using multiple logistic regression analysis owing to sig. differences between grps in parity, BMI, heavy daily work, COPD, hiatus hernia, performing PFMT or using oestrogen. |
|                            |                       |                               |  |                         |                         | Symptoms compared with controls <sup>#</sup> | Symptoms of genital prolapse:<br>25% vs 13% pelvic pressure or heaviness (OR 1.67 [95% CI 0.89 to 3.15] on multiple logistics regression analysis)<br>18% vs 4% bulge in the vulva or rubbing the mucosa (OR 2.68 [95% CI 1.13 to 6.36])<br>19% vs 8% vaginal flatulence (OR 1.76 [95% CI 0.87 to 3.55])<br>Bowel symptoms:<br>Sig. differences between grps (higher frequency in pt vs control grp) in responses to the following questions on a bowel questionnaire (where frequency is weekly or more often):<br>need to use fingers to help empty bowels, feeling of incomplete bowel emptying, no warning before bowel movement, anal incontinence, need to wear protection for faecal incontinence daytime, adversely affected in general well-being by bowel function |  |
| Langer 2001 <sup>692</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 127 (81% of the 156 treated)* | F mean age 49 (29–79), stress UI (25% mixed)<br>18% had prior continence surgery, mainly anterior repair | Burch colposuspension** | Mean 12.4 years (10–15) | Subjective failure                           | 6.3% during 1st year ( $n = 8$ ; of whom 6 had repeat surgery successfully)<br>No other failures from years 2–15   | Funding: none declared.<br>*8 died, 21 lost to follow-up.<br>**62% had concomitant hysterectomy for gynae indications<br>Urodynamic data also reported – not reproduced here.  |
|                            |                       |                               |  |                         |                         | Complications                                | 22% DO (76% of which within year 1)<br>14% rectoenterocele<br>5% recurrent UTI ( $> 3$ per year)<br>4% dyspareunia<br>4% late voiding difficulties<br>3% vault prolapse<br>1.5% uterine prolapse<br>0.8% vesicovaginal fistula   |  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention           | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Burch 1968 <sup>693</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 143             | F aged 20–79, stress UI<br>37% had prior gynae surgery (17% hysterectomy)<br>Associated pathology<br>52% cystocele, 15% fibroids, 6% ovarian cysts   | Burch colposuspension* | 44% less than 10 months;<br>56% > 10 mo,<br>42% > 20,<br>30% > 30,<br>25% > 40,<br>20% > 50,<br>13% > 60 | Subjective failure<br>Complications                                   | 7%<br>Enterocoele: 5% operated on, 3% suspected<br>3% post-op hernia<br>3% recurrent posterior cystocele  | Funding: none declared.<br>*concomitant procedures:<br>13% vaginal repair of cystocele<br>65% perineorrhaphy<br>45% hysterectomy<br>26% 'obliteration of cul de sac'<br>2% Olhausen suspension. |
| Galloway 1987 <sup>694</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 50              | F 34–76 years, 80% pure stress UI, 20% additional bladder symptoms.<br>38% had prior continence surgery, 26% hysterectomy for uterine pathology<br>Exclusions: possible outflow obstruction (flow rates < 15 ml/s) | Burch colposuspension  | Mean 4.5 (1–6) years   | Subjective cure<br>Further surgery (required in 36%)<br>Complications | 84%<br>12% urethral dilatations for voiding difficulties<br>8% release of one side of the hitch (for *)<br>8% bladder training or oxybutynin tx<br>4% 'Mundy' procedure<br>2% urinary diversion<br>2% phenolisation<br>16% voiding difficulties<br>14% urge syndrome<br>12% 'post-colposuspension syndrome'*<br>4% uterine prolapse<br>4% enterocele<br>4% dyspareunia<br>4% recurrent UI | Funding: none declared.<br>Only F with complete voiding history and video-UD data pre-op were included.<br>*pain in one or other groin at site of hitch.  |
| Lim 1990 <sup>695</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 113             | F age 20–79, stress UI   | Burch colposuspension  | 5 years  | Subjective cure/<br>improvement                                       | 80% at 2 years<br>12% improved<br>78% at 5 years<br>13% improved  | Funding: none declared.<br>Single surgeon<br>*on basis of 'routine urine  |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                              | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
|  |                       |  |   |  |                              | Complications   | Peri- post-op:<br>2% subcutaneous haematoma<br>11% inflamed or infected wound<br>2% cardiovascular<br>0.9% CVA<br>52% UTI*<br>0.9% acute retention<br><br>Late complications:<br>0.9% dyspareunia<br>2% deep left sided pelvic pain<br>4% voiding difficulty<br>5% incisional hernia<br>11% rectocele made worse | culture’.   |
| Kinn 1995 <sup>696</sup>                       | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 153 (92% responded to 5 year questionnaire)  | F mean age 55 (27–82) stress UI (20% with mixed symptoms)<br>10% prior hysterectomy<br>3% prior surgery for vaginal prolapse or UI<br><br>Exclusions:<br>neurological disease, concomitant prolapse; pts with ISD (UCP at rest < 15) treated by sling urethroplasty | Burch colposuspension                                      | Mean 5 years (39–102 months) | Subjective cure or improvement<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Long-term complications (> 2 months to 5 years) | 86% cure at 2 years<br>7% improved<br>7% failed<br><br>78% cure at 5 years<br>11% improved<br>11% failed<br><br>3% urge UI<br>1.3% rectocele<br>1.3% cystocele<br>1.3% coital pain<br>0.7% cicatricial hernia  | Funding: none declared.<br>Single urologist performed procedures.   |
| Ou 1999 <sup>697</sup> and 1993 <sup>698</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40 (5 year follow-up available for 34 [85%]) | F mean age 52 (33–80), UD stress UI   | Laparoscopic Burch using hernia mesh and surgical staples* | 5 years                      | Subjective success  | 93% at 1 year<br>89% at 3 years ( <i>n</i> = 32/36)<br>88% at 5 years ( <i>n</i> = 30/34)  | Funding: none declared.<br>*with concomitant surgery in 80%; anterior/posterior repair, bilateral salpingo- |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                        | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
|                            |                       |                             |   |                                     |   | Complications   | Peri-/post-operative (all transient):<br>3% haematuria<br>6% low grade fever<br>3% retention<br>53% sensation of urgency post-op<br>38% transient <i>de novo</i> DO (resolved by 5 months)<br><i>Longer-term:</i><br>5% ( <i>n</i> = 2) asymptomatic enteroceles at 1 and 3 years; (1/2 had surgery)<br>2.5% cystocele | oophorectomy, hysterectomy and others.<br>10% underwent further surgery during follow-up; hysterectomy, appendectomy, cholecystoectomy, hernia repair.   |
| Ross 1998 <sup>699</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 48                          | F mean age 57 (39–73) years, stress UI<br><br>Exclusions: DO, ISD, POP > grade 2 (Baden scale)<br><br>73% had prior hysterectomy<br>42% prior suspension procedure or vaginal repair for UI | Laparoscopic Burch colposuspension* | 2 years   | Objective cure (negative ultrasound, stress test and UD)<br><br>Complications                   | 93% at 1 year<br>89% at 2 years<br><br>On vaginal examination at 1 year:<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) cystocele, 4% rectocele; both asymptomatic grade 1<br><br>At 2 years, on vaginal examination:<br>4% cystocele (grade 1)<br>6% rectocele (1 grade 2; 2 grade 1)<br>4% apical vault eversion (all grade 1)                | Funding: Laborie Medical Technologies (equipment), Ethicon Endo-surgery (grant-in-aid).<br><br>*Concomitant procedures:<br>27% vaginal hysterectomy, 31% paravaginal repair, 23% posterior vaginal repair. |
| Briel 1986 <sup>700</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 239                         | F mean age 47 years, stress UI (49% with urgency; 13% urge UI)<br><br>Ingelman-Sundberg grading: 75% grade 1, 22% grade 2, 3% grade 3   | MMK                                 | 3–6 years<br>(31% for 3 years, 32% for 4, 24% for 5, 13% for 6) | Subjective cure (dry or markedly improved)<br><br>Urge UI<br><br>'severe' post-op complications | 89%<br><br>24% at 3–6 years (mean change +11%)<br><br>0.8% enterocele ( <i>n</i> = 2)<br>0.4% vesico-vaginal fistula (posthysterectomy fistula)<br>0.4% ureteral injury  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>UD also done and reported for 16% - data not reproduced here.   |
| Zorzos 1996 <sup>701</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 151; 67% (101) responded to | F mean age 47 years (31–85), 46% pure stress UI, 54% also had   | MMK                                 | Mean 51.5 months (14–130);                                      | Success (dry or symptoms improved)  | 73%<br>(83% in pure stress UI grp, 65% in grp with irritative symptoms)  | Funding: none declared<br><br>Retrospective review of records. Senior surgeon or   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                                   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures                     | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
|                               |                       | questionnaire                                     | minor irritative symptoms<br>28% had prior hysterectomy<br>24% prior continence surgery                       |              | median<br>36 months<br>40% ≥ 6 years | Complications                        | Peri- or post-operative:<br>4% UTI<br>5% wound infections<br>9% transient retention<br>2% bladder perforation from a suture (1 of whom had a bladder stone)<br>1% osteitis pubis<br>1% 'sexual problems'<br><br>Longer-term:<br>4% prolonged voiding difficulty treated by urethral dilation | trainees under his supervision undertook procedures.  |
| Czaplicki 1998 <sup>702</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 60 (75% of 81 treated responded to questionnaire) | F mean age 53 years (36–76), grade 2 or 3 stress UI<br>27% prior continence surgery<br>10% prior hysterectomy | MMK*         | Mean 9.9 years (2–15)                | Subjective cure<br><br>Complications | 88% at 3 months<br>81% at 6 months<br>57% at 5 years<br>28% at 10 years<br><br>12% dyspareunia<br>15% feeling of obstruction<br>43% feeling of residual urine<br>77% nocturia<br>77% dribbling<br>5% had repeat continence surgery (MMK, Stamey, or Ingleman-Sundberg)                       | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases, with questionnaires mailed to pts.<br>5 surgeons undertook procedures.<br>*5% pts other procedures done concomitantly incl. Beck's ventrofixation, anterior colporrhaphy. |

*Needle suspensions – case series*

| Study                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                     | Intervention          | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures            | Effect size              | Additional comments                              |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Raz 1992 <sup>703</sup> | Case series       | 290 treated,    | F mean age 59 years (15–87), stress UI with | Raz needle suspension | Mean 15 months      | Subjective cure/improvement | 83% cured<br>7% improved | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review. |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. of patients              | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                      | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
|  | EL = 3                | 206 evaluated*               | hypermobility, and with or without grade 1 cystocele<br>59% prior continence surgery (anterior colporrhaphy, MMK, Burch, needle suspension)<br>44% urgency, 29% urge UI<br>Exclusions: ISD |                                   | (13–95)               | Complications   | 14% <i>de novo</i> DO or worsening of existing DO<br>3.5% protracted suprapubic pain<br>3% enterocele (6/7 underwent surgical repair)<br>2.4% required CISC<br>2% grade 2 or 3 cystocele (3/4 had surgical repair)<br>1.5% dyspareunia<br>1% uterine prolapse<br>1% wound infection<br>0.5% clitoral anaesthesia   | *65 had significant obstruction, 19 inadequate follow-up data.   |
| Korman 1994 <sup>704</sup> and Sirls 1995 <sup>705</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 106 (70% of the 151 treated) | F mean age 56 years (19–82), UD stress UI (type 2 [anatomical] incontinence). 67% also had irritative symptoms<br>57% prior hysterectomy<br>37% prior continence surgery                   | Modified Pereyra procedure (Raz)* | Mean 25 months (9–45) | Subjective cure/improvement (cure = no urine loss regardless of provocative manoeuvres) | By questionnaire assessment (14-items):<br>47% cured<br>17% improved<br>26% same<br>10% worse<br>By retrospective chart review:<br>72% cured<br>17% improved<br>1% same<br>10% worse   | Funding: none declared.<br>Single surgeon performed all procedures.<br>Retrospective review of cases; and questionnaire assessment.<br>*with correction of vaginal vault .prolapse by colporrhaphy in 61%. |
|  |                       |                              |  |                                   |                       | Complications   | 17% <i>de novo</i> irritative symptoms<br>8% symptomatic vaginal prolapse requiring treatment<br>16% moderate to severe dyspareunia<br>6% constant pelvic pain<br>4% prolonged (no definition) urinary retention<br>2% pelvic haematoma<br>1% surgical release of 1 suspension suture to relieve suprapubic discomfort<br>1% DVT<br>1% recurrent UTI<br>1% suprapubic wound infection<br>1% pseudomembranous colitis |  |
| Gilja 2000 <sup>706</sup>                                | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 88 treated and evaluated     | F aged 29–76, UD stress UI with hypermobility<br>Exclusions: suspected   | Modified Raz procedure*           | 1 year and 5 years    | Subjective cure   | 89% at 1 year; of whom 76% were still continent at 5 years<br>(objective cure 69% at 5 years [UD])   | Funding: none declared<br>*suspension sutures fixed to rectus fascia using technique   |

| Study                            | Study type and EL     | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                | Length of follow-up                | Outcome measures                             | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
|                                  |                       | at 1 year<br>71 of 76<br>cured at<br>1 year<br>evaluated<br>at 5 years | ISD  |                             |                                    | Complications                                | 8.3% urge UI owing to <i>de novo</i> DO<br>3.4% unilateral suture removal owing to infection<br>2.2% permanent pain in suprapubic area where suspension sutures tied  | of crossing suspension suture without incision of the suprapubic area.<br>Single urologist undertook all procedures.  |
| Kelly<br>1991 <sup>707</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 114 (79% of the 145 treated)   | F mean age 57 years, UD stress UI; 59% also had urgency and urge UI (23% of whom had DO), and 59% frequency<br>41% had prior continence surgery (mostly MMK and anterior colporrhaphy)<br>46% prior hysterectomy | Modified Pereyra procedure* | Median 3.5 years (2–7.7)           | Subjective outcomes<br>Complications         | 51% cured<br>76% success ('better' or 'much better')<br>Post-operative:<br>41% reqd intermittent catheterisation owing to retention, 62% resumed normal voiding within 2 weeks<br>3% ( <i>n</i> = 3) suprapubic wound infection<br>2% vaginal bleeding<br>2% groin pain<br>1% pull-through of one suspension suture<br>1% urethrovaginal fistula<br>1% granuloma of anterior vaginal wall<br>Longer-term:<br>8% pelvic discomfort<br>16% dyspareunia<br>53% urgency (Less than 59% at baseline), of whom 30% were <i>de novo</i> symptoms | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective chart review with telephone follow-up.<br>*with concomitant procedure in 35% (cystocele repairs, hysterectomy, excisions of urethral diverticula, urethrolisis). |
| Elkabir<br>1998 <sup>708</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 52 (60% of 87 treated)*  | F mean age 53 years (35–86) stress UI  | Gittes procedure            | Mean 46 months, median 53 (24–103) | Subjective cure/improvement<br>Complications | 23% cured (52% at 1 year, 39% at 2 years)<br>27% improved<br>50% failed<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) pneumonia<br>4% wound infections<br>2% 'several' UTI<br>10% persistent unilateral groin pain requiring suture removal from affected side<br>in 92%, normal voiding resumed within 1 month<br>Further surgery undertaken in 15% (8); 3 further Gittes, 5 'other procedures'  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases and mailed questionnaire.<br>One urologist performed procedures.<br>*3 died, 9 moved away; unclear what happened to the other 23.                |
| Takahashi<br>2002 <sup>709</sup> | Case series           | 86   | F mean age 59 (35–81), stress UI   | Stamey procedure*           | Mean 38 months                     | Subjective success (cure or improvement)     | 90%   | Funding: none declared.<br>*with or without anterior  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients                                       | Patient characteristics  | Intervention     | Length of follow-up                      | Outcome measures                                      | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|------------------|--|---|---|---|
|                            | EL = 3                |   | None had prior continence surgery  |                  | (25–108)                                 | Complications   | 17% abdominal pain<br>17% voiding difficulty (duration not stated)<br>2% UTI<br>2% inflammation<br>1% peritoneal perforation<br>1% CIC for > 4 weeks<br>2% reqd removal of suspension sutures   | colporrhaphy (proportions not stated).  |
| Gofrit 1998 <sup>710</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 63 (88% of 72 treated*)                               | F mean age 51 years (31–82), stress UI<br>19% prior continence surgery (mainly anterior colporrhaphy)    | Stamey procedure | Mean 90 months (60–130; minimum 5 years) | Success (no longer needing pads)<br><br>Complications | 70% (30% failure)<br><br>13% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>10% worsening of pre-existing urge symptoms<br>8% stitch infection (reqd removal in 4/5)<br>3% bladder perforation (1/2 reqd laparotomy owing to generalised peritonitis)<br>10% 'temporarily large residual vol.'<br>1% suture removal owing to severe obstructive symptoms | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of case notes, with telephone follow-up.<br>*2 died, 7 lost to follow-up. |
| Huland 1984 <sup>711</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 66 (77% of 86 treated who had 'sufficient' follow-up) | F mean age 55 (23–80), stress UI (15% mixed)<br>56% had prior continence surgery, mainly anterior repair | Stamey procedure | Mean 48 months (20–90)                   | Subjective cure or improvement<br><br>Complications   | 85% (71% cure)<br><br>5% post-op obstructive bladder syndrome<br>suprapubic fistulas (occurring 2–36 months after op):<br>11% one side<br>5% both sides<br>3% required removal of sutures owing to fistula<br>8% temporary suprapubic pain  | Funding: none declared.   |
| Hilton 1991 <sup>712</sup> | Case series           | 100   | F median age 58 (33–81), UD stress UI with or  | Stamey procedure | Median 27 months (3–                     | Actuarial success rate*                               | ~60% at 4 years   | Funding: none declared.   |



| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. of patients          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention     | Length of follow-up                        | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------|--|---|--|---|
|                                | EL = 3                |                          | without DO, and vaginal narrowing such that colposuspension not possible.<br>84% had urgency, 78% urge UI, 36% symptoms of voiding difficulty<br>65% had prior continence surgery (32% of whom $\geq 2$ procedures); 48% had other pelvic surgery, mainly hysterectomy |                  | 51)  | Complications   | 6% pain in 1 or other suprapubic incision<br>3% UTI<br>1% superficial thrombophlebitis<br>1% DVT<br>1% ( $n = 1$ ) passed 1 of the suture buffers vaginally<br>0 <i>de novo</i> DO   | *life-table analysis.   |
| Ashken 1984 <sup>713</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 60                       | F mean age 55 (32–85), stress UI, 42% had mixed UI<br>42% had prior continence surgery, mainly vaginal repair<br>22% hysterectomy  | Stamey procedure | Unclear;<br>43% > 1 year,<br>20% > 2 years | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br><br>Complications                    | 77% cured<br>5% improved<br>18% failed (Leakage or retention)<br><br>7% temporary retention<br>2% ( $n = 1$ ) permanent retention requiring ISC*<br>5% post-op pain<br>3% unilateral stitch<br>3% stitch extrusion or cheese wiring (Stamey repeated, with pts cured)                              | Funding: none declared.<br>*pt also had diabetes and syphilis.                  |
| Kuczyk 1998 <sup>714</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 85 (74% of 115 treated)* | F median age 55 (30–85), stress UI. 11% Stamey grade 1, 66% grade 2, 24% grade 3<br>61% had prior continence surgery (mainly colporrhaphy or MMK), 53% hysterectomy  | Stamey procedure | Mean 61 months (13–93)                     | Subjective cure or improvement<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Complications | 34% cured<br>18% improved<br><br>62%<br><br>41% 'intermittent' retention (Mean duration 12 weeks [1–52])<br>2% persistent retention<br>9% suprapubic pain<br>11% infections<br>7% reqd surgery for tx-related complications<br>4% reqd repeat bladder neck suspension owing to recurrent stress UI | Funding: none declared.<br>*completed an anonymous 5-item postal questionnaire. |
| O'Sullivan 1995 <sup>715</sup> | Case series           | 66                       | F mean age 52 (28–76), stress UI; 12% had DO<br>48% had prior  | Stamey procedure | Mean 3 years, 7 months (6 months –         | Subjective cure or improvement $\geq 1$ year ( $n = 58$ )               | 34% cured<br>28% improved  | Funding: none declared.<br>Questionnaire by mail.                               |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                                     | Intervention | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|----------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|
|       | EL = 3            |                 | gynaecological surgery.<br>16% had prior continence surgery |              | 7 years<br>3 months) | Complications    | Early:<br>25% UTI<br>15% voiding difficulty (catheterised for 4–6 weeks)<br>3% wound infections<br><br>Long-term:<br>7% pelvic pain (sutures removed in 1/5 pts)<br>3% ISC<br>3% developed wound infections and had the sutures removed<br>1.5% ( <i>n</i> = 1) cuff eroded into urethra and caused fibrous obstruction which was excised<br>1.5% sutures and cuffs found subcutaneously in suprapubic incisions (but still continent) |                     |

*TVT vs biological slings – comparative studies*

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention         | Comparison                            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Wadie 2005 <sup>717</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 53              | F mean age 45 years (30–60) with stress UI<br>36% had prior surgery<br><br>Exclusions: pelvic or vaginal surgery within 6 months, predominant urge UI, cystocele > grade 2, associated urethral or bladder pathology, active UTI<br><br>60% also had correction of grade 2 cystocele | TVT ( <i>n</i> = 28) | Rectus fascial sling ( <i>n</i> = 25) | 6 months            | Cure (dry, no pads used, and negative stress test)<br><br>Complications | 92% vs 92%<br><br>0% vs 4% de novo overactivity<br>7% vs 28% wound pain<br>0 urethral erosion<br>0 vaginal erosion | Funding: none declared.<br>One surgeon performed both procedures.<br>Randomisation undertaken after pts received spinal anaesthesia. |

## Study of different surgical techniques for TVT

| Study                  | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Comparison                           | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Lo 2005 <sup>718</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 90           | F mean age ~47–50 years, undergoing primary stress UI surgery, after unsuccessful conservative therapy | Caudocranial tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) 'bottom-up' approach<br><i>n</i> = 45 | Craniocaudal TVT 'top-down' approach | About 1 year*       | Subjective continence status<br><br>Operative care<br><br>Complications (%) | 89% vs 91% cure<br>7% vs 4% improved<br>4% vs 4% failed, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>Mean operating time 26 vs 28 min<br>Hospital stay 1.53 vs 1.78, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>2.2 vs 6.7 bladder perforations<br>0 vs 4.4 vaginal mucosa perforation<br>6.7 vs 8.9 retention<br>4.4 vs 0 <i>de novo</i> DO | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2-] Retrospective review of cases, undertaken at different time points. No consideration of whether groups different in aspects other than for the intervention considered.<br><br>*results for this time reported, although actual duration of follow-up was mean 1.4 (range 1–2.1) and 1.9 (range 1.7–2.9) years. |

## TVT vs other synthetic slings – comparative studies

| Study   | Study type and EL | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                               | Comparison  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Arunkalaivan an 2003 <sup>719</sup><br>3 year follow-up<br>Abdel-Fattah 2004 <sup>720</sup><br>UK study | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 142<br>(at 3 year follow-up, response rates were 88% vs 92%;<br><i>n</i> = 128) <sup>†</sup> | F with UD stress UI, offered surgery following unsuccessful conservative therapy. Median age 54 (32–91) in TVT grp, 53 (34–79) in sling grp<br>37% vs 26% had prior hysterectomy, 12% vs 14% prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: DO, unhappy to be randomised | Tension-free vaginal tape<br><i>n</i> = 68 | Porcine dermal collagen sling (Pelvicol)<br><i>n</i> = 74 | Median 12 months (6–24)<br>And longer follow-up; median 36 vs 34 months <sup>720</sup> | Subjective cure or improvement*<br>(all comparisons<br><i>P</i> = NS) | <p>According to <i>pt-determined continence status at 12 months</i>:</p> <p>85% vs 89% dry<br/>9% vs 3% improved<br/>6% vs 8% failed</p> <p>At ~3 years:</p> <p>88% vs 82% dry<br/>5% vs 10% improved<br/>6% vs 8% failed</p> <p>If non-responders assumed to be failures at 3 years:</p> <p>79% vs 78% dry<br/>5% vs 10% improved<br/>16% vs 13% failed</p> <p>According to <i>pt-determined 'QOL' status at 12 months</i>:</p> <p>75% vs 76% with 90–100% improvement<br/>10% vs 14% with 75–90% improvement<br/>16% vs 11% with &lt; 75% (considered failed)</p> <hr/> <p>Satisfaction</p> <p>77% vs 80% would have same operation (83% vs 85% at 3 years)<br/>71% vs 84%, <i>P</i> = 0.014 would recommend op to a friend (83% vs 88% at 3 years)</p> <hr/> <p>Pad use at 1 year (believed to be daily pad use)</p> <p>Mean 0.46 vs 0.64<br/>median 0 vs 0<br/>range 0–4 vs 0–8</p> | <p>Funding: none declared.<br/>74% vs 80% procedures carried out as day cases; others with planned overnight stay.<br/>Cystoscopy done to ensure lower urinary tract integrity – no bladder perforations were identified.<br/>*all outcomes expect intra-operative complications assessed by postal questionnaire.<br/><sup>†</sup><i>n</i> = 1 vs 2 died; 7 vs 4 lost to follow-up.</p> |

| Study                      | Study type and EL | No. of patients        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                               | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                            |                   |                        |   |  |  |                     | Hospital parameters  | Mean operating time 35 (15–60) vs 30 (20–80) mins, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Hospital stay 1 (1–5) vs 1 (1–12) days, <i>P</i> = NS  |   |
|                            |                   |                        |   |  |  |                     | Complications ( <i>P</i> = NS for all comparisons)           | 19% vs 23% with any<br>13% vs 10% retention < 1 week<br>2% vs 8% retention up to 6 weeks<br>3% vs 4% haemorrhage<br>2% vs 0 infection<br>0% vs 1% severe pain<br>3.4 vs 1.4% permanent CISC (3.3 vs 2.9% at 3 years)<br>3% vs 7% reqd release of sling<br>2% vs 3% reqd urethral dilatation<br>15% vs 18% <i>de novo</i> urgency <br>9% vs 6% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>3% vs 0% dyspareunia |   |
| Liapis 2006 <sup>721</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 89 (of 91 operated on) | F mean age ~52 years, stress UI without evidence of bladder overactivity<br>Exclusions: DO, gynae condition requiring hysterectomy or other gynae operation; previous failed surgical | Tension free vaginal tape ( <i>n</i> = 46) | Tension-free vaginal tape obturator ( <i>n</i> = 43) | 12 months           | Objective outcomes*<br>Subjective outcomes<br>Operative care | Cure 89% vs 90% improvement 6.5 vs 7.6% failure 4.3 vs 2.5%<br>Cure 74% vs 77% improvement 22% vs 16% failure 4% vs 7%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Hospital stay:<br>91% vs 95% 1 day<br>6.5 vs 4.6% 2 days<br>2.2 vs 0 3 or more days<br>Duration of procedure:<br>26.7 vs 17.4 min, <i>P</i> < 0.001   | Funding: none declared.<br>Single surgeon<br>*cure = negative cough stress test during multi-channel cystometry, and 1 h pad test < 1 g;<br>improvement = negative cough stress test and 1 h pad test < 5 g;<br>failure = positive cough stress test and 1 h pad > 5 g. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                           | Comparison                        | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
|                             |                   |  | treatment   |  |                                   |   | Complications   | Haemoglobin loss during 1st post-op day: $1 \pm 0.5$ g/dl vs $0.9 \pm 0.4$ , $P = NS$<br>6.5% ( $n = 3$ ) vs 0 bladder perforation<br>8.7 vs 2.3% urinary retention > 100 ml<br>8.6 vs 9.3% <i>de novo</i> instability<br>10.8 vs 13.9% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>6.5 vs 2.3% UTI<br>2.2% ( $n = 1$ ) in TVT group had vaginal erosion owing to rejection (tape removed) |   |
| Mellier 2004 <sup>722</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 193 (75% contacted by telephone in January 2003) | F mean age 58 years, stress UI. None had genitourinary prolapse. 28% vs 34% had prior continence surgery, and 26% vs 18% prior hysterectomy. 13% both grps had urgency. 27% had ISD | Tension free vaginal tape ( $n = 99$ ) | Transobturator tape* ( $n = 94$ ) | Mean follow-up (clinic and telephone) 29.5 months (20-48) TVT, vs 12.8 (2-20) TOT | Subjective cure or improvement (at most recent post-op visit)<br><br>Satisfaction (telephone interview of 75%)<br><br>Time of discharge from hospital | 91% vs 95% cure, $P = NS$<br>7% vs 4% improved<br>2% vs 1% failed<br><br>85% vs 92% very<br>11% vs 5% moderately<br>4% vs 0% not very<br>1% vs 3% unsatisfied<br><br>71% vs 93% day 1<br>25% vs 7% day 2-3<br>4% vs 1% day $\geq 4$  | Funding: none declared. [EL = 2-] Retrospective analysis of cases performed non-concomitantly over 18 month periods; TVT done between 1999 and 2001, and TOT between 2001 and 2002. All procedures undertaken by same surgeon; data said to reflect learning curve for surgeon for TOT. |

| Study                          | Study type and EL                        | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up             | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
|                                |  |                 | Exclusions: F who underwent a concomitant surgical procedure  |  |  |                                 | Complications   | 10% vs 0% bladder perforation<br>4% vs 0% vaginal perforation<br>0% vs 1% difficulty with needle passage<br>0% vs 1% urethral laceration<br>8% vs 2% haemorrhage < 200 ml<br>1% vs 0% retzius haematoma<br>1% vs 0% subpubic haematoma<br>0% vs 1% vaginal erosion<br>6% vs 8% persisting urgency<br>3.4 vs 4.1% <i>de novo</i> urgency | **same woven mesh of the gynecare or SPARC devices, but [we] used only the meshes and removed their needles'. In all cases the TOT was fitted in the same place at an angle of 45°.<br><br>Cystoscopy performed in all TVT cases, and in 1st 26 of TOT grp. Local anaesthetic in 31% vs 65% cases, spinal or general in remainder. |
| Fischer 2005 <sup>723</sup>    | Cohort<br>EL = 2-                        | 440             | F age range 30 to > 80 years, with UD stress UI owing to urethral hypermobility and/or ISD. Primary procedure in 72% vs 76%<br><br>11% vs 14% mixed UI<br><br>47% vs 54% had prior hysterectomy | TVT ( <i>n</i> = 220)  | TOT (outside-in), <i>n</i> = 220                     | 'more than' 1 year              | Cure (no symptoms and 1 h pad test < 2 g change)<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Operative care<br><br>Complications | 76% vs 81%<br><br>With outcome 88% vs 91%<br>With procedure 89% vs 98%<br><br>Median operating time 24 vs 8 min<br><br>4.5 vs 0.5% bladder perforations<br>0.75% vs 0% revisions for post-op bleeding<br>4% vs 2% divided tapes within 1 year<br>2.5 vs 1.3% persistent sensory urge  | Funding: none declared.<br>TVT cases May 98 to Nov 99; TOT cases Feb to Sept 2003.<br><br>[EL = 2-] Retrospective review of cases, no consideration of possible confounding in analysis of results.  |
| Rechberger 2003 <sup>724</sup> | QuasiRCT (every other person)<br>EL = 1- | 100             | F mean age 54-56 years (34-79), UD stress UI.<br>Prior surgery: 11/50 from TVT grp; 7   | Tension-free vaginal tape (a monofilament tape) ( <i>n</i> = 50) | Intravaginal slingplasty (IVS); a multifilament tape | Planned 18 months (median 13.5) | Objective and subjective cure/improvement   | Cure 88% vs 80%<br>Improvement 10% vs 18%<br>Failure 2% vs 2%<br><i>P</i> = NS all comparisons  | Funding: none from manufacturers.<br>Follow-up assessment blind to tx.<br>Cure = symptom free and  |

| Study                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
|                         |                   |   | TAH, 1 Burch, 1 Kelly, 1 MMK, 1 TAH+Burch, and 13/50 IVS grp: 2 TAH, 1 vaginal hysterectomy, 6 Kelly, 1 Burch, 1 MMK, 1 MMK + Kelly<br>Exclusions: ISD   |                                     | (n = 50)   |                     | Post-op complications (P = NS unless stated otherwise)   | 20% vs 4% retention, P = 0.023<br>4% vs 8% bladder perforation<br>4% vs 2% haemorrhage from venous plexuses around bladder neck<br>16% vs 8% <i>de novo</i> urgency   | negative cough test in supine and standing positions.<br>Improved = negative cough test, but still leakage (less than pre-op) and pads occasionally wet.<br>TAH = total abdominal hysterectomy.   |
| Lim 2005 <sup>725</sup> | SB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 195 randomised, (93% analysed; others had missing data) | F mean age ~56–58 years, UD stress UI, who had failed conservative tx or required prophylactic continence surgery during prolapse repair for occult stress UI (no symptoms, but stress UI found on UD)<br>28 vs 32% vs 16% had prior vaginal repair; 51 vs 53% vs 36% prior hysterectomy, 16 vs 18% vs 13% prior continence surgery<br>69 vs 55% vs 67% urgency, 48 vs 45% vs 53% urge UI, 5 vs 10% vs 5% DO; 15 vs 12% vs 13% | Tension-free vaginal tape* (n = 65) | Intravaginal sling* (n = 65)<br>Suprapubic arc sling* (n = 65) | 6–12 weeks          | Subjective cure/improvement (improved if ≥ 50% reduction in symptoms)<br>Objective cure (on UD)<br>Satisfaction<br>Change in other symptoms (P = NS for all comparisons) | 79 vs 78% vs 75%, P = NS<br>16 vs 12% vs 17% P = NS<br>0 vs 3% vs 3% failed<br>88 vs 82% vs 72% P = NS<br>84 vs 83% vs 85%, P = NS<br>Frequency:<br>34 vs 33% vs 33% cured<br>7 vs 15% vs 20% improved<br>3 vs 8% vs 5% <i>de novo</i><br>Urgency<br>33 vs 33% vs 33% cured<br>36 vs 15% vs 20% improved<br>7 vs 8% vs 5% <i>de novo</i><br>Urge UI:<br>31 vs 30% vs 40% cured<br>16 vs 13% vs 7% improved<br>7 vs 2% vs 10% <i>de novo</i><br>Incomplete bladder emptying:<br>15 vs 28% vs 25% cured<br>3 vs 2% vs 0% improved<br>3 vs 3% vs 3% <i>de novo</i> | Funding: none declared.<br>All procedures by or under supervision of senior author.<br>General anaesthetic in 90%.<br>*concomitant surgery:<br>18 vs 17% vs 7% urethrotomy<br>31 vs 22% vs 36% anterior vaginal repair<br>3 vs 3% vs 7% hysterectomy<br>8 vs 3% vs 3% enterocele repair<br>0 vs 2% vs 3% posterior intravaginal slingplasty<br>3 vs 2% vs 2% transvaginal sacrospinous fixation<br>57 vs 50% vs 44% posterior vaginal repair. |



| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                           | Comparison                                | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
|                              |                   |                 | poor urine stream, 18 vs 30% vs 26% incomplete emptying, 13 vs 10 vs 10 bladder pain   |  |   |                     | Complications ( $P = NS$ unless otherwise stated)                                 | Intra-operative:<br>0 vs 0% vs 5% urethral puncture<br>2 vs 3% vs 7% bladder puncture<br>3 vs 2% vs 13% sling protrusion, $P = 0.04$<br>0 vs 0 vs 0 sling infection<br>3 vs 4% vs 2% <i>de novo</i> DO  |  |
| Andonian 2005 <sup>726</sup> | SB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 84              | F mean age ~60–62 years, UD stress UI with or without POP (proportion not stated). SUI grading: 1 in 9% vs 10%, 63% vs 63% grade 2, 28% vs 27% grade 3. IIQ scores 61 vs 66<br><br>Exclusions: obstructive, unstable bladder function; neurogenic bladders | Tension-free vaginal tape*<br>$n = 41$ | Suprapubic arc sling (SPARC)*<br>$n = 43$ | Minimum 1 year      | Objective cure**<br><br>IIQ score<br><br>Hospital parameters<br><br>Complications | 95% vs 83%, $P = NS$<br><br>45 (95% CI 36 to 54) vs 50 (38 to 70)<br>(where < 50 good to 50–70 moderate, > 70 poor)<br><br>Operating time: 36 (95% CI 27 to 44) vs 32 (26 to 38) mins<br>Median hosp stay (range): 1 night (0–3) vs 1 (0–7)<br><br>Intra-operative:<br>23% vs 24% bladder perforation<br>50 (0 to 250)ml median blood loss both grps<br>9% vs 5% complete retention<br>5% vs 5% further surgery to loosen tape after 3 days<br>Other complications (SPARC grp):<br>2.4% ( $n = 1$ ) tape erosion into vagina requiring partial tape removal<br>2.4% infected pelvic haematoma<br>2.4% fever | Funding: none declared.<br>*with simultaneous anterior and posterior colporrhaphy in symptomatic women with POP. % affected not stated.<br>** wt gain $\leq 2$ g on 1 h ICS pad test.<br><br>Blind assessment at 1 year; 1 pt in TVT grp had died.<br>72% vs 83% had spinal anaesthesia, 23% vs 15% general, 5% vs 2% local. |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                           | Comparison                                | Length of follow-up                             | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Tseng 2005 <sup>727</sup> | SB RCT<br>EL = 1+ | 62              | F mean age 51 years (SD 12)<br>UD stress UI alone or combined with prolapse<br><br>Exclusions:<br>POP > stage 2;<br>prior continence surgery | Tension-free vaginal tape*<br>(n = 31) | Suprapubic arc sling (SPARC)*<br>(n = 31) | Planned 2 years (median 25 months, range 24–30) | Objective cure/improvement<br><br>Hospital parameters<br><br>Post-op complications (P = NS unless stated otherwise) | Cure 87% vs 81%, P = NS<br>improvement 13% vs 19%<br><br>Operating time 33 vs 41 min<br>55% vs 39% local anaesthesia<br>45% vs 61% regional<br>3.14 vs 3.97 days mean hospital stay, P = 0.03<br><br>Intra-operative:<br>0% vs 13% bladder injury<br>106 vs 135 ml mean blood loss<br>16% vs 10% retropubic haematoma ≥ 5 cm<br>Post-operative:<br>6.5 vs 3.2% tape rejection<br>10% vs 3% defective vaginal wound healing<br>13% vs 3% protrusion of tape edge<br>Voiding parameters** (% with):<br>3% vs 7% nocturia<br>10% vs 16% frequency<br>10% vs 16% urgency<br>7% vs 16% urge UI<br>0% vs 3% dysuria<br>19% vs 32% incomplete voiding<br>7% vs 10% strain to void<br>0% vs 13% post-micturition dribble | Funding: none declared.<br>all follow-up exams and outcome assessment blind to tx allocation.<br>*with anterior colporrhaphy ± posterior colporrhaphy for symptomatic vaginal prolapse (23% vs 16%), and vaginal total hysterectomy for pelvic prolapse > ICS stage 2.<br>One surgeon performed all procedures, was 1st experience of SPARC vs 700-case experience with TVT.<br>Objective cure = pad weight ≤ 1 g;<br>improvement = reduction to < half of baseline value.<br>**no baseline data against which to compare. |



| Study                    | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                               | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures                   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
|                          |                   |                 |  |  |   |                                      | Post-op urinary retention          | 95 cases (6.5%)<br>Treatment:<br>38 CISC<br>33 indwelling urethral catheterisation<br>33 surgery (19 sling division, 7 sling loosening, 7 urethrolisis and removal of sling)  |  |
| Hung 2004 <sup>729</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 80              | F mean age 63 (46–85) in TVT grp, vs 55 (32–77) in prolene grp. UD stress UI | Tension-free vaginal tape ( <i>n</i> = 23) | Polypropylene mesh sling (Prolene) ( <i>n</i> = 57) | Mean: 23 months TVT, 20 months sling | Cure or improvement                | Cure (negative cough stress test and no reports of leakage during stress): 65% vs 72%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>Improved (negative cough stress test but may have occasional leakage during stress)   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2–] fewer in the TVT group had conditions that reqd gynaecological surgeries (30% vs 77%, <i>P</i> = 0.0002);<br>*pre = op UDI-6 scores also sig. different at baseline (49 vs 38).<br>Surgeons had performed both procedures in at least 10 pts. |
|                          |                   |                 |  |  |   |                                      | QOL (IIQ-7, UDI-6#); % improvement | IIQ-7: 80% vs 78%, <i>P</i> = NS<br>UDI-6: 77% vs 69%, <i>P</i> = NS*   |  |
|                          |                   |                 |  |  |   |                                      | Complications                      | Intra-op:<br>4% vs 0% bladder perforation, <i>P</i> = NS<br>9% vs 4% urinary retention requiring sling revision (at mean 12 days [7–17])<br>0 vs 3.5% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>9% vs 7% voiding difficulty<br>0% vs 3% dyspareunia<br>0% vs 2% vaginal/suprapubic pain | pts followed-up regularly at the urogynaecology clinic by principal author.<br>#both scales translated in to Chinese.  |

## TVT case series – 1 year follow-up or less

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|---------------------|--|---|---|
| Bodelsson 2002 <sup>754</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 177          | F mean age 56 years (28–84), UD stress UI<br>7% prior continence surgery<br>9% had concomitant surgery          | TVT under LA (73%) and SA (27%)            | 6–8 weeks           | Subjective data<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications<br><br>Operative care | 88% cure<br>11% improved<br>1% no change<br><br>15% bladder perforations*<br>1% urethral perforation<br>0.5% repeated bladder perforation<br>4% intra-op bleeding<br>0.5% haematoma<br>20% failure to void<br>12% urethral dilation<br>7% cystitis<br>6% <i>de novo</i> urge<br>2% sling rejection<br><br>Mean hospital stay 3.9 days | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Cure = absence of urinary leakage as judged by patients.<br>*9.3% in LA group, 29% in SA group, $p = 0.002$ (SA = spinal anaesthesia).<br>Overall, no sig. association between low urethral pressure, concomitant surgery or previous surgery and failure to void. |
| Mazouini 2004 <sup>739</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 71           | F mean age 58 years (36–84), stress UI<br>25% postmenopausal<br>39% had prior surgery<br>No concomitant surgery | TVT under LA (56%), SA (42%) and GA (1.5%) | 6 weeks             | Objective data<br><br>Subjective data ( $n = 55$ )<br><br>Satisfaction               | 87% cure<br>7% improved<br>5% failed<br>1 h pad test:<br>pre-op: 15 g, post-op: 1 g $P < 0.001$<br><br>76% cure<br>20% improved<br>4% failed<br><br>87% satisfied<br>13% disappointed   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = no urine loss during stress test and 1 h pad test < 100 ml.<br>Improved = pad test with 50% decrease in leakage compared to pre-op.<br>Failed = persistent incontinence.<br>Subjective criteria by authors                           |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures                                | Effect size  | Additional comments                      |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------|---|--|--|
|                              |                       |              |  |   |                      | Intra- and post-operative complications         | 4% bladder injury<br>3% tape rejection<br>4% normal voiding after 12 days<br>7% tape cut<br>25% recurrent cystitis<br>25% urgency<br>33% frequency<br>60% voiding difficulties | questionnaire.                           |
|                              |                       |              |  |   |                      | Sexual function (in sexually active group, 77%) | 58% normal<br>20% not satisfactory<br>2% improved<br>15% dyspareunia<br>5% loss of libido  |  |
|                              |                       |              |  |   |                      | Operative care                                  | Mean hospital stay 2.3 days (2–4)  |  |
| Niemczyk 2001 <sup>755</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 100          | F mean age 62 (33–90) years, UD stress UI<br>86% had prior pelvic surgery<br>Mean parity: 2.3<br>82 postmenopausal<br>18 premenopausal | TVT under LA with sedation (97%)<br>RA (3%) | 3 weeks and 2 months | Subjective cure/improvement                     | At 3 weeks (93%)<br>88% cure<br>9% improved<br>3% unchanged<br>At 2 months (54%)<br>85% cure<br>11% improved<br>4% unchanged   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA. |
|                              |                       |              |  |   |                      | Satisfaction                                    | 77% reported minimal/no discomfort with surgery<br>64% rated inconvenience of surgery as none/minimal<br>91% would recommend to friends  |  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                      | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures                          | Effect size  | Additional comments                                      |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|
|                              |                       |              |  |                                   |                            | Intra- and post-operative complications   | 23% bladder perforation<br>1% retained plastic sheet<br>8% UTI<br>5% urinary retention<br>1% retropubic haematoma<br>1% fungal vaginitis<br>5% <i>de novo</i> urge |  |
|                              |                       |              |  |                                   |                            | Operative care                            | Mean operation time 35 min (19–99)   |  |
| Deans 2004 <sup>756</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 62           | F with UD stress UI<br>median age:<br>TVT alone: 57 years<br>TVT+combined surgery:<br>60 years<br>29% prior continence surgery, 31% prior gynae surgery<br>Combined with vaginal procedure in 23%<br>median parity:<br>TVT alone: 2<br>TVT+combined: 2.5 | TVT under LA or GA<br>(no data)   | 6 weeks                    | Post-op complications                     | Voiding difficulty (immediate post-op):<br>25% TVT alone<br>50% TVT+combined (8% and 28% at 6 weeks)<br>11% bacterial cystitis<br>10% <i>de novo</i> urge          | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Australia.           |
| Virtanen 2002 <sup>757</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 46           | F mean age 61 years (37–83), stress UI<br>Mean parity: 2.2 (0–8)<br>Mean BMI: 27.2 (20–36)<br>32% had prior pelvic surgery   | TVT under LA                      | Mean time: 11 weeks (7–16) | Success rate (negative cough stress test) | 94%  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Finland.             |
|                              |                       |              |  |                                   |                            | Intra- and post-operative complications   | 2% haematoma<br>0 bladder, urethral or ureteral injury/laceration; infection, or tape rejection  | Ultrasound outcomes also reported – not reproduced here. |
| Wang 2002 <sup>758</sup>     | Case series           | 59           | F with stress or mixed UI (%mixed not stated)  | TVT under spinal anaesthesia (SA) | 3 months                   | Subjective data                           | 86% cure   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.                 |

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                        | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|
|                                | EL = 3                |              | 42 normal voiders<br>15 abnormal voiders<br>Mean age:<br>normal voiders: 65.8 years<br>abnormal voiders:<br>72 years<br>Previous surgery:<br>normal voiders: 47%<br>abnormal voiders: 67%                |                                     |                     | Factors correlated with post-op voiding dysfunction (% voiding dysfunction in pts with normal vs abnormal voiding post-op)** | Abnormal pre-op uroflow* ( $P = 0.007$ )<br>Pre-op low peak flow rate ( $< 15$ ml/s), 10% vs 45% ( $P = 0.049$ )<br>Pre-op vault collapse or enterocele 10% vs 36% ( $P = 0.017$ )<br>Concomitant vault suspension surgery 10% vs 33% ( $P = 0.03$ )<br>Post-op UTI 14% vs 60% ( $P = 0.006$ )  | Subjective criteria as reported by patients.<br>**'pattern and configuration'.<br>**normal voiding = PVR $< 100$ ml, max. daily frequency 6, and urinary stream considered normal by the patient.   |
| Abdel-Hady 2005 <sup>759</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 658          | F mean age 57 years (28–90), with UD stress UI (19% mixed)<br>10% aged $> 70$ years<br>18% prior failed surgery<br>29% also underwent concomitant surgery<br>median BMI: 27 (19–56), 30% with BMI $> 30$ | TVT under SA unless contraindicated | 6 months            | Subjective data<br><br>QOL (KHQ), mean change from baseline<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications                   | Overall<br>91% cure and happy with operation<br>8% sig. improved<br>$< 1\%$ failed<br>81% in women $> 70$ years old<br><br>–83%, $P < 0.001$<br><br>Bladder perforation (incidence not stated)<br>4% voiding difficulty<br>0.6% retropubic haematomas<br>0.5% thromboembolism<br>4% inability to void/incomplete voids/poor stream<br>0 division of tape<br>Women who had concomitant repair surgery ( $n = 190$ ) tended to take a longer time to recover, but by 6 weeks, outcomes NS between TVT group and TVT +repair surgery | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Women's perception of symptoms: cure, improved $> 50\%$ or no change.<br>Data available on 454 women (31% drop-out).<br>300 completed QOL assessment.<br>Women with previous surgery or vaginal hysterectomy ( $n = 75$ ) reported to be more liable to urethral and bladder injuries. |



| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Karram 2003 <sup>760</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 350          | F mean age 58 years (28–89)<br>with UD stress UI<br>20% had prior continence surgery<br>55% had concomitant pelvic surgery<br>Mean parity: 2.8 (0–12)<br>Mean BMI: 28.5 (18–46) | TVT under GA   | Min 6 months        | Intra- and post-operative complications                        | 4.9% bladder perforations<br>1.1% increased bleeding<br>2% haematomas (1 needing laparotomy)<br>5% voiding dysfunction<br>2% prolonged voiding dysfunction needing cutting of tape<br>11% at least 2 UTI<br>12% persistent urge incontinence<br>1% femoral nerve injury<br>1% wound healing defect<br>0.3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) tape erosion<br>0.3% wound breakdown<br>0.3% tape excision | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Sig. association between women with previous continence surgery and voiding dysfunction (RR 3.27, 95% CI 0.015 to 4.2).                                |
| Moss 2002 <sup>761</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 320          | F median age 55 years (24–85) with UD stress UI<br>48% TVT only<br>51% had prior pelvic surgery<br>231 postmenopausal (61% on HRT)<br>89 pre/intra-menopausal                   | TVT under LA+ sedation (64%), LA (6%), SA (22%)<br>GA (9%) | Min 6 months        | Subjective cure<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications | 92%<br><br>0 mortality<br>4% bladder perforation*<br>11% UTI<br>10% voiding difficulties (based on 245 women)<br>0.3% tape resection<br>0.3% underwent open colposuspension for recurrent SUI   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective criteria = no leakage as judged by patient.<br>*3 in TVT as a primary procedure, 10 in women who had previous pelvic surgery, <i>P</i> = NS. |

| Study                   | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                         |                       |              |   |              |                     | Risk factors/sub group analysis  | <p>Previous surgery:<br/>No sig. association between success rates of TVT as a primary procedure and in women who had previous pelvic surgery</p> <p>No. of previous operations:<br/>No sig. association between voiding difficulties and no. of previous operations</p> <p>Body weight:<br/>Sig. higher subjective success rate in women &gt; 80 kg</p> <p>Menopausal status:<br/>No sig. differences in success rates between pre- and postmenopausal groups, and no sig. difference associated with HRT usage</p> |   |
| Zhu 2005 <sup>750</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 42           | F mean age 52 years (35–79) with UD stress UI<br>Mean parity: 2 (1–5) | TVT under LA | 10 months           | <p>Subjective and objective cure (combined)</p> <p>Intra- and post-operative complications</p> <p>Operative care</p> | <p>93% cure<br/>7% sig. improved</p> <p>0 bladder/blood vessel injury<br/>76% urge incontinence x 1 week, 24% for 2 – 6 weeks<br/>12% urinary retention x 11 days<br/>0 TVT erosion<br/>0 wound infection<br/>0 tape rejection</p> <p>Mean operation time<br/>26.3 min (26–30)<br/>Mean hospital stay<br/>2.9 days (2–12)<br/>82% discharged within 2 days</p>   | <p>Funding: none declared.<br/>Setting: China.</p> <p>Subjective and objective criteria:<br/>Cure = no leakage on cough stress test and patient-determined continence status.<br/>Improved = small leakage on cough test and urine leakage &lt; 50% on 1 h pad test.<br/>Failed = not fulfilling the above.</p> |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. patients   | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures                         | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Paick 2005 <sup>136</sup><br>Associated publications<br>Paick 2004 <sup>137,138</sup><br>(one considered results in stress vs mixed grps and both whether pre-op MUCP or VLPP predict outcomes) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 274 (221 at time of reporting of one series <sup>138</sup> ) | F mean age 55 years (28–80) with UD stress U (73% pure stress UI, 27% with mixed)<br>20% had prior hysterectomy, and 5% prior continence surgery<br>In study with 221 pts, 28% had low VLPP ( $\leq 60$ cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br>73% had VLPP > 60 <sup>138</sup><br>No concomitant surgery reported | TVT under LA (96%), SA (3.6%) and GA (0.7%) | Mean time: 10.5 months (6–52) | Subjective and objective data (combined) | 91% cure<br>9% failed<br>Cure in pure stress UI vs mixed UI grps <sup>137</sup> :<br>96% vs 78% $P < 0.001$<br>(multivariate analysis, TVT failure sig. associated with urge symptoms (OR 15.12, 95% CI 1.90 to 120.61) <sup>138</sup><br>According to VLPP <sup>138</sup> :<br>82% vs 93% for high vs low VLPP, $P = 0.013$<br>Risk of failure higher with MUCP < 20 <sup>138</sup> : (OR 0.92 95% CI 0.86 to 0.99) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Korea.<br>One surgeon.<br>Subjective and objective criteria.<br>Cure = absence of subjective complaint of leakage and absence of objective leakage on stress testing.<br>All other cases considered failures.<br>Low VLPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O.<br>Another Paick publication may include some of these pts who had longer-term follow-up. <sup>802</sup> |
|   |                       |  |  |   |                               | Intra- and post-operative complications  | 4.7% bladder perforations<br>14% urinary retention<br>10% poor flow<br>6% frequency<br>3% dysuria<br>1.7% hesitancy<br>1.7% <i>de novo</i> urge (of pure SUI grp)<br>0.4% wound infection<br>0.4% UTI<br>0.4% acute pyelonephritis<br>1% tape released<br>0.4% tape resected<br>0 haematoma<br>0 wound erosion/poor healing<br>0 tape rejection  |   |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up       | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| Sokol 2005 <sup>741</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 267          | F mean age 61 years (29–93) who underwent TVT<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–10)<br>Mean BMI: 29 (18–52)<br>77% menopausal<br>30% on HRT<br>178 (66%) concomitant prolapse repair<br>71 (26%) concomitant hysterectomy<br>82 (30%) TVT only                    | TVT under GA (72%)<br>TVT only (54% GA, 23% LA, 22% LA+sedation) | Mean: 2 months (0.1–42.6) | Predictors of prolonged urinary retention after TVT                     | Sig. association between increasing age ( $P < 0.001$ ), decreasing BMI ( $P = 0.002$ ) and presence of post-op UTI ( $P < 0.001$ ) with longer time to adequate voiding<br>median days to voiding<br>TVT: 5 days (0–32)<br>TVT+surgery: 8 days (0–44) (NS)<br>Voided the day of surgery:<br>21% of isolated TVT<br>2% of TVT+concomitant surgery ( $P < 0.001$ )<br><br>Sig. association with previous history of continence surgery (OR 2.96, 95% CI 1.17 to 7.06)<br><br>No sig. difference between TVT as an isolated procedure (11.3%) and TVT +prolapse repair (11.2%) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Adequate voiding = 2 consecutive voids of at least 80% of total bladder volume when total vol. $\geq$ 150 ml.<br>Time to adequate voiding = no. of days after surgery required to meet the above criteria for catheter removal. |
| Mukherjee 2001 <sup>752</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 242          | F with UD stress UI<br>36% with BMI $\geq$ 30 (Mean age: 56 years)<br>40% with BMI 25–29 (Mean age 57 years)<br>24% with BMI $<$ 25 (Mean age 55 years)<br>coexisting prolapse (number not reported) corrected before TVT under the same anaesthetic | TVT under SA   | Mean: 38 $\pm$ 16 weeks   | Subjective cure/improvement<br><br>QOL (KHQ), mean change from baseline | Overall:<br>91% cure<br>8% improved<br>1% failed<br>According to BMI ( $\geq$ 30, 25–29, $<$ 25)<br>Cure 89%, 95%, 85%<br>Improved 11%, 5%, 12%<br>Failed 0, 0, 3%<br>$P = NS$ between groups<br><hr/> BMI $\geq$ 30: –78%<br>BMI 25–29: –86%<br>BMI $<$ 25: –80%<br>$P = NS$ between groups, $P < 0.001$ vs baseline  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>By King's QOL and bladder-specific (BSS) questionnaire.  |



| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                               | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Abouassaly 2004 <sup>753</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 241          | F mean age 58 years (25–87), with stress UI<br>Mean parity: 2.5 (0–10)<br>49% had prior hysterectomy, 30% prior pelvic surgery. 36% using HRT<br>9% underwent concomitant pelvic surgery   | TVT under LA (2.5%), RA (96%)<br>GA (1.7%) | Mean time: 147 days (60–484) | Intra- and post-operative complications             | 6% bladder perforations<br>19.5% urinary retention<br>3% tape released<br>1.2% tape sectioned<br>1.7% recurrent SUI<br>1.9% pelvic haematoma<br>0.4% wound infection<br><i>At 1 year</i><br>5.8% <i>de novo</i> urge<br>5.8% reported urgency/frequency<br>17% minor difficulty in voiding<br>7.5% suprapubic discomfort<br>11.8% ≥ 1 UTI<br>1% tape erosion and removal | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Canada.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Cure as judged by the women.   |
|                                |                       |              |  |  |                              | Operative care                                      | Mean operation time 32 min (12–135)<br>Mean hospital stay 2.6 days (1–15)  |   |
| Mutone 2003 <sup>740</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 153          | F with UD stress UI with or without ISD (MUCP < 20 or VLPP < 60; 48% with).<br>Hypermobility present in 91% (defined as Q-tip straining angle ≥ 30°)<br>Mean age:<br>Hypermobile: 58 years (26–87), others: 63 years (49–79)<br>median no of previous surgical procedures:<br>Hypermobile: 0 (0–4)<br>Non-hypermobile: 2 (0–3) | TVT under LA and sedation                  | median: 6 months (0.5–26)    | Subjective data                                     | Overall:<br>91% cure<br>8% improved<br>0.7% no change or worse<br>In subgroups with hypermobility vs no hypermobility*:<br>92% vs 79% cure<br>7% vs 21% improved<br>0.7% vs 0% failed, <i>P</i> = NS for comparisons   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Cure = complete absence of SI symptoms.<br>Failure = partial improvement, no change or worsening of SI symptoms.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Objective cure = subjective cure and negative standing stress test.<br>*straining angle > 30°. |
|                                |                       |              |  |  |                              | Objective cure in pts with hypermobility vs without | 92% vs 79%, <i>P</i> = NS  |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                             |                       |              | ( $p < 0.01$ )<br>None underwent concomitant surgery  |                                |                     | Intra- and post-operative complications (overall)   | 2.6% bladder perforations<br>0.7% mesh erosion<br>0.7% haemorrhage requiring transfusion<br>78% voiding normally without catheter within 2 weeks post-op  |   |
| Segal 2004 <sup>762</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 98           | F mean age 54 ± 12.8 years, with stress UI (34% pure stress, 66% mixed)<br>Mean parity: 2.6 ± 1.7<br>Mean BMI: 29.7 ± 7.4<br>54% Postmenopausal<br>62% on HRT<br>39% had prior continence surgery | TVT under LA and sedation      | Mean time: 7 months | Urge incontinence and OAB symptoms<br><br>QOL (median changes from baseline)<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications | SUI ( $n = 33$ )<br>9% had urge UI post-op<br>34% had OAB post-op ( $n = 98$ )<br>27% used anticholinergics post-op<br><br>IIQ -57 (from 57 to 0 score change), $P = 0.013$<br>UDI: -44 (from 61 to 17), -72%, $P = 0.22$ (significant change in stress, irritative and obstructive scales)<br><br>8% bladder perforation<br>6% voiding dysfunction<br>2% urethral dilatation<br>2% tape revision<br>Sig. association between prior continence surgery and post-op OAB requiring anti-cholinergic (OR 8.2, 95% CI 1.32 to 13.3) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.  |
| Quershi 2003 <sup>763</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 96           | F mean age 54 years (32–84) who had undergone a TVT procedure<br>Parity: 0–6<br>72% had previous gynae surgery  | TVT under LA (3%) and SA (97%) | Up to 3 months      | Patient satisfaction<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications   | 85% success<br>7% partial success<br>10% not successful (pre-op: changed pads ≥ twice/day, post-op: none)<br><br>7% bladder injury<br>30% minimal bleeding<br>4% pain on voiding at 3 months<br>12% readmission for UTI/constipation<br>1% tape removal<br>1% worsening DO and recurrent UTI  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Author's questionnaire used to assess subjective satisfaction. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                         | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Walsh 2004 <sup>764</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 67           | F with UD stress UI<br>69% aged < 70 years (mean 54), and 31% aged > 70 (mean 76)<br>28% of younger age group had prior continence surgery, 6% collagen injection. 67% of older age group had prior surgery, 38% collagen injection | TVT (Type of anaesthesia not stated) | Mean time 9 months (for under 70 years) and 12 months (for over 70 years) | Subjective data<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications | SUI improved:<br>By 90% in under 70 ( $P = 0.037$ )<br>By 80% in over 70 ( $P = 0.046$ )<br>Sig. improvement in frequency and urgency symptoms pre-op and post-op in the two age groups<br><br>4% bladder perforations<br>0 bowel/vascular injury/other complications<br>57% spontaneous voiding post-op in both groups | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>QOL using King's Health Questionnaire. |
| Ghezzi 2005 <sup>746</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 53           | Sexually active women with stress UI<br>Mean age 51 years (34–70)<br>29% using HRT<br>43% experience UI during intercourse  | TVT under GA (38%) or spinal (62%)   | Median 12 months (range 6–12)   | Change in sexual function<br><br>complications                 | 62% unchanged<br>34% improved<br>4% worsened<br>Coital UI cured in 87%<br><br>3.8% bladder perforation<br>5.7% voiding dysfunction<br>3.8% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>1.9% ( $n = 1$ ) vaginal erosion  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Italy.   |

## TVT case series – 1 and 2 years follow-up

| Study                       | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                       | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Meschia 2001 <sup>777</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Prospective | 404          | F mean age 57 years (31–83), with UD stress UI.<br>29% had urgency; 14% urge UI<br>3% marked genital prolapse + urinary leakage during stress<br>25% women had | TVT<br>44% under LA, 50% SA, 6% GA | 21 months (range 12–35) | Objective cure<br><br>Subjective data<br><br>Mean symptom score | 90%<br><br>92% cure<br>4% improved<br>4% failed<br>Post-op: 0.7 (range 0–10) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: 6 hospitals in Italy.<br>All patients received prophylactic antibiotic therapy before surgery.<br>Objective cure = no urine leakage during cough |



| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention        | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Meschia 1999 <sup>951</sup> |                       |              | associated anatomical defects at vaginal sites<br>Mean parity: 2 (range 0–2)<br>Mean BMI: 26 (range 17–36)<br>19% had prior pelvic surgery<br>21% had other reconstructive procedures      |                     |   | Intra- and post-operative complications  | 6% uneventful bladder perforations<br>4% voiding difficulties (PVR ≥ 100 ml)<br>1.5% retropubic haematoma – spontaneously absorbed<br>0.5% laparotomy for retropubic bleeding<br>0.5% defective healing<br>0.3% obturator nerve injury   | provocation test.<br>Subjective criteria.<br>'cure' = no urine loss during stress; 'improved' = significantly fewer leakage episodes during stress with a satisfied patient.<br>'failed' = similar no of leakage episodes post-op as pre-op.<br>Symptom score: perception of severity of incontinence by VAS (0–10). |
| Richter 2005 <sup>778</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 87           | F mean age 56 years (31–95) with stress UI<br>60% had prior therapy (behavioural, medication or pessary use)<br>40.2% had no previous treatment<br>82.8% underwent ≥ 1 concomitant surgery | TVT under SA<br>82% | Mean time 19 months<br>Data available for 84% at 1 month, 24% at 2 years) | IIQ (mean change from baseline)<br>UDI (mean change from baseline)<br>Satisfaction (at 24 months)<br>Post-op complications | –95%, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>–72%, <i>P</i> < 0.01<br>96% satisfied<br>Not reported   | Funding: Health Services Foundation, University of Alabama, Birmingham, USA.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Concomitant pelvic reconstructive surgery: ant/post colporrhaphy, vaginal vault suspension, vaginal hysterectomy, colpocleisis.   |
| Lo 2002 <sup>779</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45           | F mean age 69 years (65–85), with UD stress UI<br>27% had previous surgery<br>median parity: 5 (2–9)   | TVT under LA        | Mean 19.7 months (12–34)  | Objective and subjective data<br>Post-op complications<br>Operative care   | 91% cure<br>2% improved<br>7% failed<br>4% bladder perforation<br>11% cystitis<br>15% urge<br>4% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>4% voiding discomfort<br>0 retention<br>0 defective healing<br>0 tape rejection<br>Mean operation time 21 min (18–35)<br>Mean hospital stay 24 h (12–72) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>Objective and subjective criteria:<br>Cure = 1 h pad test < 2 g/h, no urinary leakage.<br>Improved = 2–5 g/h pad test, leakage on coughing.<br>Failed = > 5 g/h leakage.  |

| Study                              | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention         | Length of follow-up                        | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Wang 2000 <sup>780</sup>           | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 39           | F mean age 43 years (range 22–74), UD stress UI<br>Mean parity: 4.1 (range 0–7)   | TVT under SA         | median time 19 months (range 12–24 months) | Objective data<br><br>Subjective data  | 85% cure<br>5% improved<br>10% failed<br>87% cure<br>5% improved<br>8% failed  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>Objective cure:<br>pad weight < 5 g on 1 h pad;<br>improvement > 50% reduction,<br>failure > 5 g weight. |
|                                    |                       |              |   |                      |  | Post-op urological symptoms  | 21% frequency<br>15% feeling of incomplete voiding<br>5% dysuria<br>8% positive urine culture<br>0 <i>de novo</i> DO   | Subjective cure:<br>no urine loss during exercise;<br>improvement < 50% leakage episodes vs pre-op,<br>failure > 50% leakage episodes vs pre-op.        |
| Palma 2002 <sup>781</sup>          | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 110          | F median age 53 years (42–72), UD stress UI<br>31% cystocele (94% Grade I, 6% Grade II)<br>11% rectocele<br>7% perineal rupture<br>Dystopy correction performed | TVT<br>92% SA, 8% LA | Mean time 18 months (range 2–24)           | Subjective cure /improvement<br><br>Post-op complications                    | 81% cure<br>9% improvement<br>10% unsatisfied<br>13% bladder perforation<br>9% urinary retention<br>0.9% required surgical lysis of TVT<br>0 vaginal infection or tape erosion<br>29% transient irritative post-voiding symptoms; urgency persisted in 18%, and urge UI in 5% (DO present in 35% of these) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Brazil.<br>Antibiotic prophylaxis 1 h pre-op and for 24 h post-op.  |
|                                    |                       |              |   |                      |  | Operative care   | Mean operation time<br>30 min (20–90 min)<br>40 min if dystopy correction<br>Mean hospital stay 24 h (12–36 h)   |   |
| Ulmsten 1996 <sup>782</sup><br>HTA | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 75           | F mean age 52 years (36–81) with SUI (urodynamically proven)  | TVT under LA         | 2 years                                    | Subjective and objective data<br><br>Intra- and post-operative complications | 84% cure<br>8% improved<br>8% no change<br>7% voiding problems<br>0 defective healing<br>0 sling rejection   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Subjective and objective criteria:<br>QOL assessment and pad test.                                       |

| Study                        | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                      | Length of follow-up              | Outcome measures                       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                              |                                      |              |  |   |                                  | Operative care                         | Mean operation time 22 min (16–42)<br>Mean sick leave 10 days (7–21)   |   |
| Gateau 2003 <sup>783</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Prospective | 112          | F mean age 60 years (29–87), with UD stress UI<br>37% had prior continence surgery   | TVT under SA or GA                                | Mean time 22.6 months (7–23)     | Subjective data                        | CONTILIFE (QOL)<br>87% cure<br>13% improved<br>MUH*<br>Significant improvement in all elements: mean no of complaints about SUI, sensation of dysuria, micturition urge, satisfaction, ( $P \leq 0.01$ )               | Funding: none declared<br>Setting: France.<br>QOL assessed by Contilife and *MUH (measurement of urinary handicap).   |
|                              |                                      |              |  |   |                                  | Complications                          | 10% bladder perforations<br>2.7% haematomas<br>7.2% urinary retention at 1 month<br>11.6% <i>de novo</i> urge  |   |
| Vassallo 2002 <sup>784</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 151          | F mean age 61 (SD13)<br>Women with SUI (77% 'anatomic', 9% ISD, 15% occult)<br>Mean parity: 3.01 ± 1.8<br>52% on HRT<br>31% prior continence surgery<br>75% underwent concomitant procedures | TVT under LA and GA (for concomitant surgery)     | Mean time 22.1 months (6.1–49.8) | QOL (score change from baseline)       | IIQ-7<br>–73%, $P < 0.001$<br>UDI-6<br>–57%, $P < 0.001$   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>QOL results also reported for subgroups of anatomic, ISD and occult SUI; data not reproduced here.  |
| Cetinel 2004 <sup>785</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 75           | F mean age 51 years (33–69), with UD stress UI (79% mixed UI)<br>Mean parity: 5.2 (1–28)<br>17% previous surgery   | Modified TVT under LA (57%), GA (39%) and EA (4%) | Mean time 21.6 months (6–38)     | Subjective data (at 12 months or more) | 87% cure<br>10% improved<br>3% failure<br>In pure stress vs mixed UI groups:<br>In women with MUI ( $n = 59$ )<br>44 (74%) urge incontinence disappeared<br>In women with SUI ( $n = 16$ )<br>0 <i>de novo</i> urgency | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Turkey.<br>56 (75%) operated by experienced urologists.<br>19 (25%) by residents under tutor's supervision.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Cure = did not leak urine at all.<br>Improvement = use < 1 pad |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Satisfaction                    | 93% satisfied<br>90% would accept op again and recommend to friends  | daily and/or declared complete satisfaction.<br>Failure = any leakage.  |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Intra-operative complications   | 4% bladder perforation<br>3% bleeding needing transfusion<br>16% voiding difficulties<br>1% lower urinary tract symptoms<br>12% inguinal pain<br>2.6% skin and prolene skin infections<br>7% UTI             | EA = epidural analgesia.  |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Factors predicting cure rate    | Patient's age over 55 years (logistics regression, multivariate analysis; Exp[β]:8.76, 95% CI 1.57 to 48.95)<br>Type of anaesthesia (local, epidural, general): NS<br>Experienced surgeons and residents: NS |   |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Operative care                  | Mean operating time 34.7 min (20–70)<br>Mean hospital stay 1.2 days (1–5)  |   |
| Fiori 2003 <sup>786</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 57           | Women with SUI and Grade 1–2 cystocele (urodynamically proven)<br>Mean age: 62 years (42–83)<br>33.4% had previous laparotomy<br>15.8% had vaginal procedures | TVT under SA | 22.2 months         | Objective data                  | 88% cure<br>9% improved  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Italy.  |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | QOL                             | Sig. improvement (no data given)<br>0 modification of sexual habits  | QOL assessed by self-evaluation questionnaires (VAS 1–10).  |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Intra-and post-op complications | 1.7% bladder perforation<br>1.7% retropubic haematoma<br>1.7% loin pain<br>1.7% persistent pubic pain<br>1.7% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>24% short-term voiding difficulties                                  | Objective cure = full-time continence with negative stress test.<br>'Improved' = slightly positive stress test with pad test leakage < 20 g/24 h. |
|                           |                       |              |   |              |                     | Operative care                  | Mean operation time 35 min   |   |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. patients       | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------|--|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Allahdin 2004 <sup>787</sup><br>Associated study<br>Allahdin 2004 <sup>788</sup><br>which reported outcomes irrespective of age, although fewer pts recruited at time of report | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 179                | F mean age 61 years (31–90), with UD stress or mixed UI (~36% mixed)<br>Group A = 30–49 years (n = 53)<br>Group B = 50–69 years (n = 91)<br>Group C = 70–90 years (n = 35) | TVT (type of anaesthesia not stated)     | Mean time 21 months (1–40) | Subjective data                  | 83% cure<br>(85% in A; 81% in B; 86% in C)<br>10% sig. improved<br>(4% in A; 14% in B; 9% in C)<br>7% failure<br>(11% in A; 4% in B; 6% in C)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective cure = 80–100% improvement by QOL.<br>Sig. improved = 50–70% improvement.<br>Failure = < 50% improvement.  |
|   |                       |                    |  |  |                            | Intra- and post-op complications | 3% bladder perforations<br>0.5% urethral perforation<br>1.6% bleeding > 200 ml<br>9% voiding problems<br>16% urgency<br>2.8% CISC<br>1.6% TVT erosion   | Intra-operative antibiotic prophylaxis.  |
|   |                       |                    |  |  |                            | Operative care                   | Length of hospital stay:<br>150 day cases<br>24 stayed 1–8 days   |  |
| Allahdin 2004 <sup>788</sup><br>Associated study<br>Allahdin 2004 <sup>787</sup><br>which aimed to compare outcomes in different age grps                                       | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 162 (data for 79%) | F mean age 64 years (38–90) with UD stress or mixed UI (36% mixed)<br>143 TVT only<br>16 TVT+concomitant surgery<br>Mean age: 64 years (38–90)<br>Mean BMI: 36 (23–49)     | TVT under LA (32%), SA (64%) and GA (4%) | Up to 1 year               | Subjective data                  | Overall<br>85% cure<br>11% improved<br>4% failed<br>In mixed UI group:<br>88% cure<br>9% improved<br>3% failed  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>1 trained urologist supervised 52 cases.<br>1 trained gynaecologist supervised 110 cases.<br>10% operations involved trainees, supervised.<br>Subjective criteria by QOL questionnaire. |
|   |                       |                    |  |  |                            | Intra- and post-op complications | 3.6% bladder perforations<br>1.2% urethral perforations<br>1.2% bleeding > 200 ml<br>0.6% retropubic haematoma<br>2% voiding problem needing CISC<br>5% urgency<br>1.2% vaginal wall erosion of TVT<br>0.6% intractable urge incontinence | Cure = 90% improvement in symptoms of incontinence.<br>Improved = 70–90% improvement in these symptoms.<br>Failed = < 70% improvement.<br>128 women completed study at   |

| Study  | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures                              | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|--|
|  |                                      |              |   |  |                              | Operative care                                | Mean hospital stay<br>TVT only: 2 days (1–3)<br>TVT+surgery: 6 days (5–8)   | 1 year.  |
| Price 2004 <sup>789</sup><br>(Audit of TVT use vs NICE guidance) | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>audit       | 95           | F mean age 59 (33–90) with UD stress UI<br>84% failed physiotherapy.<br>7% had complete genital prolapse, 5% declined physiotherapy<br>42% TVT for relapses<br>36% underwent concomitant surgery (pelvic floor repair, hysterectomy, or both) | TVT under SA (80%), GA (14%) and LA (7%) | Mean time 20 months          | Subjective data                               | 75% cure<br>21% sig. improvement<br>3% no change<br>1% worse  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>79 TVT performed by consultant; 16 by SpR under supervision.  |
|  |                                      |              |   |  |                              | Satisfaction (questionnaire)                  | 76% mostly satisfied<br>16% mixed feelings<br>5.6% mostly dissatisfied<br>0% unhappy<br>92% would recommend TVT   | Subjective data from BFLUTS questionnaire.   |
|  |                                      |              |   |  |                              | Intra-op complications                        | 4% bladder/urethral perforation<br>1% bleeding<br>27% voiding problem post-op<br>2% long-term voiding problem<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>0% tape rejection<br>0% defective healing                                |  |
| Levin 2004 <sup>770</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>prospective | 313          | F mean age 64 ± 11 years, UD stress UI. 27% had occult stress UI + prolapse)<br>86% postmenopausal (20% on HRT)<br>19% had hysterectomy<br>4% had undergone anti-continenence surgery   | TVT (50% under EA or SA)                 | Mean time 21.4 ± 13.5 months | Post-op complications ( <i>n</i> = 241 [77%]) | 5% intravesical passage of tape<br>2.5% voiding problems<br>1.3% erosion of tape<br>10% fever<br>10% UTI<br>1.3% retropubic haematoma<br>6.6% persistent mild SUI<br>8.3% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>0 blood transfusion | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Israel.<br>*these 313 patients also analysed in a case-control study of 460 women, where outcomes considered by age (Gordon 2005 <sup>820</sup> ). |
|  |                                      |              |   |  |                              | Operative care                                | Mean hospital stay 4.8 ± 3.1 days   |  |
| Lo 2003 <sup>773</sup>   | Case series                          | 58           | F mean age 55 years (38–29), UD stress UI   | TVT under SA or EA                       | Mean: 18 months              | Objective cure                                | 91% cure<br>10% failed at 1 year  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.  |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                           | EL = 3                |              | 129 concomitant surgeries (no of women not stated)<br>Mean parity: 5 (2–9)<br>16% had previous pelvic surgery  |   |                     | Complications  | 0 bladder injuries<br>0 healing defect of vaginal/abdominal wound<br>0 tape rejection<br>7% UTI<br>5% febrile episodes<br>3.4% gluteal pain  | 3 women loss to follow-up.<br>Objective cure = pad test < 2 g/h without urine leakage on coughing.<br>Failed = urine loss > 2 g/h and leakage on cough test.  |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                     | Operative care   | Mean operating time 21 mins (18–35)<br>median hospital stay 3.4 days (3–9)   |   |
| Carta 2002 <sup>766</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 52           | F mean age 57 years (SD 10), UD stress UI (13% with MUI)<br>4 had previous continence surgery<br>28 postmenopausal<br>Mean age: 56.7 ± 10.3 years<br>Mean parity: 2.05 ± 1.3 | TVT under SA (94%), LA (4%) and GA (2%) | Up to 18 months     | Subjective data (in pure stress UI grp and mixed UI grp)<br><br>Objective data (in pure stress UI vs mixed UI grp) | Cure (pure stress UI vs mixed UI) 81% vs 43%<br>Improved 9% vs 28%<br>No change 7% vs 28%<br><br>Cure 89% vs 43%<br>Improved 11% vs 57%<br>0% no change                              | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Italy.<br>Subjective criteria by questionnaire.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = if continent with stress test or no sign of urine retention or no sign of residual > 150 ml. |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                     | Intra- and post-op complications   | 5.7% bladder perforations<br>7.7% urinary retention 1st week post-op<br>2% urinary retention after 4 weeks – section of tape without removal<br>0 tape rejection<br>0 healing defect |   |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                     | Operative care   | Mean operating time 25.3 min (20–40)<br>Mean hospital stay 2.4 days (2–6)  |   |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                   | Length of follow-up         | Outcome measures                            | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Huang 2003 <sup>736</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 106          | F mean age 57 (SD 11) years, UD stress UI<br>50% had uterine prolapse;<br>50% myomas<br>50% underwent TVT+LAVH, and<br>50% TVT+VTH+APC | TVT + hysterectomy (VH, APC and LAVH) under GA | Mean time 18 months (12–36) | Objective data                              | Overall cure 86%<br>TVT+LAVH ( <i>n</i> = 53)<br>86% cure<br>4% improved<br>4% failed<br>TVT+VTH+APC ( <i>n</i> = 53)<br>85% cure<br>6% improved<br>4% failed   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>APC = anteroposterior colporrhaphy.<br>VTH = vaginal total hysterectomy.<br>LAVH = laparoscopic-assisted vaginal hysterectomy.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = negative cough stress, 1 h pad test < 5 g , no urine leakage.<br>Improved = negative cough stress, 1 h pad test < 50% pre-op , urine leakage at cough provocation.<br>Failed = positive cough stress, 1 h pad test > 50% pre-op, urine leakage.<br>Subjective criteria (VAS):<br>Cure = VAS > 90%<br>Improved = VAS 75–90%.<br>Failed = VAS < 75%.<br>100 women completed study. |
|                           |                       |              |  |  |                             | Subjective data                             | Overall cure 90%<br>TVT+LAVH<br>91% cure<br>4% improved<br>0 failed<br>TVT+VTH+APC<br>89% cure<br>6% improved<br>0 failed   |   |
|                           |                       |              |  |  |                             | Post-op complications (related to TVT only) | <i>Overall</i><br>2% bladder perforations<br>11% voiding difficulty<br>10% urinary urgency<br>0% blood transfusion<br>0% laparotomy<br>IISTVT+LAVH<br>IIE8% urinary urgency<br>8% voiding difficulty<br>IISTVT+VTH+APC<br>IIE11% urinary urgency<br>4% voiding difficulty |   |



| Study                           | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up            | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                 |                                      |              |  |                                 |                                | Operative care   | TVT+LAVH<br>Mean hospital stay: 3.5 days<br>Mean catheterisation time: 1.5 days<br>TVT+VTH+APC<br>Mean hospital stay: 4.8 days<br>Mean catheterisation time: 3.7 days   |  |
| Haab 2001 <sup>776</sup>        | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>prospective | 62           | F mean age 63 (SD 7) years, with SUI<br>26% had previous surgery for SUI<br>Exclusion: urge incontinence, DO, sphincter deficiency | TVT under SA (68%) and LA (32%) | Mean time: 16.8 months (12–24) | Subjective and objective data<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Post-op complications<br><br>Operative care | 87% cure<br>10% improved<br>3% failed<br><br>97% would undergo surgery again<br>94% would recommend TVT to friends<br>2% would not<br>5% not sure<br><br>10% bladder perforations (5 in women who had previous surgery vs 1 in women who had no previous surgery; $P < 0.01$ )<br>6% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>0 pelvic pain or dyspareunia<br>0 infection<br>0 sling rejection<br><br>Mean operating time 23 ± 11 min (16–42) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>QOL/satisfaction by questionnaire using VAS.<br>Cure = no leakage based on QOL and stress test.<br>Improved = ≥ 50% decrease in symptoms based on QOL.<br>Failed = did not meet above cure or improvement criteria.<br>All women taught CISC<br>Intra- and post-op antibiotics. |
| Laurikainen 2003 <sup>769</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 191          | F median age: 60 years (32–84) with symptoms of stress UI (34% mixed UI)   | TVT under LA (82%) and SA       | Mean time: 17 months (3–36)    | Subjective data  | 88% cure<br>(69% of MUI, 97% SUI, $p = 0.001$ )<br>12% minimal/no improvement   | Funding: None declared.<br>Setting: Finland.<br>90% performed by same  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up         | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
|                             |                       |              | median parity: 2 (0–8)<br>median BMI: 27 (19–39)<br>119 on HRT<br>58% had previous surgery:<br>20% continence surgery<br>40% hysterectomy<br>13% vaginal surgery<br>13% abd/gynae surgery<br>Concomitant surgery +TVT<br>7% for prolapse<br>11% hysterectomy | (18%)        |                             | Post-op complications<br><br>'Cure' data in subgroups<br><br>Operative care | 2.6% bladder perforations<br>0.5% severe bleeding (400 ml)<br>2.6% haematomas<br>29 (15%) overall minor complications:<br>0.5% wound infection<br>9.5% UTI<br>4.8% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>10% urinary retention<br>0.5% underwent TVT twice<br>0 nerve/vessel/bowel injury<br>0 tape rejection<br><br>Complications in women with previous surgery vs women without: 17% vs 13% (NS)<br><br>Complications in obese vs non-obese women: 18% vs 14% (NS)<br><br>Obese vs non-obese: NS<br>LA vs SA: NS<br>Hysterectomy vs no hysterectomy: NS<br>TVT vs TVT+other surgery :NS<br>Concomitant chronic disease vs no such disease: NS<br><br>Mean operating time 27 min (16–63) (Obese vs non-obese: NS)<br>Mean hospital stay 2 days (1–10)<br>Mean sick leave 18 days (2–50) | surgeon.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>cure = report by women of being completely continent at any stress situation. |
| Nilsson 2001 <sup>771</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 161          | F mean age 56 years (29–81), with recurrent UD stress UI and MUCP < 20   | TVT under LA | Mean time: 16 months (6–24) | Subjective and objective data   | 87% cure (81% MUI, 78% of low UCP)<br>7% improved<br>5% failed  | Funding: None declared.<br>Setting: Finland.<br>TVT performed by 2 surgeons.                                      |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                             | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures           | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
|                           |                       |              | (37% mixed UI)<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–9)<br>Mean BMI: 25 (19–35)<br>Duration of symptoms: 10 years (1–50)<br>41% prior hysterectomy<br>28% prior continence surgery |  |                               | Post-op complications      | 20% minor complications overall<br>3.7% bladder perforations<br>4.3% urinary retention<br>6.2% UTI<br>3% <i>de novo</i> urgency (with/without UI)<br>0.6% blood loss of 450 ml<br>0.6% wound infection<br>0.6% retropubic haematoma<br>0 tape rejection<br>0 defective healing | Subjective and objective criteria:<br>Cure = negative stress test, no leakage by 24 h pad test, < 5 on VAS scale, chose 'cure' from 4 answers.<br>Improved = negative stress test, 75% on VAS scale, chose 'improved' from 4 answers.<br>Failed = < 75% on VAS scale. |
|                           |                       |              |   |  |                               | Operative care             | median operating time 22 min (10–40)   |   |
| Flock 2004 <sup>743</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 336          | F mean age 63 years (40–87) with SUI (34% mixed UI)<br>11% had prior surgery<br>26% underwent TVT+other gynaec surgeries  | TVT under LA (73%), SA (23%) and GA (4%) | median time: 16 months (5–25) | Haemorrhagic complications | 2% increased blood loss (> 200 ml)<br>4% retropubic haematoma (40–1000 ml)<br>(obese vs non-obese: NS; TVT+other surgery vs TVT alone: NS)<br>1% surgical removal of haematoma (1 laparotomy, 3 laparoscopic aspiration)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Germany.<br>No continence outcomes reported.  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures              | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Ramaswamy 2004 <sup>765</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 90 pts treated; 86 had complete records, and 70 (78%) responded to questionnaire follow-up | F mean age: 50 years (31–83), with UD stress UI (8% mixed UI)<br>Mean parity: 2.5 (0–7)<br>26% had co-morbidities | TVT under LA (2%) and SA (88%) | 16.3 months (3–28)  | Subjective and objective data | TVT questionnaire ( <i>n</i> = 70):<br>79% success (cure or improvement)<br>In women with pure stress UI ( <i>n</i> = 63):<br>59% cure<br>22% improved<br>8% worsened<br>11% no change<br>Mixed UI group ( <i>n</i> = 7):<br>29% cure<br>29% improved<br>29% worsened<br>13% no change<br>Audit of records ( <i>n</i> = 84):<br>Overall: 82% success<br>In pure stress UI grp:<br>64% dry<br>23% mostly dry<br>13% wet<br>Mixed UI grp<br>43% dry<br>29% mostly dry<br>29% wet | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>TVT performed by 4 experienced surgeons.<br>Subjective criteria: TVT questionnaire.<br>Objective criteria: TVT audit survey. |
|                               |                       |  |   |                                |                     | Complications                 | 14% bladder perforations<br>8% CISC<br>1% further colposuspension<br>1% urinary diversion<br>28% urge  |   |
|                               |                       |  |   |                                |                     | Operative care                | median hospital stay 3.4 days (2–14)   |   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                             | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures              | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| de Mattieis <sup>737</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 98           | F mean age 62 (39–79), with UD stress UI   | TVT + other vaginal surgery under LA     | 14.6 months (4–24)            | Success rate                  | 77% cure<br>(10% moderate DO – disappeared after 10 months)<br>4% improved<br>5% failed  | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Italy.<br>Criteria not stated for 'cure, improved, failure'.   |
|                            |                       |              |  |  |                               | Post-op complications         | 1% lesion on iliac vein<br>3% bladder perforations<br>1% haematoma of the Retzius  |   |
| Soulie 2001 <sup>768</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 52           | F mean age 64 years (37–91), with stress UI (56% 29 recurrent SUI, 23% mixed UI). 67% had urethral hypermobility<br>15% underwent an associated pelvic prolapse repair<br>Exclusions:<br>Psychiatric patients, neurogenic and hypocontractile bladders | TVT under SA (82%), LA (12%) and GA (6%) | 15 months (6–36)              | Subjective and objective data | Overall 83% cure<br>In pts with MUCP < 30 cmH <sub>2</sub> O ( <i>n</i> = 27):<br>78% cure<br>In pts with MUCP > 30 cmH <sub>2</sub> O ( <i>n</i> = 25):<br>88% cure<br>17% improved<br>0 failed | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>TVT performed by 9 surgeons in 5 centres.<br>Subjective and objective criteria using questionnaire:<br>Cure = no leakage, no need of pads, no major urinary retention.<br>Improved = minimal leakage without disturbing daily living.<br>Failure = no change or worsened. |
|                            |                       |              |  |  |                               | Complications                 | 11.5% bladder perforations<br>17% transient urinary retention<br>0 sling infection<br>0 vaginal erosion<br>0 <i>de novo</i> urge   |   |
|                            |                       |              |  |  |                               | Operative care                | Mean operating time 30 min (20–60)<br>Mean hospital stay<br>TVT: 2.5 days (1–7)<br>TVT+ repair: 4.3 days (2–17)  |   |
| Lo 2002 <sup>730</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 41           | F mean age: 50 years with UD stress UI who had undergone at least 1  | TVT under LA (78%) and SA                | median time 16 months (12–24) | Objective cure/improvement    | 83% cure<br>5% improved<br>12% failed (3 had ISD pre-op)   | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>Subjective and objective  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures             | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|---------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
|                             |                       |              | unsuccessful continence procedure<br>27% had ISD<br>Mean parity: 3.5<br>22% had concomitant surgery | (22%)                                   |                     | Complications                | 10% bladder perforations<br>17% urge<br>5% voiding discomfort<br>0 healing defect<br>0 haematoma<br>0 <i>de novo</i> voiding difficulty                            | criteria:<br>Cure = no leakage, 1 h pad test < 2 g/h.<br>Improved = Urine leakage, pad test 2–5 g/h.<br>Failed = leakage > 5 g/h.  |
|                             |                       |              |   |   |                     | Operative care               | Mean operating time 22 min (15–44)<br>median hospital stay 22 h (12–72)  |  |
| Schiotz 2000 <sup>790</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 42           | F mean age 50 years (36–77) with UD stress UI<br>64% previous surgery                               | TVT under LA (90%), SA (2%) and GA (2%) | 16 months (6–27)    | Subjective or objective data | Subjective:<br>85% cure<br>10% almost cure<br>Objective:<br>81% cure<br>12% almost cure<br>7% somewhat improved  | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Norway.<br>Criteria:<br>Cure = no subjective or objective stress-related leakage, or minimal subjective leakage on severe stress but no leakage on objective testing. |
|                             |                       |              |   |   |                     | Satisfaction                 | 97% pain of TVT procedure acceptable<br>95% willing to repeat experience<br>98% would recommend it to a friend in similar situation                                | Almost cure = > 90% improvement, stop using protection, minimal leakage on severe stress, objectively proven leakage not exceeding 10% of pre-op quantity.   |
|                             |                       |              |   |   |                     | Complications                | 5% bladder perforations<br>2% skin infection<br>2% defective healing of vagina<br>0 bleeding, tape rejection, UTI, long-term voiding problems, <i>de novo</i> urge | Not cure = results poorer than the above.  |
|                             |                       |              |   |   |                     | Operative care               | Mean operating time 34 min (21–57)<br>90% women discharged within 24 h   |  |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Munir 2005 <sup>791</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 76           | F mean age 54 (25–85),<br>UD stress UI (11% mixed UI)<br>50% had previous pelvic surgery<br>1.3% underwent concomitant gynae surgery<br>Mean parity: 2.2 (0–6) | TVT under SA (99%) and GA (1%) | 14.3 months (2–42)  | Subjective data                 | 59% completely dry or leaked < once a week<br>92% improved symptoms<br>8% no effect<br>(80% reported improvement of > 75%;<br>44% reported improvement of 100%)<br>In the 44% who reported improvement of 100%:<br>20% reported 'completely dry'<br>39% leaking ≤ once a week<br>71% resumed normal activities within 3 weeks | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective criterion by modified BFLUTS.<br>Objective criteria as documented in clinical notes by surgeons.<br>54 (72%) response rate. |
|                           |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Satisfaction                    | 94% satisfied<br>6% not   |  |
|                           |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Objective data                  | 46% completely dry or 100% improved<br>88% improvement of ≥ 75%<br>4% no change<br>0 worsened   |  |
|                           |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Intra- and post-op complication | 1 (1.3%) Haematoma<br>1.3% blood transfusion<br>1.3% failed to void<br>1.3% UTI<br>Short- term complications after discharge:<br>15% bleeding<br>7% UTI<br>33% pain<br>Delayed post-op complications<br>35% urgency<br>7% short-term urge incontinence<br>19% UTI<br>11% large residuals<br>10% post-op pain                  |  |
|                           |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Operative care                  | Mean hospital stay 1.7 days   |  |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                              | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Moran 2000 <sup>733</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40           | F mean age: 51 years (33–86), with UD stress UI<br>median parity: 2 (0–4)<br>Mean BMI: 25.1 (19–35)<br>53% had previous hysterectomy<br>None had prior continence surgery | TVT under LA and light sedation           | Mean time 12.3 months (6–24) | Subjective data<br><br>Objective data<br><br>Post-op complications<br><br>Operative care | 80% cure<br>17.5% sig. improved<br>2.5% no change<br>95% cure<br>17.5% <i>de novo</i> urge<br>5% bladder perforations<br>15% post-op DO<br>5% voiding dysfunction<br>2.5% UTI<br>0 infection<br>0 tape rejection<br>Mean operating time 42 min (25–65)<br>Mean hospital stay 2.2 days (2–4)<br>Mean time of return to work 2.2 weeks (1–6) | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: UK.<br>Subjective criteria = no details given.<br>Objective criteria = urodynamics.  |
| Lebret 2001 <sup>772</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 100          | F mean age 60 years (38–87), with UD stress UI<br>21% had prior continence surgery. 100% had undergone PFMT<br>15% had concomitant  | TVT under LA (35%), EA (47%) and GA (18%) | ≥ 1 year                     | Objective data   | 77% cure<br>15% sig. improved<br>TVT+prolapse repair ( <i>n</i> = 15%)<br>9 dry<br>4 improved<br>2 failed  | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>TVT by 6 different surgeons (learning period in the 1st 50 patients, experienced period in the last 50 patients). |



| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up     | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|
|                          |                       |              | prolapse repair<br>Exclusion: urge UI   |              |                         | Intra- and post-op complications                                      | Overall:<br>15% bladder injury<br>13% retention<br>10% dysuria<br>5% urgency<br>2% bladder erosion<br>During learning period:<br>22% bladder injury<br>20% retention<br>14% dysuria<br>4% urgency<br>8% pelvic pain<br>2% late bladder erosion (tape migration)<br>Experienced period:<br>8% bladder injury<br>6% retention<br>6% dysuria<br>6% urgency<br>4% pelvic pain<br>2% late bladder erosion | Objective criteria:<br>Cure = totally dry.<br>Sig. improved = negative stress test, negative pad test (leakage on severe stress).   |
| Wang 1998 <sup>775</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 70           | F mean age 43 years *22–74), with UD stress UI (16% mixed UI)<br>Mean parity: 4 (0–7) | TVT under EA | Median 12 months (3–18) | Objective data<br>Subjective data<br>Intra- and post-op complications | 87% cure<br>4% improved<br>9% failed<br>83% cure<br>1% improved<br>16% failed<br>4% bladder perforations<br>16% had blood loss > 200 ml<br>17% post-op voiding problems<br>6% UTI<br>0 defective healing<br>0 tape rejection   | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = pad test ≤ 5 g.<br>Improved = loss decreased to < 50% experienced pre-op.<br>Failed = pad test > 5 g.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Cure = no urine loss with exercise.<br>Improved = < 50% leakage than pre-op. |

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                 | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Operative care                   | Mean operating time 29 min (20–51)<br>Mean hospital stay 3 days (2–8)  | Failed = > 50% leakage than pre-op.   |
| Azam 2001 <sup>731</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 67           | F mean age 49 years (38–78), with UD stress UI<br>All had ≥ 1 prior surgery for incontinence<br>median parity: 2 | TVT under LA (34%),<br>SA (63%)<br>and GA (3%) | Up to 1 year        | Subjective and objective data    | 81% cure<br>6% improved<br>13% failed  | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Australia.<br>Subjective and objective criteria:   |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Intra- and post-op complications | 19% bladder perforations<br>7% UTI<br>7% new onset DO<br>1.5% voiding disorder<br>0 excessive bleeding/retropubic haematoma<br>0 wound infection<br>0 tape removal | Cure = no urine loss, pad test > 1 g, patient report of no leakage and satisfaction with outcome.<br>Improved = no urine loss, pad loss improvement of at least 75%, and patient report of some leakage but overall satisfaction. |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Operative care                   | Mean operating time 49 min<br>51% discharged within 24 h   | Failed = demonstrable urine loss, pad loss improvement of < 75%, and patient report of some leakage and dissatisfaction.  |
| Pang 2003 <sup>738</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45           | F with UD stress UI<br>All had pelvic floor reconstruction surgery and concomitant TVT                           | TVT + pelvic floor surgery under LA            | At 1 year           | QOL                              | Significant improvement in UDI-6 and IIQ-7 scores from baseline, $P < 0.01$  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: China.  |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Satisfaction ( $n = 37$ )        | 72% satisfied<br>95% would recommend to friends<br>84% would choose same tx if reqd  | Operation by 2 surgeons.<br>Subjective criteria assessed by QOL: UDI-6, IIQ-7.  |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Objective data                   | 42.5% cure (37% in women who had cytocele repair)  | Objective criteria:   |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Intra- and post-op complications | 7% bladder injury<br>2% UTI<br>8% vault haematoma<br>7% fever<br>2% repeated catheterisation   | Cure = negative stress test, normal cystometry.   |
|                          |                       |              |  |  |                     | Operative care                   | median operating time 60 min (30–150)<br>median hospital stay 6 days (4–15)  |   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| Davis 2004 <sup>774</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 97 (68% with 1 year follow-up)                             | F mean age 62 years (31–86), with stress UI<br>26% had prior continence surgery<br>median parity: 2 (0–8)<br>Mean BMI: 27 | TVT                            | 1 year                | Satisfaction  | 80% satisfied<br>20% dissatisfied<br>Satisfied women more likely to achieve subjective cure ( $P = 0.009$ ) but not objective cure (NS)<br>Dissatisfied women more likely to have OAB and required sling release ( $P = 0.001$ )      | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: USA.<br>Satisfaction criteria using UDI-6.  |
| Sander 2002 <sup>767</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45   | F with UD stress UI (36% mixed UI)<br>73% had previous continence surgery   | TVT under LA (91%) and SA (9%) | 1 year                | Subjective data<br>Objective data<br>Intra- and post-op complications           | 87% cure<br>13% improved<br>88% cure<br>2% bladder perforation<br>8% urinary retention needing cystoscopy (2 needing CISC at 1 year, 1 had partial excision of tape)<br>Subjectively 25 (78%) considered their voiding more difficult | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Denmark.<br>Subjective criteria = asking women's if voiding has changed post-op (dysuria, hesitance, use and pressure, incomplete emptying)<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = pad test < 8 g/24 h and no leakage.      |
| Yalcin 2004 <sup>792</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 61 (only 21 followed up at 6 months, and fewer thereafter) | F with UD stress UI<br>46% had concomitant surgery<br>Mean age: 49 years (TVT) and 50 years (TVT+surgery)                 | TVT under LA or GA             | 6 months to 2.5 years | Subjective data (believed to be at 1 month)<br>Intra- and post-op complications | 92% cure<br>8% improved<br>NS between TVT vs TVT +surgery<br>6.6% UTI<br>3.3% bladder perforations<br>3.3% voiding difficulty<br>3.3% post-op urge incontinence<br>1.6% nerve injury<br>$P = NS$ between TVT vs TVT +surgery          | Funding: University of Istanbul.<br>Setting: Turkey.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>Cure = leakage < than once a month.<br>Improved = 50% improvement.<br>No change.<br>Follow-up:<br>21 women at 6 months<br>19 at 1 year<br>13 at 2 year<br>8 at > 2 years. |
| Lo 2001 <sup>793</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 82   | F mean age 57 years (30–65), with UD stress UI<br>24% had prior continence  | TVT under LA                   | Up to 1 year          | Objective data  | 93% cure<br>5% improved<br>2% failed  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Taiwan.<br>Objective criteria:  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|--|---|--|--|
|                             |                       |              | surgery<br>median parity: 3 (1–60)   |   |  | Intra- and post-op complications  | 13% voiding problems<br>0 bladder injuries<br>0 wound healing defect<br>0 tape rejection<br>0 <i>de novo</i> DO  | Cure = pad test < 2 g/h without urinary leakage on coughing.<br>Improved = < 5 g/h on pad test and urinary leakage on coughing.<br>Failed = leakage > 5 g/h.   |
|                             |                       |              |  |   |  | Operative care  | Mean operating time 25 min (18–35)<br>Mean hospital stay 2 days (1–4)  |  |
| Al-Badr 2003 <sup>794</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 63*          | F mean age 58 years (32–82) with UD stress UI<br>10% had prior prolapse surgery<br>Mean parity: 2.5 (0–7)<br>63% on HRT<br>33% had concomitant procedures        | TVT under LA (5%), SA (81%) and GA (4%) | Up to 3 years (only 1 year data used: owing to high drop-out rate) | Objective data (n = 53)<br>Subjective data (n = 53)<br>Intra- and post-op complications | 87% cure<br>95% cure<br>6.4% bladder perforations<br>6.4% mild vaginal bleeding<br>1.6% retropubic haematoma<br>49% voiding dysfunction (38% unable to void, 11% high PVR)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Canada.<br>*16% loss to follow-up at 1 year; 97% loss at 3 years.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = inability to demonstrate SUI in clinical exam and /or provocative UD.<br>Subjective criteria: |
|                             |                       |              |  |   |  | Operative care  | Mean hospital stay<br>1 day (0–6)<br>27% discharged within 24 h, 60% within 48 h   | Cure = women's report of no SUI.   |
| Magatti 2002 <sup>795</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 78           | F mean age 58 years (36–77) with stress UI<br>12% TVT + colpohysterectomy (28% TVT + prolapse repair [NOT in analysis])<br>Mean parity: 2.3 (0–5)<br>40 BMI > 25 | TVT under LA (67%)<br>SA (33%)          | 6–36 months  | Objective and subjective data<br>Intra- and post-op complications                       | 93.5% cure at 6 months<br>92% continent and satisfied at 1 year<br>3.8% bladder perforations<br>3.8% <i>de novo</i> urge<br>1.3% haemorrhage resulting in colposuspension<br>1.3% haematoma<br>1.3% vaginal erosion –tape re-stitching | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Italy.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = stress test at 300 ml of fill while standing and supine-modified pad test).<br>Subjective<br>Cure = QOL by VAS.   |
|                             |                       |              |  |   |  | Operative care  | Mean operating time 34 min (20–60)<br>Mean hospital stay 3 days (2–8)  |  |

## TVT case series – 2–3 years follow-up

| Study   | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                              | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Neuman 2004 <sup>744</sup><br>And<br>Neuman 2003 <sup>796</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 524          | F with UD stress UI<br>57% also underwent anterior and/or posterior Colporrhaphy, and 7% vaginal hysterectomy<br>No demographics | TVT under LA (11%), SA (31%) and GA (58%) | Mean time 2.7 years           | TVT needle bladder penetration rate                 | 13% at least 1 TVT needle penetration<br>44% occurred in the first 100 procedures; 24% bladder penetration rate in the first 50 patients, 6% in the last 50 patients<br>0.6% had bilateral bladder penetrations<br>Penetration rate and primary/non-primary SUI corrective surgery: NS<br>Penetration rate and anesthetic modalities: NS<br>Penetration rate and colporrhaphy and hysterectomy: NS<br>0 deleterious effect<br>0 post-op voiding dysfunction, UTI or bladder overactivity<br>1 recurrent UTI and severe dysuria: undiagnosed transvesical TVT at 2.5 years, removed under GA | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Israel.<br>All women had diagnostic cystoscopy before withdrawal of TVT needles.                                  |
|   |                                      |              |  |   |                               | Prolapse <sup>796</sup>                             | 4% new prolapse (from 158 without prolapse at baseline)<br><i>n</i> = 3 grade 1 rectocele<br>4 grade 1 cystocele  |   |
| Sevestre 2003 <sup>797</sup>                                    | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Propsective | 76           | Elderly F mean age 75 years (70–91) with UD stress UI (5% DO)<br>29% had previous continence surgery<br>96% had pre-op local     | TVT<br>Under GA (73%)<br>LA (27%)         | Mean time 24.6 months (16–49) | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br><br>Satisfaction | 67% cure<br>13.7% persistent SUI<br>18.4% urge UI<br><br>82% satisfied<br>14% 'results inadequate'<br>4% 'Worse'  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>BFLUTS questionnaire used; satisfaction by VAS.<br>Discomfort score reported on 'EVA' scale – data not |

| Study                     | Study type and EL                       | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                     | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|---|--------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|---|
|                           |   |              | hormone treatment  |                                  |                            | Complications    | No intra-op complications reported<br>21% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>26.3% urinary retention<br>85% voiding difficulties<br>1.3% vaginal erosion<br>0 wound infection   | reproduced here.<br>2 lost to follow-up.  |
|                           |   |              |  |                                  |                            | Operative care   | Mean operation time 16 min (12–22)<br>Mean hospital stay 1.7 days (1–4)  |   |
| Deval 2002 <sup>798</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Restrospective | 187          | F mean age 55 (SD 11) years (31–102), with UD stress UI (29% mixed UI)<br>Mean parity: 2.2 ± 1.3 (0–9)<br>61% BMI > 24<br>21% BMI > 30<br>9% no previous surgery<br>37% underwent hysterectomy during TVT;<br>16% posterior colporrhaphy | TVT under GA, SA or LA (no data) | Mean time 27 months (6–34) | Objective        | 90.4% 'cure'<br>9.6% 'failure or improvement'  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: France.   |
|                           |   |              |  |                                  |                            | Subjective data  | 70.6% 'cure'<br>According to VAS (scores 0 to 12):<br>Pre-op: 6.2 ± 2.4<br>Post-op: 0.9 ± 2.2 ( <i>P</i> = 0.001)<br>Lower after GA, LA than SA ( <i>P</i> = 0.001); lower after GA than SA ( <i>P</i> = 0.01)<br>According to VAS:<br>women with new onset urge symptoms: 2.2 ± 3.2<br>women without new onset urge symptoms: 0.2 ± 0.7 ( <i>P</i> = 0.0001)<br>22% 'improvement'<br>1.6% 'no change'<br>5.9% 'worse' | Objective criteria:<br>'cure' = no stress incontinence on clinical and urodynamic exam, and on stress provocation test.<br>'failures' = all other cases.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>'cure' = , 'improved', 'unchanged' or 'worse' according to responses to CONTILIFE questionnaire and VAS scores. |

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Post-op complications                                    | 35% total<br>10% bladder injury<br>3% haemorrhage<br>1% blood transfusion<br>9% UTI<br>0.5% septicaemia<br>6% urinary retention<br>0.5% haematoma<br>11% difficult voiding<br>21% new onset urge symptoms<br>0.5% persistent retropubic pain<br>(most patients had more than 1 complication) |   |
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Operative care   | Mean operative time<br>29 min (25 – 59)  |   |
| Kinn 2001 <sup>799</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 75           | F mean age 60 (SD 12 years, range 39–83) with UD stress UI (31% mixed UI)<br>Parity: range 0- > 5)<br>24% previous hysterectomy, 4% surgery for uterine prolapse, 21% prior continence surgery, 3% radiation therapy for cervical cancer | TVT under LA (97%) and SA (3%) | 2 years             | Continence by VAS  | 66.7% complete<br>13.3% minimal leakage<br>9.3% small leakage<br>9.3% unchanged<br>1.3% worsened   | Funding: Grants from Johanna Hagstrands and Sigfid Linner's Foundation.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Bristol 12-item questionnaire =<br>Score 1 = little discomfort;<br>5 = severe discomfort.<br>VAS (visual analogue) =<br>0 = total incontinence<br>10 = perfect continence. |
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Daily frequency by Bristol questionnaire                 | Pre-op: 9.1 daytime, 1.2 at night ( $P < 0.001$ )<br>Post-op: 7.4 daytime, 0.9 at night ( $P < 0.001$ )<br>Post-op improvement in leakage and pad test ( $P < 0.001$ )   |   |
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Self-report of impact of incontinence on quality of life | Post-op improvement in social life, physical activity, depression/anxiety ( $P < 0.001$ )  |   |
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Continence by surgery status                             | First time surgery: 83.3%<br>Previous surgery: 73% ( $P < 0.01$ )  |   |
|                          |                       |              |  |                                |                     | Continence by BMI status                                 | BMI 24–28: 70%<br>BMI > 28: 41% ( $P < 0.01$ )   |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL                      | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up         | Outcome measures             | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|
|                             |  |              |   |              |                             | Post-operative complications | 2.6% bladder perforations<br>12% temporary urine retention<br>2.6% vaginal sling erosion<br>2.6% UTI<br>5% transient urge<br>2.6% permanent increased urge   |   |
|                             |  |              |   |              |                             | Operative care               | Mean operation time 39 min<br>Mean hospital stay 1 day   |   |
| Jeffrey 2001 <sup>800</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Retrospective | 112          | F mean age 54 years (33–102), with UD stress UI (21% mixed UI)<br>14 (12.5%) Grade I<br>47 (42%) Grade II<br>51 (45.5% Grade III)<br>Mean parity: 2.1 (0–6)<br>64% BMI > 24<br>6% previous surgery for incontinence<br>33% concomitant pelvic surgery | TVT under LA | Mean time 25 months (18–34) | Objective                    | 'cure': overall: 89% (91% for pure stress UI grp, 83% mixed UI)<br>'improved': overall 11% (9% SUI, 17% MUI)<br>None 'failed'  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: France.<br>LA = local anaesthesia.<br>Ingelman-Sundberg scale = Grade I: UI when coughing or sneezing, Grade II: UI when running or picking up objects from the floor<br>Grade III: UI when walking or stair climbing.<br>Objective cure = no stress UI on UD and on stress provocation test; no urinary retention;<br>'improved' = no UI on stress provocation test; 'failed' = All other cases. |
|                             |  |              |   |              |                             | Subjective data              | 'cure'; overall 66% (69% SUI, 54% MUI)<br>'improved': overall 28% (24% SUI, 42% MUI)<br>'no change': overall 3% (2% SUI, 4% MUI)<br>'become worse'; overall 5% (all SUI)   |   |
|                             |  |              |   |              |                             | Operative care               | Mean operation time<br>30 min (range 25–50)  |   |
|                             |  |              |   |              |                             | Complications                | 37.5% overall<br>26% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms<br>12% bladder injuries*<br>11% urinary infection<br>8% urinary retention<br>12.5% voiding difficulties < 15 days<br>3.6% voiding difficulties > 15 days<br>2.7% haemorrhage<br>0.9% haematoma | Subjective cure, 'improved' and 'failed' according to response to the CONTILIFE questionnaire.<br>*all occurred on left side, 5 occurred in women with previous continence surgery.<br>Significant difference between women with and without previous surgery: 5 (71%) vs 8 (7.6%) $P < 0.001$ .  |



| Study                      | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Tomoe 2005 <sup>732</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Prospective | 66           | F mean age 58 years (40–80) with stress UI (UD in 48%).<br>5% had mixed UI<br>24% aged ≥ 65 years;<br>76% < 65 years<br>Mean parity: 2.3 (1–4)<br>Mean BMI: 23.7 (range 18–32)<br>Exclusions: prior continence surgery, severe DO, overt neurogenic bladder disease, POP   | TVT under LA                   | 2 years             | IIQ-7 (change from baseline)<br>UDI-6 (change from baseline)<br>Satisfaction with surgical outcomes<br><i>De novo</i> urge UI | –93%, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>Sig. improvement in all domains also reported (physical activities, travel, social activities, emotional health)<br>–88%, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>Sig. improvement in all domains also reported (irritative, stress, and obstructive/discomfort symptoms)<br>88%<br>12%   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Japan.<br>Total scores for both QOL scales transformed to 100.<br>Outcomes also considered for the % over and below 65 years – no sig. difference found between groups in any domain/score.  |
| Liapis 2001 <sup>801</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 68           | Women with UD stress UI<br>74% with Stage I prolapse<br>Mean age: 53.8 ± 8.5 years<br>Mean parity: 2.1 ± 0.9<br>Mean BMI: 28.4 ± 2.5<br>26% with Stage II prolapse<br>Mean age: 54.2 ± 8.1 years<br>Mean parity: 2.1 ± 1.3<br>Mean BMI: 27.2 ± 3.3<br>TVT for Stage I prolapse<br>TVT + colporrhaphy for Stage II prolapse | TVT under epidural anaesthesia | 2 years             | Objective data<br>Subjective data   | 'cure'<br>TVT only: 50 (88%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 16 (88.8%)<br>'improved'<br>TVT only: 2 (6%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 1 (5.5%)<br>'failed'<br>TVT only: 3 (4%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 1 (5.5%)<br>'cure'<br>TVT only: 45 (90%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 16 (88.8%)<br>'improved'<br>TVT only: 2 (4%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 0 (0%)<br>'failed'<br>TVT only: 3 (6%)<br>TVT+ colporrhaphy: 2 (11%) | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Greece.<br>Objective criteria:<br>'cure' = post-op pad weight difference of < 1 g.<br>'improved' = post-op reduction of urine loss to < 50%.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>'cure' = no loss of urine with exercise, coughing or weight lifting.<br>'improved' = significant reduction of leakage episodes expressed by patients' satisfaction.<br>All patients had a Foley catheter and vaginal tampon in place for 24 h. |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. patients      | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures              | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
|  |                       |                   |   |                                |                          | Post-op complications         | 6% perforated bladder<br>3% UTI<br>5% <i>de novo</i> instability<br>9% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>10% variable degrees of urinary retention after catheter removal – residual urine > 100 ml<br>0 cystocele relapse<br>0 TVT rejection |  |
|  |                       |                   |   |                                |                          | Operative care                | Mean operation time (TVT only)<br>28 ± 11 min<br>Hospital stay 2 days (range 1–3)   |  |
| Paick 2004 <sup>802</sup><br>(these pts may also be included in cohort with shorter follow-up by same author) <sup>136–138</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 60                | F mean age 57 years (35–71) with stress UI<br>Exclusions: mixed or urge UI<br>20% had prior hysterectomy<br>3% had other continence surgery     | TVT under LA (96%) and SA (4%) | At least 2 years         | Subjective and objective data | 83% cure<br>12% improved<br>5% failed   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Korea.<br>Subjective and objective criteria:   |
|  |                       |                   |   |                                |                          | Urodynamics                   | Max. flow rate higher in cure group pre-op (adjusted OR 0.90, 95% CI 0.82 to 0.99)<br>Other parameters: NS  | Cure = Absence of subjective complaint + objective leakage on stress test.<br>Improved = patient report of some leakage but overall satisfaction + no urine loss on stress test. |
|  |                       |                   |   |                                |                          | Post-op complications         | 6 (10%) bladder perforations<br>3 (5%) intermittent catheterisations<br>11 (18%) voiding problems<br>2 (3%) <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms<br>0 infection<br>0 erosion/tape rejection   | Failed = did not meet above cure or improvement criteria.  |
| Kuuva 2003 <sup>803</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 51<br>Prospective | F median age 57 years (38–76) with UD stress UI, who did not require additional surgery<br>20% had had 2 previous continence procedures;<br>80% | TVT under LA                   | median 24 months (24–60) | Objective data                | 90% cure<br>6% improved<br>4% failed  | Funding: Grant from the Medical Society of Finland.<br>Setting: Finland.   |
|  |                       |                   |   |                                |                          | Subjective data               | 80% cure<br>16% improved<br>4% failed   | Objective criteria:<br>cure if negative 24 h pad test;<br>improvement if negative pad test   |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                          | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                 | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
|  |                       |              | median BMI: 25 (20–30)<br>median duration of symptoms: 10 years (1–37)   |                                       |                     | Post-op complications            | 6% bladder perforations<br>6% voiding difficulty<br>6% UTI<br>6% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms without DO   | and > 80% reduction in urine leakage.<br>Subjective criteria:<br>cure if ≤ 10 on VAS<br>improvement if ≤ 25 on VAS.   |
|  |                       |              |  |                                       |                     | Operative care                   | median operating time 25 min (10–40)   | Failure: did not meet above cure or improvement criteria.   |
| Schraffordt Koops 2005 <sup>804</sup> and 2006 (see below) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 809          | F mean age 51 years (20–82) with UD stress UI<br>16% had operative history for incontinence or prolapse<br>Mean parity: 2.4 ± 1.1<br>47% postmenopausal (34% on HRT)<br>7% had concomitant surgery | TVT under LA (80%), SA (8%), GA (12%) | Up to 2 years       | Intra- and post-op complications | Intra-op<br>4% bladder perforations<br>1.2% severe blood loss (> 300 ml)<br>1 (0.12%) iliac vein laceration needing laparotomy<br>0% urethral lesion<br>Post-op<br>3.4% haematoma<br>0.1% temp rise > 38 C<br>0.2% tape rejection<br>0.7% UTI<br>15% voiding difficulty* | Funding: Foundation for Scientific Research of the Gynecology Associates Tilburg.<br>*catheter reqd for > 24 h.<br>Post-op complications influenced by 'Learning curve' effects.<br>17% first 10 TVT<br>29% next 10 TVT<br>20% > 20 TVT.<br>Sig. association in the second 10 TVT by same surgeon (OR 0.66, 95% CI 1.14 to 3.29). |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics      | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---|---|---|
|  |                       |              |                              |              |                     | Multivariate analysis of risk factors for having intra- or post-operative complications                       | <p>Intra-operative history of prolapse surgery: OR 2.86, 95% CI 1.15 to 7.11</p> <p>Women with history of continence surgery or both prolapse and continence surgery: NS</p> <p>General anaesthetic: OR 4.14 to 95% CI 2.01 to 8.53</p> <p>No sig. association among women with concomitant surgery (overall complication rate in this group 9.5%: ns)</p> <p>Post-op complications</p> <p>24% in teaching hospital</p> <p>16% in local hospital (OR 0.55, 95% CI 0.35 to 0.85)</p> <p>Fewer in premenopausal women</p> <p>OR 0.67 to 95% CI 0.46 to 0.99</p> <p>Spinal anaesthesia</p> <p>OR 0.35, 95% CI 0.13 to 0.92</p> |   |
|  |                       |              |                              |              |                     | Operative care  | median operating time 32.4 min (14–120)   |   |
| Schraffordt Koops 2006 <sup>805</sup> and 2006 <sup>806</sup> and 2005 (see above) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 809          | As Koops 2005 <sup>804</sup> | TVT          | At least 2 years    | <p>QOL (UDI-6, IIQ-7) by mailed questionnaire</p> <p>N = 634*, but 26 excluded</p> <p>Subjective response</p> | <p>Change in scores form baseline: IIQ-7 –79%</p> <p>UDI-6 –60%</p> <p>95% improved in response to question about leakage from UDI</p> <p>80% no leakage on direct questioning from doctor</p> <p>97% no leak observed on cough test during physical exam</p>   | <p>Funding: none declared.</p> <p>*Excluding pts with prior or undergoing concomitant surgical procedures for stress UI or prolapse. Further exclusions owing to declining to take part further or not completing questionnaire.</p> <p>77% response rate to questionnaire at 2 years.</p> <p>OR via multivariate analysis.</p> |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients                  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                      | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                          | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                           |                       |                               |  |                                   |                     | Factors determining success (QOL or cure) | Surgeons' experience (more than 20 procedures per surgeon):<br>For QOL: OR for success 1.9 (95% CI 1.24 to 2.97)<br>For cure: OR for failure 0.55 (95% CI 0.32 to 0.96)  |  |
| Dietz 2004 <sup>742</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 145 (data for 74% at 2 years) | F mean age 55 years (31–79) with stress UI<br>Mean BMI: 28 (19–43)<br>47% had concomitant pelvic surgery | TVT (type of anaesthesia unclear) | 2 years             | Voiding functions                         | MFR centiles<br>Pre-op: 49.7 (32.5)<br>Post-op: 22.9 (23.6) ( $p < 0.001$ )<br>Between 1st and last post-op visit (mean of 2 years):<br>MFR centiles<br>20 (21) vs 25 (24) ( $p = 0.021$ )<br>Residual urine<br>82 (117) vs 45 (56) ( $p < 0.001$ )<br>Reduced 'poor stream'<br>OR 0.77, 95% CI 0.61 to 0.96<br>Reduced 'straining to void'<br>OR 0.69, CI 0.48 to 0.98<br>Reduced 'incomplete emptying'<br>OR 0.79, CI 0.65 to 0.96<br>Reduced 'hesitancy' and 'stop-start voiding':NS<br>Sig. relationship between length of follow-up and reported UTI:<br>8% UTI at 1 year<br>18% UTI at 2 years<br>28% UTI at 3 years<br>20% at 4 years and<br>33% at 5 years<br>OR 1.73, CI 1.39 to 2.15 | Funding: Johnson and Johnson.<br>Setting: New Zealand.<br>Data available on 108 women at 2 years.<br>MFR = max. flow rate. |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|--|--------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Ulmsten 1998 <sup>735</sup><br>Some overlap with Ulmsten 1999 <sup>734</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 131          | F mean age 53 years (35–88) with UD stress UI<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–5)<br>None had prior continence surgery, or signs/symptoms of prolapse<br>Exclusions: DO, ISD | TVT under LA | ≥ 12 months         | Subjective and objective data combined<br><br>Complications<br><br>Operative care | 91% cure<br>7% sig. improved<br>2% failure<br><br>1 (0.8%) bladder perforation<br>1 (0.8%) wound infection<br>3 (2.4%) short-term urinary retention<br>1 (0.8%) voiding problem<br>1 (0.8%) retropubic haematoma<br>0 tape rejection<br><br>Mean operating time 28 min (19–41)<br>Mean sick leave 2 weeks (10–21 days) | Funding: not declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Subjective cure ≥ 90% improvement QOL (VAS); sig. improvement = between 70–90% improvement in QOL and no UI on stress test, and 'sig.' reduction in leakage on 24 h pad.<br>Objective cure: < 10 g/24 h pad test, negative stress test on coughing.<br>TVT performed by 3 experienced urogynaecologists. |

## TVT case series – 3 or more years follow-up

| Study                           | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention        | Length of follow-up        | Outcome measures              | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Debodinance 2002 <sup>807</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 256          | F mean age 57 years (29–96) with stress UI (21% mixed)<br>10% had prior continence surgery<br>25% also underwent prolapse surgery | TVT under SA and GA | 3 months, 1, 2 and 3 years | Objective data (all patients) | <p>At 3 months (<i>n</i> = 251)</p> <p>90% cure<br/>8% improved<br/>2% failed</p> <p>1 year (60%)<br/>91% cure<br/>1% improved<br/>1% failed<br/>6.4% recurrent</p> <p>At 2 years (27%)<br/>83% cure<br/>0% improved<br/>10% failed<br/>7.2% recurrent (global 14%)</p> <p>At 3 years (6%)<br/>87% cure<br/>0% improved<br/>13% failed<br/>13% global recurrent</p> <hr/> <p>Objective data (mixed UI group [21%])</p> <p>At 3 months (<i>n</i> = 52)</p> <p>75% cure<br/>17% improved<br/>8% failed</p> <p>1 year (52%)<br/>85% cure<br/>4% improved<br/>4% failed<br/>7.4% recurrent</p> <p>At 2 years (29%)<br/>60% cure<br/>0% improved<br/>20% failed<br/>33% recurrent (global 14%)</p> | <p>Funding: none declared.</p> <p>Setting: France.</p> <p>Objective criteria data:</p> <p>Cure = completely dry during stress.</p> <p>Improved = occasional leakage.</p> <p>Failed = leakage unchanged or worse.</p> <p>Data available from:<br/>251 women at 3 months<br/>154 women at 1 year<br/>69 women at 2 years<br/>15 women at 3 years.</p> |

| Study                              | Study type and EL                    | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                                    |                                      |              |  |   |                     | Intra- and post-op complications                                     | 6% bladder perforation<br>Short-term:<br>1% haematomas<br>3% UTI<br>0.4% urethral wound<br>0.4% ureteral fistula<br>13% transient urinary retention<br>0.4% acute renal failure<br>Long-term:<br>16% urinary urgency<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>26% objective dysuria<br>23% subjective dysuria<br>20% <i>de novo</i> dysuria<br>0 defective healing<br>0 tape rejection |   |
|                                    |                                      |              |  |   |                     | Satisfaction with TVT  | 64% very satisfied<br>31% satisfied<br>3% not satisfied<br>2% disappointed   |   |
| Bunyavejchevin 2005 <sup>808</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3                | 63           | F mean age 52 (35–71), UD stress UI<br>None had previous surgery<br>33 had genital prolapse<br>50 menopausal<br>Mean parity: 3.8 (1–4) | TVT under SA and CS                           | 3 years             | Objective data<br>Intra- and post-op complications<br>Operative care | 95% cure<br>5% improved<br>10% failed<br>3% bladder injury<br>1.6% urinary retention<br>5% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>Mean operation time 32.2 ± 10 min<br>Mean hospital stay 1.5 ± 2.0 days   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Thailand.<br>CS = conscious sedation.<br>Objective criteria:<br>Cure = no incontinence on stress provocation, no urinary retention/residual urine > 150 ml.<br>Improved = no incontinence on stress provocation.<br>Failed = none of the above. |
| Rezapour 2001 <sup>747–749</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Prospective | 163          | A) F with recurrent UD stress UI ( <i>n</i> = 34)<br>Mean age: 58.9 ± 10 years   | TVT via sagittal suburethral vaginal incision | 4 years (range 3–5) | Objective cure/improvement (group A)                                 | 82% cure**<br>9% Improved<br>9% failed (1 had 2 previous failed colposuspensions)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>TVT performed by experienced   |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                       | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|
|       |                   |              | Mean parity: 2 (0–4)<br>33% had < 2 previous operations, 10% had < 5 previous operations (16 Burch colposuspension, 7 MMK, 10 paraurethral bulking injections, 7 anterior repairs, 11 different sling procedures)  | under LA<br>Tape not fixed |                     | Post-op complications (group A)        | 3% uneventful bladder perforation (previously undergone MMK 3 times before TVT)<br>41% prophylactic suprapubic bladder drainage (previously experienced post-op voiding difficulties after incontinence operations) | urogynaecologists.<br>Cure if urinary leakage < 10 g/24 h pad test, if no leakage during a cough test, if patient satisfaction > 90% according to 'QOL' evaluation.<br>'Improved' = if did not leak on cough provocation and had a QOL improved > 75% < 90%.<br>'Failed' = did not meet the above criteria. |
|       |                   |              | B) F with ISD (MUCP < 20), <i>n</i> = 49.<br>Mean age: 66.1 ± 11 years<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–5)<br>(8 with immobile urethra; no cystocele or rectocele diagnosed)<br>All postmenopausal women were treated with systemic or local oestrogen therapy for 3 months before TVT |                            |                     | Operative care (group A)               | Mean hospital stay<br>4 days (range 1–6)  | QOL reported to be assessed but not stated how.<br>Routine post-op ultrasonography.   |
|       |                   |              | C) Women with mixed UI ( <i>n</i> = 80)<br>Mean age: 59.2 ± 11 years<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–4)<br>(Urge component:   |                            |                     | Objective cure/improvement (group B)   | 74% cure**<br>12% improved<br>14% failed*   | *5 in women > 70 years with a urethral pressure of < 10 cmH <sub>2</sub> O and an immobile urethra).<br>**overall cure rate 81%.  |
|       |                   |              |  |                            |                     | Post-op complications (group B)        | 2% uneventful bladder perforation<br>10% haematoma<br>22% temporary voiding problems  |   |
|       |                   |              |  |                            |                     | Operative care (group B)               | Mean operation time 35 ± 12 min<br>Hospital stay 1 day  |   |
|       |                   |              |  |                            |                     | Objective cure/improvement (group C)   | 85% cure**<br>4% improved<br>11% failed   |   |
|       |                   |              |  |                            |                     | Urgency without incontinence (group C) | 20 (25% of 'cure' or 'improved' women)  |   |

| Study   | Study type and EL                      | No. patients                        | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up          | Outcome measures                         | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|
|   |  |                                     | premature voiding reflex or urethral relaxation)<br>49 postmenopausal women were treated with systemic or local oestrogen therapy                                 |                                 |                              | Post-op complications (group C)          | 1.3% bladder perforation<br>18% voiding problems<br>8% haematoma (1 laparotomy performed to exclude vessel injury – patient was on anti-coagulant therapy)  |   |
| Tsivan 2004 <sup>809</sup>                                      | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>retrospective | 55                                  | F mean age 63 years (37–83), with UD stress UI<br>76% had concomitant procedures (hysterectomy, colporrhaphy, vaginal vault suspension)                           | TVT under SA (67%) and GA (33%) | Mean time 55 months (48–65)  | Subjective cure<br>Post-op complications | 79%<br>6% bladder perforations<br>2% urethral injury<br>2% UTI<br>36% short-term voiding difficulties<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>4% vaginal erosion<br>2% bladder erosion<br>4% obstructed urethra requiring urethrolisis | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Israel.<br>Operations by experienced surgeons well trained in vaginal surgery.<br>3 loss to follow-up.<br>Criteria for 'success' = complete continence and freedom from pad protection. |
|   |  |                                     |   |                                 |                              | Operative care                           | Mean operation time 28 min<br>Post-op hospital stay 2.7 days (1–8)  |   |
| Glavind 2004 <sup>745</sup>                                     | Case series<br>EL = 3                  | 84 (81% responded to questionnaire) | Women with SUI<br>Pre-op:<br>79% sexually active<br>26 (49%) had incontinence during intercourse<br>1 stated incontinence as reason for not being sexually active | TVT or IVS                      | Within a period of 4.5 years | Post-op sexual function                  | 19 cure of incontinence during intercourse: 10/19 (50%) had an improved sexual life<br>7% reduced libido<br>0 <i>de novo</i> incontinence during intercourse  | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Denmark.<br>Subjective criteria assessed by retrospective questionnaire.  |
| Ulmsten 1999 <sup>734</sup><br>10 of these patients included in | Case series<br>EL = 3                  | 50                                  | F mean age 57 (SD 11) years, UD stress UI   | TVT under LA                    | 3 years                      | Subjective and objective data combined   | 86% cure<br>12% improved<br>2% failed   | Funding: none declared.<br>cure = negative pad-test (< 10 g/24 h); no   |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. patients      | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures                       | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Ulmsten 1998 <sup>735</sup><br>series   |                       |                   | None had prior continence surgery<br>All postmenopausal women were taking systemic or local oestrogen therapy<br>Exclusions: Urge UI, prolapse   |              |                               | Post-op complications                  | 4% women needed repeated catheterisation 2–3 days<br>6% women needed indwelling catheter for up to 12 days<br>0 severe bleeding (> 300 ml)<br>0 PVR > 100 ml<br>0 defective healing<br>0 tape rejection                 | incontinence on stress provocation test, and patient satisfaction > 90% according to QOL evaluation (VAS); no voiding problems (PVR > 100 ml).<br>'Significantly improved' = no incontinence on stress provocation; had a QOL improved > 75% < 90%; no post-op urinary retention/urge incontinence. |
|   |                       |                   |  |              |                               | Operative care                         | Mean operation time 29 min (range 16–47)  | 'Failed' = did not meet the above criteria.   |
| Olsson 1999 <sup>952</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 51                | F mean age: 53 years (34–80), UD stress UI<br>Mean parity: 2 (0–5)<br>28 post menopausal using HRT or local oestrogen<br>25% previous pelvic surgery<br>20% also underwent prolapse repair | TVT under LA | 3 years                       | Objective and subjective data combined | 90% cure<br>6% improved<br>4% failed  | Funding: none declared.<br>Subjective cure ≥ 90% improvement QOL (VAS); sig. improvement = between 70–90% improvement in QOL and no UI on stress test, and 'sig.' reduction in leakage on 24 h pad.   |
|   |                       |                   |  |              |                               | Post-op complications                  | 2% bladder perforation<br>8% temporary urge symptoms<br>2% healing defect of vaginal wall<br>2% cystitis<br>2% recurrent cystitis<br>0 severe bleeding (> 300 ml), PVR > 100 ml, or defective healing or tape rejection | Objective cure: < 10 g/24 h pad test, negative stress test on coughing.   |
|   |                       |                   |  |              |                               | Operative care                         | Mean operation: 45 min (20–60)<br>Mean sick leave: 21 days (7–30)<br>Mean hospital stay 2 days  |   |
| Nilsson 2001 <sup>810</sup><br>5 year follow-up of<br>Ulmsten 1998 <sup>735</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 90<br>prospective | median age at follow-up: 57 years (40–91)  | TVT under LA | median time 56 months (48–70) | Objective and subjective data combined | 85% cure<br>11% improved<br>5% failed   | Funding: None declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>TVT performed by   |

| Study   | Study type and EL                    | No. patients                         | Patient characteristics                   | Intervention | Length of follow-up                        | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------|--|---|--|--|
|   |                                      |                                      | 28% also had symptoms of urgency          |              |  | Post-op complications                                     | 3% retropubic haematoma<br>1% bladder perforation<br>3% intra-operative bleeding of > 200 ml<br>4% initial post-op voiding difficulty<br>7% UTI<br>1% wound infection<br>1% recurrent UTI<br>5% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms<br>0 tape rejection<br>56% of women with pre-op urge symptoms were relieved of them post-op | experienced urogynaecologists.<br>Objective and subjective criteria:<br>Cure = negative 24 h pad test, cough stress test, QOL improved $\geq$ 90%.<br>Improved = > 50% reduction in pad test, < 15 g loss.<br>Failed = did not meet the above criteria.<br>5 gave subjective data only.                            |
|   |                                      |                                      |   |              |  | Operative care  | Mean operation time 30 min (15–55)<br>Post-op hospital stay 2 days (1–5)   |  |
| Nilsson 2004 <sup>811</sup><br>7 year follow-up of<br>Ulmsten 1998 <sup>735</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3<br>Prospective | 90 (71% fully evaluated prospective) | median age at follow-up: 60 years (42–94) | TVT under LA | Mean time 91.1 months (7.6 years) (78–100) | Objective and subjective data combined<br>Subjective data | 81% cure (84% negative pad test, 95% negative stress test)<br>81% cure<br>16% improved<br>3% failed<br><i>Change in continence status since 5 year follow-up:</i><br>87.5% unchanged<br>5% improved<br>7.5% worse<br>84% claiming dry on stress<br>84% VAS score < 10 (on 0–100 scale)                                   | Funding: None declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Objective criteria:<br>24 h pad test, cough stress test, 2 day voiding diary.<br>Subjective criteria<br>QOL by VAS.<br>Questionnaire on 'cure' data.<br>10 lost to follow-up.<br>16 gave subjective data only.<br>Medical status of 18 urge symptoms:<br>4 diabetes |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures                                      | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|--------------|--|---|---|---|
|                              |                       |              |   |              |  | Post TVT complications                                | 23% urge symptoms<br>8% asymptomatic pelvic prolapse<br>8% UTI<br>6%) <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms<br>0 voiding difficulty or tape rejection  | 4 cardiovascular disease<br>3 asthma<br>1 bladder cancer<br>1 anal incontinence<br>5 <i>de novo</i> urge unrelated to any disease.      |
| Holmgren 2005 <sup>812</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 692          | Women with stress or mixed UI<br>SUI ( <i>n</i> = 580 [84%])<br>Mean age: 61 years, mean parity:2.4. BMI: 27; 55% oestrogen treatment.<br>6% prolapse surgery, 2% radiation for gynae cancer, 9% chronic bronchitis, 22% recurrent UTI, 5% chronic constipation<br>MUI ( <i>n</i> = 112 [16%]); mean age: 67 years, mean parity:2.3, BMI: 30; 69% oestrogen treatment<br>10% prolapse surgery, 5% radiation for gynae cancer, 10% chronic bronchitis, 26% recurrent UTI, 11% chronic constipation | TVT under LA | 2–8 years<br>Stress UI:<br>16% with 2 years follow-up, 20% with 3, 19% with 4, 18% with 5, 27% with 6–8 years<br>Mixed UI:<br>26% with 2 years follow-up, 29% with 3, 19% with 4, 15% with 5, 12% with 6–8 years | Subjective data<br><br>Pre- and post-op complications | SUI group:<br>80–90% 'cure' and 'almost cure' from 2–8 years<br>8.2% nocturnal incontinence<br>MUI group:<br>60% 'cure' up to 3 years<br>30% 'cure' at 6–8 years ( <i>P</i> = 0.02)<br>27.3% nocturnal incontinence<br>SUI group ( <i>n</i> = 580):<br>3% intra-op complications<br>9% post-op complications<br>24.5 ml post-op residual urine<br>0.9 day hospital care<br>16 days sick leave<br>9% subsequent tape correction<br>MUI group ( <i>n</i> = 112):<br>2% intra-op complications<br>4% post-op complications<br>20 ml post-op residual urine<br>1 day hospital care<br>14 days sick leave<br>3.6% subsequent tape correction | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Sweden.<br>Operated by 10 surgeons.<br>Questionnaire (unspecified) on SUI and urgency incontinence. |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | Cure rates according to no. of TVT procedures performed by surgeons | 250 TVT performed: 87% cure<br>103 TVT: 79% cure<br>81 TVT: 85% cure<br>57 TVT: 86% cure<br>40 TVT: 85% cure<br>18 TVT: 72% cure<br>15 TVT: 87% cure<br>11 TVT: 91% cure |                     |

## UK surgeons' experience of TVT

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--|--------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Duckett 2004 <sup>817</sup> | Survey<br>EL = 3  | 426 surgeons* | Surgeons who performed 7336 TVT (40% gen gynaecologists<br>31% urogynaecologists<br>3% subspecialists in urogynae<br>25% urologists) | NA           | NA                  | Continence surgery performed<br>Suggested criteria for competence<br>TVT operation by group<br>Use of prophylactic antibiotics<br>Anaesthesia (type used by surgeons)<br>Intra- and post-op complications<br>Noted (experienced) | 7336 (45%) TVT<br>4430 (27%) Burch colposuspension<br>46% suggested performing 10–20 cases under supervision<br>43% suggested 20–50 cases required to gain competence, depending on previous experience<br>44% performing ≥ 10 a year<br>91% gynaecologists and 87% of urologists performed ≥ 25 TVTs a year<br>> 87%<br>62% intra-operative<br>22% intra- and post-operative<br>3% post-operative<br>Overall: 25% LA, 53% SA, 22% GA<br>Urologists: 50% GA<br>Sp interest urogynaecologist: 51% SA<br>Gen gynaecologists: 63% SA<br>44% noted bladder perforations ( <i>n</i> = 1–5 in 90% of perforations)<br>37% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>28% voiding abnormality > 6 weeks | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK, data collected for 2001.<br>81% response rate. |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                   | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | Markers for recovery               | 'Off work'<br>20% recommended 2 weeks off work<br>30% 2–4 weeks<br>35% 4–6 weeks<br>15% > 6 weeks off work<br>'Driving'<br>44% suggested driving within 2 weeks of surgery<br>37% no driving between 2–4 weeks<br>18% 4–6 weeks<br>'Sexual intercourse'<br>18% recommend abstinence for $\geq 2$ weeks<br>40% 2–6 weeks<br>42% > 6 weeks |                     |
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | TVT + Concomitant prolapse surgery | 69% (34% of urologist, 76% of gynaecologists)  |                     |
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | Follow-up of patients              | 17% follow-up at 6 weeks<br>19% at 3 months<br>21% at 6 months<br>17% at 1 year<br>4% > 1 year<br>4% no follow-up<br>2% follow-up by nurses<br>1% by junior doctors<br>6% by other health professional<br>81% surgeons willing to audit their outcome data   |                     |



## TVT registry data

| Study                     | Study type and EL                            | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                 | Effect size   | Additional comments                          |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|---|--------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Kuuva 2002 <sup>813</sup> | Registry data<br>EL = 3<br>Nationwide survey | -            | 1455 TVT operations<br>(40 included $\geq 1$ or several other concomitant operations) | TVT          | 2 weeks to 2 months | Intra- and post-op complications | <p><i>Common:</i></p> <p>7.6% minor post-op voiding difficulty</p> <p>4.1% UTI</p> <p>3.8% bladder puncture</p> <p>2.3% urinary retention from 6 h to 3 months</p> <p>1.9% haemorrhage (&gt; 200 ml)</p> <p>1.9% retropubic haematoma</p> <p><i>Uncommon or rare:</i></p> <p>0.5% haematoma outside retropubic area</p> <p>0.8% wound infection</p> <p>0.7% defect healing of vaginal incision</p> <p>0.3% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms</p> <p>0.3% worsening of pre-op urge</p> <p>0.14% dysuria</p> <p>0.2% pain in gluteal/thigh muscle region</p> <p>0.07% vesicovaginal fistula</p> <p>0.07% venous thrombosis</p> <p>0.07% seroma formation around tape</p> <p>0.07% injury to epigastric vessel</p> <p>0.07% injury of obturator nerve</p> <p>0.07% vaginal haematoma</p> <p>0.07% urethral lesion</p> | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: Finland. |

| Study  | Study type and EL       | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                               | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                 | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|--|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Tamussino 2001 <sup>814</sup> (55 units)<br>An earlier report of 29 units also identified: Tamussino 2001 <sup>815</sup><br>Also: Kolle 2005 <sup>816</sup> ( <i>n</i> = 5578) | Registry data<br>EL = 3 | 2795         | Women who had undergone TVT<br>28% had previous surgery for incontinence<br>1640 (59%) TVT as isolated procedures, 1155 (41%) in conjunction with other gynae procedures | TVT under LA (28%)<br>EA (47%)<br>GA (24%) | 3 years (1998–2001) | Intra- and post-op complications | 2.7% bladder perforations (sig. higher in women with previous surgery for prolapse)<br>2.3% increased bleeding<br>17% UTI<br>2.6% re-operations<br>0.4% loosening of tape<br>0.5% division of tape<br>0.1% removal of tape<br>0.3% replacement of suprapubic catheter<br>0.1% increase tension of tape<br>0.7% evacuation of haematoma<br>0.14% intervention to control bleeding<br>0.04% laparotomy for small bowel perforation<br>0.04% intra-urethral injection | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: 55 centres in Austria.   |
|  |                         |              |  |  |                     | Bladder drainage                 | 17% intermittent catheterisation<br>61% urethral Foley<br>19% suprapubic catheter  |  |
|  |                         |              |  |  |                     | Operative care                   | median operation time<br>TVT only ( <i>n</i> = 1640)<br>30 min (range 10–120)<br>TVT in combination ( <i>n</i> = 1155)<br>81 min (range 15–390)<br>Post-op stay median 5 days (0–46)   |  |
| Kolle 2005 <sup>816</sup> ( <i>n</i> = 5578)<br>Related to Tamussino 2001 <sup>814</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3   | 5578         | Data from Austrian Vaginal Tape Registry   | Tension-free vaginal tape procedure*       | NA                  | Bleeding complications           | Incidence 2.7%<br>1.9% intraoperative<br>0.8% reintervention or conversion for bleeding or haematoma<br>0.3% received blood transfusion  | Funding: none declared.<br>*95% Gynecare TVT.<br>bleeding considered arterial in 12% and venous or unknown in 88%. |

Cohort studies comparing outcomes of TVT by patient age or weight, or according to concomitant surgery

| Study                                   | Study type and EL | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Pugsley 2005 <sup>818</sup><br>UK study | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 226 (20 [9%] had no details of post-discharge findings) | F stress UI; UD diagnosis available for 93%, of whom 86% had pure stress UI, 3% DO, 10% mixed UI. Median age 58 years (24–91) in TVT grp; 54 (32–76) in colposuspension group | Tension-free vaginal tape ( <i>n</i> = 123; 19% aged ≥ 70 years)* | Colposuspension ( <i>n</i> = 103; 10% aged ≥ 70 years)* | Median 91 days (19–731 [2 years])<br>In TVT grp: median 100 (23–492)<br>In colpo grp 74 (19–731) | Subjective cure and improvement                                      | TVT:<br>overall 89% (100/112)<br>in pts ≥ 70 years 82% (9/11)<br>in pts < 70 years 90% (75/83)<br>OR for results by age: 0.29 (95% CI 0.08 to 1.01)<br><br>Colposuspension:<br>overall 89%<br>in pts ≥ 70 years 77% (17/22)<br>in pts < 70 years 92% (83/90)<br>OR for results by age: 0.48 (95% CI 0.09 to 2.62)   | Funding: none declared.<br>*with other procedures (mainly prolapse repair) in 7% of TVT group; and with others, mainly hysterectomy, in 41% of colposuspension grp.<br>[EL = 2–] Retrospective review of cases from theatre records. Whether groups similar at baseline in all other characteristics apart from the intervention not clear.<br>The authors also compared complications rates from the 2 interventions – data not reproduced here as the aim of the study was to focus on outcomes according to age 7 unclear whether groups similar at baseline..<br>**% difference not odds ratio; used if one result = zero.<br>Proven UTI = positive culture of 10 <sup>5</sup> colony forming units/ml.<br>recurrent UTI = 3 or more in months 0–3. |
|   |                   |   |   |   |   |  | Early complications (OR for age ≥ 70 years vs < 70 years [95% CI])** | TVT:<br>wound infection** –3.0 (–10.0, 4.0)<br>haematoma** 4.3 (0.3, 8.4)<br>proven UTI 1.73 (0.42, 7.08)<br>post-op haematuria** –3.0 (–10.0, 4.0)<br>voiding difficulty before discharge 2.04 (0.64, 6.50)<br>readmission for any reason 2.35 (0.54, 10.20)<br>Bladder injury/perforation** 4.0 (–4.0, +12.0)<br><br>Colposuspension :<br>wound infection 0.67 (0.08, 4.86)<br>haematoma 1.43 (0.16, 13.14)<br>proven UTI 11.33 (2.61, 49.28)<br>post-op haematuria 1.74 (0.18, 16.42)<br>voiding difficulty before discharge 1.82 (0.49, 6.80)<br>readmission for any reason 2.78 (0.71, 10.78)<br>Bladder injury/perforation** –3.0 (–13.8, +7.3) |   |

| Study                                      | Study type and EL       | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|  |                         |                 |   |  |   |   | Late complications (OR for age $\geq$ 70 years vs < 70 years [95% CI])**                              | TVT:<br>ISC at any time 1.40 (0.26, 7.46)<br>ISC at latest review 4.24 (0.25, 70.56)<br>new irritative symptoms 1.86 (0.73, 4.71)<br>repeat UD 3.91 (1.11, 13.76)<br>recurrent proven UTI 4.22 (1.03, 17.26)<br>division of tape 29.12 (3.2, 264.86)<br>Colposuspension:<br>ISC at any time 2.41 (0.43, 13.43)<br>ISC at latest review 9.1** (3.0, 15.2)<br>new irritative symptoms 1.83 (0.51, 6.53)<br>repeat UD 2.41 (0.43, 13.43)<br>recurrent proven UTI** -1.2 (-7.2, 5.0)     |   |
| Karantanis 2004 <sup>819</sup><br>UK study | Case-control<br>EL = 2- | 68*             | F with UD stress UI. 29% had prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: UD mixed UI, flow rates < 15 ml/s and/or PVR > 100 ml; recurrent UTI, concomitant prolapse surgery | Pts aged $\geq$ 65 years who underwent tension-free vaginal tape | Pts aged < 65 years who underwent tension-free vaginal tape | Median 12 months (6-18) for older women; 16 (12-23) for younger | Subjective cure rate<br>GUTTS questionnaire**<br>Urinary symptoms (at 6 weeks)<br>Hospital parameters | 45% vs 73% $P = 0.05$<br>Outcome scores: 90% vs 100%, $P = 0.003$<br>Care satisfaction scores: 87% vs 97%, $P = NS$<br>Total scores: 87% vs 95%, $P = 0.03$<br>Subjective cure 65% vs 79%<br>persistent SUI 18% vs 3%<br>persistent urge UI 9% vs 6%<br><i>de novo</i> urge 3% vs 3%<br>$P = NS$ for all comparisons<br>Hosp stay median 1 vs 1 days (range 1-2)<br>UTI 18% vs 12%<br>CISC or suprapubic catheterisation < 6 weeks 0% vs 6%<br>Voiding difficulty 3% vs 15% $P = NS$ | Funding: none declared.<br>*from 109 cases, who were case-matched according to primary or subsequent surgery, BMI, and mode of anaesthesia. Chart review of pts undertaken.<br>**genitourinary treatment satisfaction score for continence surgery; 2 components; outcome satisfaction score, and care satisfaction score, both scores between 0 and 16, higher score indicating better satisfaction. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL       | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                | Outcome measures                            | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Gordon 2005 <sup>820</sup>   | Cohort<br>EL = 2-       | 460             | F with UD stress UI (74%) or mixed UI (26%)*<br>34% aged ≥ 70 (mean age 75 years)<br>66% aged < 70 years mean 57 (35-69)<br>20% vs 15% prior hysterectomy<br>3% vs 5% prior continence surgery<br>84% vs 67% underwent prolapse repair | Pts aged ≥ 70 years who underwent tension-free vaginal tape | Pts aged < 70 years who underwent tension-free vaginal tape                              | Mean 26 (SD 13) months, range 3-67 | Persistent UI ( <i>n</i> = 331; 72% of pts) | Stress UI 7% vs 6%<br>Urge UI 75% vs 76% (of <i>n</i> = 28 vs 34)  | Funding: none declared.<br>*31% vs 23% mixed in older vs younger pts [EL = 2-] owing to possible confounding.<br>313 (68%) of the pts were a subset of F previously studied for TVT outcomes (Levin 2004 <sup>770</sup> ).   |
|                              |                         |                 |  |   |  |                                    | Hospital parameters                         | Mean hosp stay 5.6 (SD 3.2) vs 4.3 (SD 2.4) days   |  |
|                              |                         |                 |  |   |  |                                    | Complications                               | 14% vs 9% UTI<br>1.3 vs 4.9% bladder perforation, <i>P</i> < 0.05<br>0 vs 0.3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) urethral perforation<br>1.9% vs 1% vaginal erosion (treated with tape excision)   |  |
| Rafii 2003 <sup>821</sup>    | Cohort<br>EL = 2-       | 187             | F mean age 55 with UD stress UI (56 vs 73% vs 79%) or mixed UI (44 vs 27% vs 23%)<br>10% had prior continence surgery<br>37% concomitant vaginal hysterectomy<br>Exclusions: neurological disease, bladder instability                 | TVT in pts with BMI > 30 ( <i>n</i> = 39)                   | TVT in pts with BMI 26-30 ( <i>n</i> = 62)<br>TVT in pts with BMI 20-25 ( <i>n</i> = 86) | Mean 27 months (6-38)              | Subjective cure/improvement                 | 72 vs 72% vs 74% cure<br>13 vs 20% vs 27% improved<br>15 vs 9% vs 5% failed<br><i>P</i> = NS for comparisons   | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken June 98 to Feb 2001, France.<br>Subjective cure assessed by CONTILIFE questionnaire.<br>Objective cure = no UI on UD, negative stress test, no retention, PVR ≤ 150 ml).<br>Sig. more F in BMI > 30 grp had urge symptoms at baseline, 44 vs 26% vs 17%, <i>P</i> = 0.01. |
|                              |                         |                 |  |   |  |                                    | Objective cure                              | 82 vs 89% vs 93%, <i>P</i> = NS  |  |
|                              |                         |                 |  |   |  |                                    | Complications (unless stated)               | Intra- or early post-op:<br>3 vs 10% vs 13% bladder injury<br>3 vs 3% vs 5% haemorrhage<br>8 vs 8% vs 9% UTI<br>5 vs 5% vs 5% retention<br>Late (> 6 weeks):<br>26 vs 13% vs 15% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>18 vs 6% vs 3% urge UI, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>BMI > 30 grp vs others |  |
| Lovatsis 2003 <sup>822</sup> | Case-control<br>EL = 2- | 70              | F mean age 53 years with UD stress UI<br>11% prior   | TVT in pts with BMI > 35 ( <i>n</i> = 35)                   | TVT in pts with BMI ≤ 30 ( <i>n</i> = 35)  | 6-24 months                        | Cure (subjective or objective)*             | 89% vs 91% <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken Nov 99 to July 2001, Canada, were 1st   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|                              |                   |                 | continence surgery<br>11% concomitant surgery<br>Exclusions:<br>MUCP ≤ 20   |   |  |   | Complications  | 0% vs 14% bladder perforation<br>$P = 0.03$ (all cases fell within 1st 65 procedures undertaken by 1 surgeon)<br>14% vs 23% required catheterisation<br>Operating time 49 vs 35 min $P < 0.05$   | procedures undertaken by surgeon (159 in total, 43 in F with BMI > 35).<br>Logistic regression analysis said to be used.<br>*by telephone interview or negative stress test.   |
| Rafii 2004 <sup>823</sup>    | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 186             | Believed to be the same pts as included in Rafii 2003 <sup>821</sup><br><br>% with mixed UI: 35 vs 20% vs 24%<br>10 vs 5% vs 13% prior continence surgery                           | TVT ( $n = 100$ )   | TVT + hysterectomy ( $n = 40$ )<br>TVT + pelvic floor repair ( $n = 46$ )* | Mean 25 months  | Subjective cure/improvement<br><br>Objective cure (VAS)<br><br>Complications ( $P = NS$ unless stated) | 72 vs 73% vs 67% cure<br>20 vs 25% vs 22% improved<br>7 vs 3% vs 11% failed<br>$P = NS$ for comparisons<br><br>93 vs 98% vs 93%, $P = NS$<br><br>Intra- or early post-op:<br>5 vs 18% vs 13% bladder injury ( $P = 0.05$ TVT alone vs others)<br>Late (> 6 weeks):<br>34 vs 15% vs 30% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>7 vs 13% vs 11% using ISC | Funding: none declared.<br>*colporrhaphy or vagina vault fixation.<br>UI severity on VAS sig. higher in TVT only grp (mean scores 6.8 vs 5.4 vs 5.2, $P < 0.0001$ ).<br>Procedures undertaken June 98 to Feb 2001, France.                         |
| Meltomaa 2004 <sup>824</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 150             | F mean age 55 with stress or mixed (41%) UI symptoms (52% underwent UD).<br><br>44% vs 60% prior gynaec surgery, 13% vs 7% prior continence surgery, 11% vs 8% neurological disease | TVT + vaginal surgery* ( $n = 75$ )                       | TVT ( $n = 75$ )   | 3 years (71% evaluated by mailed questionnaire, others in clinic) | Subjective cure<br><br>Complications   | 87% vs 92%<br><br>20% vs 9% transient retention<br>$P = 0.005$<br>4% vs 8% <i>de novo</i> urgency $P = NS$<br>13% vs 8% UTI $P = NS$<br>13% vs 1% infection (not UTI), $P = 0.001$<br>4% vs 3% tape transection  | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures Aug 98 to June 2000 by experienced urogynaecologists, all under local anaesthetic with concomitant surgery by general afterwards.<br>* 65% vaginal hysterectomy, 20% colporrhaphy, 15% sacrospinal fixation. |
| Rardin 2005 <sup>825</sup>   | Cohort<br>EL = 2- | 175             | F with UD stress UI resulting from ISD<br>Mean ages 61 vs 72, $P < 0.0001$  | TVT in patients with urethral hypermobility ( $n = 124$ ) | TVT in patients without urethral   | 11.9 (SD 7.8) months  | Continence status  | 86% vs 82% cured<br>8% vs 6% improved<br>4% vs 6% failed, $P = NS$<br>(2% vs 6% tapes taken down)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases done Jan 1999 to Jan 2002.  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison                 | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       |                   |                 | No sig. differences in % undergoing concomitant surgery (57% vs 59%), prior continence surgery (41% vs 49%), or DO (11% vs 14%), or in urodynamic parameters or residual urine<br><br>% undergoing concomitant colporrhaphy 20% vs 43% posterior<br>$P = 0.0018$ , 37% vs 12% anterior,<br>$P = 0.0009$ |              | hypermobility ( $n = 51$ ) |                     | Complications<br>( $P = NS$ for all comparisons) | 5.6 vs 5.9% bladder perforation<br>0.8% vs 2% ureteral injury<br>1.6% vs 0% haematoma/abscess<br>5% vs 4% retention<br>2.4% vs 4% incomplete emptying<br>4 vs 5.9% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>23% vs 24% <i>de novo</i> overactive bladder | Hypermobility = deflection of $\geq 30^\circ$ from horizontal on maximal Valsalva strain.<br><br>Cure: no leakage reported by patient or negative cough stress test). Improvement: pt reporting improvement or <i>de novo</i> urge UI in the absence of stress UI. |

*Suprapubic arc sling*

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                  | Length of follow-up              | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Deval 2003 <sup>826</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 104             | F mean age 59 years, stress UI owing to hypermobility (Q-tip angle $> 30^\circ$ ), and bladder capacity $\geq 250$ ml. Mean severity score on VAS of 0 to 10 = 6.4<br><br>81% UD stress UI, 19% mixed UI. 12% had prior continence surgery<br><br>exclusions: drug tx with antidepressants, | Suprapubic arc sling (SPARC)* | 11.9 months (SD 1.9; range 8–20) | Objective cure (no UI on UD or stress test, and no retention [PVR $< 150$ ml])<br><br>Subjective cure (based on results for KHQ and BFLUTS QOL questionnaires)<br><br>Hospital parameters (mean, SD, range) | 90% cure<br>10% failure<br><br>69% cure<br>25% improved<br>6% failed<br><br>operating time 19 (SD 6) mins (9–40)<br>hosp stay 2.2 (SD 1.5) days (1–9)<br>duration catheterisation 1.3 (1–10) | Funding: none declared.<br><br>*with other procedures in 12%: vaginal hysterectomy in 6%, posterior colporrhaphy in 6%.<br><br>local anaesthesia used in 15%, 37% spinal, 48% general.<br><br>*9/11 diagnosed during cystoscopy, 2 during bladder filling.<br><br>** all needing 'tape section'. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                             |                       |                 | adrenergic or anticholinergics drugs; grade 3 or 4 cystoceles or other vaginal support defects                                      |                                 |                     | Complications   | 11% bladder injury*<br>within 15 days:<br>9% UTI<br>3% retention**<br>11% voiding difficulties<br>those occurring after 15 days:<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms   |   |
| Hodroff 2005 <sup>828</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 445             | F mean age 60 years, with stress UI. 67% underwent urodynamic evaluation<br>22% had concomitant prolapse repair and/or hysterectomy | SPARC (no details of procedure) | Mean<br>15 months   | QOL (UDI-6, IIQ-7), mailed questionnaire follow-up; 46% response rate | Mean scores:<br>UDI-6: 26.04<br>IIQ: 12.75   | Funding: none declared; lead author and another paid consultants to American Medical Systems. |
|                             |                       |                 |   |                                 |                     | satisfaction  | 91% would repeat procedure<br>84% would recommend to friend  | Retrospective review of cases.<br>83% subjective cure rate at 4 months (clinic visit).        |
|                             |                       |                 |   |                                 |                     | complications   | 6.7% bladder perforation<br><i>n</i> = 1 hosp admission for rectus haematoma<br><i>n</i> = 1 abdominal pain from a small bowel perforation<br>6.1% <i>de novo</i> urge symptoms<br>4.3% sling release owing to voiding dysfunction | No details of procedure.  |



## Intravaginal slingplasty

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients    | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures             | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------|---|---|
| Bafghi 2005 <sup>829</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 149                | F median age 64 years (36–91), UD stress UI owing to ISD (MUCP < 30 cmH <sub>2</sub> O), or urethral hypermobility   | Intravaginal slingplasty (IVS)                               | Not stated - time of presentation of complication up to 17 months | Tape infection               | 7% (11 cases)<br>Presenting symptoms: vaginal discharge (6/11), vaginal or abdominal fistula 5/11<br>Time of presentation ranged from 4 to 17 months (median 9)<br>Management: 10/11 failed to respond to antibiotics so surgery (uni- or bi-lateral tape removal) undertaken in 10/11 pts; the problem resolved in the remaining pt at 3 months      | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases.<br>None of the pts underwent a concomitant prolapse repair procedure.<br>Procedure under cystoscopic monitoring.                          |
| Ijland 2005 <sup>830</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 49 (of 52 treated) | F median age 58 years (33–93) with 'proven' stress incontinence.<br>71% prior hysterectomy<br>12% prior continence surgery   | Intravaginal slingplasty (anterior IVS)                      | Median 18 months (12–32)  | Cure<br><br>Complications    | 86% (14% failure)<br><br>0 erosion, infection or rejection<br>0 bladder or bowel perforation<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) reqd blood transfusion<br>2% haematoma<br>18% reqd ISC (up to 2 days)<br>10% had 'occasional urge UI' with continuous voiding difficulties   | Funding: in part by Tyco Healthcare Netherlands.<br>Retrospective analysis of cases with telephone follow-up using semi-structured questionnaire.<br>Procedure done between Dec 1999 and July 2001. |
| Baessler 2005 <sup>831</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 19                 | F treated with IVS who were referred because of complications following anterior ( <i>n</i> = 11) and/or posterior intravaginal slingplasty ( <i>n</i> = 13)<br>Median age 51 years (35–71)<br>Three underwent concomitant posterior | IVS (6 anterior, 8 posterior, 5 both anterior and posterior) | Median time to symptoms 1 month (up to 12)                        | Main indications for removal | Of the 11 anterior intravaginal slings:<br>6 intractable mesh infection<br>1 retropubic abscess with cutaneous sinus<br>1 vesico-vaginal fistula<br>1 intravesical mesh and pain syndrome<br>2 voiding difficulties and pain syndrome<br>Of the 13 posterior intravaginal slings:<br>3 intractable mesh infection<br>10 pain syndrome and dyspareunia | Funding: none declared.<br>Pts referred to author's centre between April 2001 and April 2004.<br>Surgery to remove mesh after median 24 months (10 weeks to 36 months).                             |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                   | Length of follow-up                                    | Outcome measures       | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
|                            |                       |                 | bridge repair and 1 had second posterior IVS inserted for recurrent prolapse |                                |  | Outcome                | At 6 weeks to 6 months, in all women genital pain, chronic vaginal discharge and bleeding, voiding and defecation difficulties had been 'markedly alleviated (5) or had ceased (14)'<br>12 of 17 sexually active women (71%) resumed sexual intercourse without difficulties<br>10 women required subsequent surgery for stress UI and POP |   |
| Siegel 2005 <sup>832</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 35              | F mean age 58 years (54–66) with anatomical stress UI                        | Intravaginal slingplasty (IVS) | Mean time to presenting symptoms 9 months (range 2–15) | Vaginal mesh extrusion | 17% ( <i>n</i> = 6) defective vaginal healing manifested by extrusion of the sling material<br>Symptoms: intermittent serosanguineous vaginal discharge ( <i>n</i> = 5*)<br>pelvic pain (3)<br>dyspareunia (3)<br>All patients required surgical removal of the sling material.<br>No urethral erosions were noted                         | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective chart review of cases from November 2002 to September 2003.<br>*pelvic abscess found in one. |

## Safyre

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. of patients      | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                      | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|
| Palma 2005 <sup>833</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 126 (140 procedures) | F mean age 63 (40–71), stress UI. 49% had cystocele, and 10% rectocele<br>60% had failed prior continence surgery<br>Exclusions: DO, max. flow | Polypropylene mesh sling (Safyre) | Mean 18 months (12–36) | Subjective cure/ improvement/ failure*<br>Hospital parameters | 92% cure<br>2% improved<br>6% failure<br>Op time 25 min (unclear whether mean value)<br>Hospital stay 24 (12–36) h | Funding: none declared.<br>Cystoscopy during procedure<br>*cure = dry, improvement = leakage < once every 2 weeks, failure = leakage > once/week. |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics                           | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|---------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |                 | rate < 15 ml/s and/or PVR > 20% of volume voided. |              |                     | Complications    | 2% bladder perforation<br>3% retention > 4 weeks after surgery, reqd loosening of sling tension<br>21% transient <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>5% vaginal erosion of tape (with pain, discharge, bleeding, dyspareunia, dysuria, recurrent UTI): tape trimmed in 4, and covered by advanced vaginal flap in 2<br>5% reqd tightening of tape<br>No cases of intra-op bleeding, or urethral or vaginal perforation |                     |

*Safyre – controlled trial comparing different methods of inserting the sling*

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Comparison   | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------|---|--|--|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Palma 2005 <sup>834</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2– | 226          | F mean age ~62 years with UD stress UI<br>3% concomitant Kelly plication for grade II cystocele<br>60% vs 65% had prior failed continence surgery, 28% vs 46% prior prolapse surgery, 38% vs 37% prior hysterectomy | Safyre sling (transvaginal approach)<br><i>n</i> = 126 | Safyre (transobturator approach)<br><i>n</i> = 100 | Mean 18 vs 14 months | Subjective cure<br><br>Operative care<br><br>Complications | 92.1% vs 94%<br>2.4% vs 2% 'significant improvement'<br>5.5% vs 4% failure<br><br>mean operative time 25 vs 15 min <i>P</i> < 0.05<br><br>9.5% vs 0% bladder injury<br>20.6% vs 10% transient irritative voiding symptoms<br>3.1% vs 0% retention<br>3.1% vs 1% sling infection<br>4.7% vs 6% reqd sling adjustment (tightening) | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2–] Differences in duration of follow-up.<br>Cure = absence of UI;<br>improved = leakage < every 2 weeks;<br>failure = leakage > once a week. |

## Transobturator tape

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention   | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--|--|----------------------|---|--|---|
| de Leval 2003 <sup>835</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 107             | F mean age 62 years (929–88), stress UI<br>16% had prior surgery for UI and/or prolapse  | Transobturator tape inside-out, using a non-absorbable mono-filament polypropylene tape* | 1 month              | Hospital parameters (mean)<br><br>Complications   | Operating time 14 min (7–20)<br>Hospital stay 1.8 days (0.5–8)<br><br>None intra-operatively<br>Immediate post-operative:<br>16% pain/discomfort in thigh folds<br>2% pain associated with hip arthralgia lasting 1 week<br>At 1 month:<br>1% vaginal erosion<br>3% complete urinary retention (tape released)<br>1% superficial vein thrombosis with secondary development of abscess that reqd drainage                                    | Funding: none declared.<br>*31% also underwent prolapse surgical correction.  |
| Costa 2004 <sup>836</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 183             | F mean age 56 years (29–87), stress UI associated with hypermobility. 53% had pure stress UI, 19% stress UI with urgency, 27% had mixed UI. 12% had DO<br>12% had prior prolapse surgery, 26% prior hysterectomy, 14% prior continence surgery | Transobturator tape (Uratape)*   | Mean 7 months (1–21) | Cure or improvement (cure = no subjective leakage, % negative cough stress test; improvement = reduction of SUI)<br><br>Complications | At < 3 months ( <i>n</i> = 176):<br>86% cured<br>8% improved<br>6% failed or missing data<br>At ≥ 6 months ( <i>n</i> = 130):<br>83% cured<br>5% improved<br>12% failed or missing data<br>0.5% bladder perforation<br>1% urethral perforation<br>0.5% lateral vaginal perforation (sulcus)<br>4% transient voiding disorders<br>At 1 year, 1% had voiding difficulties with residuals ≥ 100 ml on urodynamics)<br>5% <i>de novo</i> urgency | Funding: none declared.<br>Mentor-Porges co provided technical support for the registry.<br>7 centres, which all used the same case report form; pts operated on between Oct 2001 and March 2003.<br>31% procedures under spinal anaesthesia, 69% under general.<br>*combined with other procedures in 14% (colposuspension, rectocele repair, needle suspension or hysterectomy).<br>Cystoscopy performed at the beginning of their experience, but not continued. |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                  | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Cindolo 2003 <sup>837</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 80 (93% of 86 treated)                                    | F mean age 56 (39–79) with SUI with urethral hypermobility without severe urogenital prolapse. 28% had mixed UI<br><br>15% had prior hysterectomy. 65% had 1st grade cystocele, 8% 1st grade vaginal vault prolapse       | Transobturator tape (Uratape) | Mean 4 months (1–8)                  | Cure or improvement*<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Hospital parameters (mean)<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Complications | <i>Subjective:</i><br>82% cure<br>15% improved<br>3% failed<br><br><i>Objective:</i><br>80% cure<br>12% improved<br>8% failed<br><br>Operating time 16 min (11–36)<br>Hospital stay 1.1 (1–6) days<br><br>1 (1%) bladder laceration (treated intraoperatively)<br>1% post-op retention, resolved after 4 weeks<br>10% urgency/frequency<br>2.5% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>1% vaginal erosion with inguinal abscess (treated without sling removal) | Funding: none declared<br>Spinal anaesthesia used. No cystoscopy.<br><br>*objective and subjective rates given for same definition; cure = resolution of SUI symptoms, negative cough stress test, no new symptoms or side effects). Improvement = persistent SUI symptoms but reduced leakage episodes; positive full bladder cough stress test or SUI confirmed by urodynamics). |
| Delorme 2004 <sup>838</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32 (21% of the 150 treated, who had min 1 year follow-up) | F mean age 64 years (50–81), stress UI without associated prolapse. 44% had pure stress UI, 56% mixed UI. 19% had DO, 16% ISD (UCP < 20 cmH <sub>2</sub> O). 16% had prior continence surgery, and 16% prior hysterectomy | Transobturator tape (Uratape) | Mean 17 months (13–29)               | Cure or improvement*<br><br><br>Complications   | 91% cured<br>9% improved<br><br>16% obstructive voiding disorders (max. flow rate < 15 ml/s, and/or PVR > 20% vol. voided); 1/5 pts reqd self-catheterisation for 1 months; pt has persisting obstructive symptoms<br>14% (2/14) <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>No cases of vaginal or urethral erosion   | Funding: none declared.<br>*cure = wearing no protection, no stress leakage, and negative cough stress test with full bladder; improvement; using less protection and self-reported improvement.<br><br>One surgeon. Cystoscopy not used. Spinal or general anaesthesia used.  |
| Krauth 2005 <sup>839</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 604 (131 with 1 year follow-up)                           | F mean age 57 years, stress UI (pure in 47%, 53% mixed)   | Transobturator tape (I-STOP)* | 1 year for 22%<br>1–3 months for all | Satisfaction and <i>de novo</i> urinary symptoms at 1 year ( <i>n</i> = 131)  | 86% satisfied<br>14% not satisfied<br>1.5% <i>de novo</i> dysuria and urgency<br>3% re-operation   | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective study.<br>*8% also underwent prolapse surgery or hysterectomy.<br>6 centres; 7 surgeons (3 urologists, 4  |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures    | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   | up)             |                         |              |                     | Hospital parameters | 72% general anaesthetic<br>length of operation < 15 min (75%), < 30 min (90%)<br>hospital stay < 25 h (67%), < 48 h (92%)<br>catheterisation: none (30%), < 12 h (48%), < 24 h (65%)   | gynaecologists).    |
|       |                   |                 |                         |              |                     | Complications       | Intra-operative:<br>3 (0.5%) bladder perforation<br>0.33% vaginal perforation<br>0.83% haemorrhage<br>0.33% haematoma<br>0.16% ( <i>n</i> = 1) immediate section of tape<br>Post-operative:<br>1.5% transient retention<br>2.3% transient perineal pain<br>1.3% transient dysuria<br>2.5% UTI<br>0.3% cicatrisation faults<br><i>De novo</i> symptoms after 1–3 months ( <i>n</i> = 572 [95%]):<br>0.35% dysuria and urgency<br>2.8% dysuria<br>1.6% urgency<br>0.3% dyspareunia<br>0.2% perineal pain |                     |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. of patients    | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                | Length of follow-up         | Outcome measures                           | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Domingo 2005 <sup>845</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 65                 | F UD stress UI. Median age of those with vaginal erosion of tape 54 years (40–77)   | Transobturator tape (43 Uratape, 21 Obtape) | unclear                     | Vaginal erosion                            | 14% ( <i>n</i> = 9; 5 uratape, 4 obtape)<br>Presenting symptoms: persistent vaginal discharge; 5 also had vaginal pain, 1 fever, 1 right labia major pain and oedema with purulent vaginal flow<br>Time of presentation: mean 9 months (2–19)<br>Management: conservative (tape trimming) attempted in 3; successful in 1; tape removed in all others | Funding: none declared<br>Obtape = same as Uratape with a 15 mm central silicone coated section.<br>4 surgeons undertook procedure. |
| Lukban 2005 <sup>840</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 47 (of 58 treated) | F mean age 56 years (SD 13) with UD stress UI. 55% had mixed UI<br>60% had prior hysterectomy<br>Of those who completed questionnaire ( <i>n</i> = 47): 30% had prior continence surgery, 68% underwent concomitant surgery | TOT (Monarc)                                | Mean 8.5 months (3–15)      | QOL (IIQ)<br>Satisfaction<br>Complications | –73% change in mean score, <i>P</i> < 0.001<br>96% completely or somewhat<br>89% stated leakage better or much better<br>72% no leakage or 'a drop or two' (all considered cured)<br>2.1% ( <i>n</i> = 1) 'moderate difficulty' with voiding<br>No intraoperative (trauma to bladder urethra, ureter; haematoma or major vascular injury)             | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective chart review with mailed questionnaire follow-up.  |
| Naidu 2005 <sup>841</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 91 (of 96 treated) | F mean age 56 years (32–88) with UD stress UI. All had failed conservative treatment<br>19% had prior continence  | TOT (Monarc)                                | Median 7 weeks (range 5–15) | Continence status*<br>Satisfaction         | 55% completely dry<br>33% 'substantially continent'<br>81% satisfied<br>11% not satisfied<br>8% not sure  | Funding: none declared.<br>Cases done March 2003 to March 2004.<br>*to be evaluated fully at 1 year.                                |

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                  | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures                                   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                |                       |                 | surgery<br>44% underwent concomitant surgery  |                               |                                     | Complications                                      | 2.2% vaginal fornicial puncture<br>1.1% urethral puncture<br>0 bladder perforation<br>7.7% catheterisation > 24 h<br>13% vaginal packing for > 24 h<br>8.8% UTI<br>6.6% catheterisation > 2 days<br>2.2% sling adjustment<br>12% sling protrusion/delayed healing<br>3.3% wound infections   |  |
| Spinosa 2005 <sup>842</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 117             | F mean age 55 years (37–82) with stress UI. 19% had associated urgency<br>36% underwent concomitant surgery   | TOT out-in (Obtape)           | Median 16 months (7–22)             | Satisfaction (subjective cure)<br>Complications    | 92% complete<br>4% partial (improved)<br>4% unchanged<br>2.6% de novo dysuria<br>0.9% ( <i>n</i> = 1) haemorrhage > 300 ml<br>1.7% de novo urgency<br>2.6% tape erosion<br>0 urethral injury<br>0 bladder perforation  | Funding: none declared.<br>Cases done Feb 2003 to April 2004.  |
| Deval 2006 <sup>843</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 129             | F mean age 57 years with stress UI associated with urethral hypermobility; 40% had mixed UI.<br>25% prior hysterectomy<br>15% prior continence surgery<br>21% concomitant surgery<br>Exclusions: DO | TOT (Obtape), under GA in 85% | Mean 17 months (SD 4.7, range 8–28) | Objective cure<br>Subjective cure<br>Complications | 90%<br>78%<br>0.8% vaginal perforation<br>0 bowel, nerve, bladder, ureteral, or vascular injuries<br>1.6% urinary retention<br>5.4% voiding difficulties<br>5.4% UTI<br>9.3% de novo urgency<br>6.2% vaginal erosion (0.8% vaginal extrusion)<br>1.6% obturator abcess<br>4.6% tape ablation | Funding: none declared.<br>Objective cure = no SUI on clinical or urodynamic investigations, negative stress provocation test, and no urinary retention (PVR ≥ 150 ml).<br>Subjective cure assessed using the KHQ and BFLUTS questionnaires.<br>Procedure under general anaesthetic in 84%, and spinal in 16%. |
| Roumeguere 2005 <sup>844</sup> | Case series           | 120             | F mean age 58 years (31–86) with UD stress  | TOT (Uratape or Obtape; 60    | 12–30 months                        | QOL at 1 year (CONTILIFE), <i>n</i> = 100          | Global satisfaction 78%  | Funding: none declared.<br>Data also reported for each tape in   |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--|---|--|
|       | EL = 3            |                 | UI (30% mixed)<br>4% had prior continence surgery<br>8% had concomitant surgery | pts each)    |                     | Continence status at 1 year<br><br>Complications | 80% dry<br>12% improved<br>8% failed<br><br>0.8% ( <i>n</i> = 1) bladder perforation<br>2.5% urethral perforations*<br>10.8% lateral vaginal injuries<br>1.7% transient retention<br>9.2% voiding difficulties during first week<br>4.25 UTI<br>2.5% vaginal erosions<br>2.5% de novo urgency | paper.<br>Mailed questionnaire follow-up; 100 responded.<br><br>*tape removed and new uratape inserted after 3 months. |

*Controlled trials comparing different routes or methods of inserting TOT*

| Study                                | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                       | Comparison                             | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|---|--|
| David-Montefiore 2005 <sup>847</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 88           | F mean age 53–57 years with stress UI (13% mixed UI)<br><br>About 7% had prior continence surgery<br>24% had prior hysterectomy | I-STOP (retropubic, <i>n</i> = 42) | I-STOP (transobturator, <i>n</i> = 46) | 1 month             | Operative care<br><br>Complications (%), <i>P</i> = NS between grps unless otherwise stated<br><br>Subjective cure at 1 month<br><br>QOL (change in mean scores) | Mean operating time (SD): 21 (9.5) vs 17 (6.6) mins, <i>P</i> = 0.03<br><br>Mean hospital stay: 1.8 (1.7) vs 1.4 (0.5) days, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>Mean duration catheterisation: 1 (1) vs 0.8 (0.5) days, <i>P</i> = NS<br><br>4.8 vs 8.7 <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>9.5 vs 0 bladder injury, <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>0 vs 10.9 vaginal injury, <i>P</i> = 0.03<br>4.8 vs 0 haemorrhage > 200 ml<br>4.8 vs 0 retropubic haematoma<br>2.4 vs 0 pelvic abscess<br><br>92.9 vs 93.5%<br>(4.8 vs 2.2 improved, 2.4 vs 4.3 failed)<br><br>UDI: –92 vs –91%<br>IIQ: –98 vs –76% | Funding: none declared.<br>Urgency at baseline 60% vs 39%, <i>P</i> = NS.<br>Urethral closure pressure 46 vs 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, <i>P</i> = 0.02<br>Post-op pain scores 2 (scale 0–7) vs 0.8 (scale 0–6), <i>P</i> = 0.0005.<br>Surgeon had 'lengthy experience' of retropubic route, and ≥ 30 procedures by transobturator route.<br>Surgery undertaken between March 04 and May 05. |
| Debodinance 2006 <sup>846</sup>      | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | 100          | F mean age ~54 years, SUI (8% vs 0% mixed UI; 12% vs 10% had urgency).  | TOT outside-in (Monarc)            | TOT inside-out (TVT-O)                 | 12 months           | Objective cure (dry during exertion on UD assessment)  | 90% vs 94%, <i>P</i> = NS   | Funding: Single surgeon.<br>Procedures under LA.   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Comparison | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                   | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|---|--------------|------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |              | 12% vs 10% had prior continence surgery<br>No concomitant surgery |              |            |                     | Satisfaction (very or 'satisfied') | 98% vs 100%, $P = NS$  |                     |
|       |                   |              |   |              |            |                     | CComplications                     | No significant difference in peri-op, early post-op, or late post-op complications |                     |

*Slings made of polypropylene (Prolene or Marlex mesh) – controlled trials*

| Study                   | Study type and EL                     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                      | Comparison                             | Length of follow-up                    | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Kuo 2001 <sup>848</sup> | Quasi-RCT (every other pt)<br>EL = 1– | 50              | F mean age 57 or 59 years with stress UI (mixed UI in 13% vs 19%)<br><br>Exclusions: SUI with cystocele or uterine prolapse as this reqd concomitant surgery | Rectus fascial sling ( $n = 24$ ) | Polypropylene mesh sling* ( $n = 26$ ) | Median 24 months (19–35) vs 23 (13–33) | Cure (negative stress test)<br>Satisfaction<br>Hospital parameters<br>Complications ( $P = NS$ unless otherwise stated) | 96% vs 100%<br>92% vs 92%<br>Mean op time 47 (6) vs 35 (10), $P < 0.005$<br>Hosp stay 8.5 (2) vs 4.5 (2), $P < 0.005$<br>8.4% vs 0% haematoma<br>4.2% vs 8% persistent dysuria<br>8.3 vs 3.8% <i>de novo</i> urgency or DO<br>% voiding after removing catheter<br>67% vs 92%, $P < 0.05$ :<br>25% vs 8% voiding delayed 1–2 weeks<br>4% vs 0% delayed 3 months<br>4% vs 0% reqd urethrolisis | Funding: none declared.<br>*self-fashioned, by cutting a 30×30 cm mesh into 15 strips of 2×30 cm.<br>Further publications by same author seem to be related and were not considered separately owing to probable duplication of data. Kuo 2005 <sup>953</sup> and Kuo 2001. <sup>954–956</sup> |

*Slings made of polypropylene (Prolene or Marlex mesh) – case series*

| Study        | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size | Additional comments     |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Spence-Jones | Case              | 143          | F mean age 66 years (29– | Polypropylene | Median 1 year       | Subjective cure  | 99%         | Funding: none declared. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures            | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 1994 <sup>849</sup>        | series<br>EL = 3      |              | 85) with stress or mixed UI (35% mixed)<br>Only 49% had stress leakage on examination<br>45% had prior hysterectomy, 25% prior continence surgery<br>Concomitant surgery undertaken: 100% anterior repair, 48% vaginal hysterectomy, 15% enterocele repair, 84% posterior repair, 26% salpingo-oophorectomy, 21% sacrospinous vault fixation | mesh (Marlex)               | (6 weeks to 4 years)   | Complications               | 31% reqd blood transfusion<br>0.7% ( <i>n</i> = 1) bladder injury<br>0.7% DVT<br>10% fever > 38.5° on 2 occasions<br>20% UTI<br>0.7% haematoma (resolved)<br>12% discharged using CISC<br>2.8% reqd CISC at 1 year<br>0.7% osteomyelitis (resolved)<br>0.7% osteitis pubis (suprapubic sutures cut and removed)<br>3% mesh exposure (excised)<br>1.3% persistent abdominal sinus<br>9% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>12% developed recurrent prolapse (median time 1 year (6 months to 2 years)) | Urodynamic data at 6 weeks also reported – data not reproduced here. Investigates whether peak flow rate predicts outcome. |
| Bryans 1979 <sup>850</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 69           | F mean age 54 years (29–79), recurrent SUI (29% mixed) in whom scarring and loss of vaginal and urethral mobility had made open colposuspension technically impractical<br>37% operated on by suprapubic approach. Mean 1.7 procedure per pt   | Polypropylene mesh (Marlex) | 6 months to 8 years<br>68% > 2 years,<br>30% > 4,<br>18% > 6 | Subjective cure/improvement | 74% cured<br>4% improved<br>22% failed<br>In F with pure stress UI:<br>90% cured<br>10% failed<br>In F with mixed UI:<br>35% cured<br>15% improved<br>50% failed  | Funding: none declared.<br>Annual questionnaire sent to women to gather follow-up data.                                    |

| Study                           | Study type and EL     | No. patients          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|------------------------|--|---|---|
|                                 |                       |                       |  |   |                        | Complications  | 22% voiding difficulty (requiring change to pts voiding position)<br>6% voiding delay > 21 days (ISC in ¾ for 3–6 months)<br>7% non-healing of vaginal wall (exposed sling part removed in 2/5)<br>6% wound infection post-op<br>1.4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) sinus tract thro anterior vaginal wall<br>1.4% 'small bleb' on abdominal incision at 5 years<br>3% enterocele requiring surgical repair<br>0 fistulas |   |
| Demirci 2005 <sup>851</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 81                    | F mean age 54 years (30–76). 90% had UD stress UI; the remaining 10% who had negative stress test also had prolapse. 9% had ISD, 47% urgency (21% of whom had DO)<br><br>57% underwent other procedures (abdominal or vaginal)<br><br>11% prior continence surgery | Mid-urethral self-fashioned polypropylene sling (into 1×7.5 cm tapes) | Mean 22 months         | Objective cure (≤ 2 g on 1 h pad test). <i>n</i> = 73<br><br>Complications | 96%<br><br>4% bleeding > 300 ml (1 retropubic haematoma, 1 reqd laparotomy for ligating blood vessels, 1 reqd blood transfusion)<br>2% wound infection<br>4% persistent urinary retention (reqd catheterisation > 30 days)<br>4% reqd sling release<br>5% UTI<br>19% persistent urgency<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urge (2% <i>de novo</i> DO)<br>0 bladder injury<br>0 urethral injury                          | Funding: none declared.<br><br>I-QOL scores also reported but only for pts who had only the sling ( <i>n</i> = 35); mean scores improved by 71% <i>P</i> < 0.001. |
| Constantini 2005 <sup>852</sup> | Case series           | 40 (39 followed-up; 1 | F mean age 57 years (37–73), with stress UI (62% mixed) related to ISD   | Polypropylene mesh (Marlex)   | Mean 58 months (12–92) | Cure (based on pad usage)  | 77% cure (no pads/day)<br>15% improved (1 pad/day)<br>8% failed (≥ 2 pads/day)  | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Consecutive pts.   |

| Study                           | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention        | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                 | EL = 3                | died)        | 28% had prior hysterectomy, 15% prior continence surgery<br>Concomitant cystocele repair in 8%               |                     |                               | 'surgical cure'   | 56% cure (dry and no persisting post-op complications)<br>33% improved (mild UI, no regular pad protection)<br>10% failed (SUI dry but <i>de novo</i> urgency or urge UI)  | *11% of 28 who had repeat urodynamics had DO.   |
|                                 |                       |              |  |                     |                               | Patient satisfaction  | 77% satisfied and would repeat the operation   |   |
|                                 |                       |              |  |                     |                               | Complications   | 5% vaginal haematoma<br>8% suprapubic pain (resolved by month 2)<br>10% suprapubic haematoma<br>8% mesh-related problems (1 vaginal wall erosion, treated with vaginal wall repair; 2 reqd sling removal owing to erosion or dyspareunia)<br>21% voiding dysfunction (PVR > 20% total bladder vol.; none self-catheterised for > 3 months)<br>46% urgency*<br>2.5% developed cystocele<br>5% developed rectocele |   |
| Laurikainen 2004 <sup>853</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 217          | F median age 56 years (24–90), stress (76%) or mixed (24%) UI<br>56% using HRT or oestrogen<br>12% underwent | Polypropylene mesh* | Mean 23 (SD 11) months (3–36) | Cure (negative stress test and no symptoms)<br>Operative data | 87% cure<br>13% minimal or no improvement<br>Mean hosp stay 3 days (1–12)<br>Sick leave 16 days (2–34)<br>Operating time 25 min (15–45)  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases treated January 1997 to April 2001.<br>2 surgeons. |



| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|
|   |                       |              |   |   |                       | Complications                                    | 0 urethral erosion<br>0 permanent retention<br>1% prolonged voiding dysfunction requiring ISC for 3 months max.<br>0.33% ( <i>n</i> = 1) vaginal erosion of mesh requiring removal<br>7% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>0.33% pelvic haematoma<br>0.33% pelvic bleed from suprapubic tube placement<br>1% hospital readmission (0.33% needed transfusion, 0.66% small bowel obstruction)<br>2% cystocele<br>0.33% enterocele<br>0.66% vaginal pain<br>0.33% urinary obstruction<br>0.66% suprapubic pain |   |
| Rutman 2006 <sup>857</sup><br>5 year follow-up of Rodriguez 2003 <sup>854</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 68           | F mean age 62 years (29–86) with UD stress UI; 54% mixed UI<br>52% prior continence surgery<br>36% concomitant prolapse surgery                       | Self-fashioned polypropylene sling          | Minimum 5 years       | Continence status<br>Complications               | 72% no symptoms of SUI<br>74% never being bothered by SUI<br>21% SUI leakage < once per week<br>90% had ≥ 50% improvement<br>0 sling removal because of pain, infection, or mesh erosion<br>7.2% <i>de novo</i> urgency*  | Funding: none declared.<br>Cases lost to followup were defined as treatment failures.<br>Pre-existing urgency resolved in 51%.                      |
| Iglesias 2003 <sup>855</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 21           | F mean age 64 years (53–78) with UD stress or mixed UI (90% SUI, 10% MUI)<br>62% had prior continence surgery<br>52% had ISD (MUCP < 20 or VLPP < 60) | Polypropylene sling with REMEEX* prosthesis | Mean 12 months (6–25) | Objective cure<br>Operating time<br>Satisfaction | 62% (< 2 g on 1 h pad test) [28% had < 10 g]<br>32 (25–45) mins<br>91% very   | Funding: none declared.<br>*placed in the suprapubic incision with handle left external to body, which allows adjustment of sling post-operatively. |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                              |                       |              | 19% had additional procedure to correct prolapse  |   |                                     | Complications  | 5% ( <i>n</i> = 1) <i>de novo</i> DO<br>0 intra-op complications<br>1.3 mean days catheterisation (1–2)<br>48% reqd immediate post-op adjustment of sling  |   |
| Martinez 2003 <sup>856</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 29           | F mean age 62 years, stress UI associated with prolapse which reqd surgical correction (1 pt did not have stress UI).<br><br>UD findings (in 80%): 93% pure stress UI, 7% mixed; the remaining 20% had a positive stress test | Polypropylene sling with REMEEX* prosthesis | Mean 8 months (3 months to 2 years) | Subjective assessment<br><br>Hospital parameters (mean)<br><br>Complications | 93% cured<br>7% much better<br>0 slightly better or worse<br><br>Op time 119 min (60–310)<br>Hosp stay 5 (3–13) days<br><br>14% urgency<br>14% seroma<br><br>7% recurrent SUI at 3 months (both had new external handle fitted, sling readjusted and cured)<br>3% UTI<br>3% vaginal haematoma<br>3% reqd blood transfusion<br><br>No urethral or bladder lesions | Funding: none declared.<br>*placed in the suprapubic incision with handle left external to body, which allows adjustment of sling post-operatively. |

## Slings made of silicone – case series

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------------|---|---|--|
| Korda 1989 <sup>858</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 54 (53 analysed) | F mean age 54 years (34–77), with UD stress (83%) or mixed UI (17%)<br><br>Decision to used sling made intra-op in 54% of pts when colposuspension not technically feasible | Silicone sling (reinforced with woven polyethylene) | 15 months (4–30)    | Subjective cure or improvement<br><br>Complications | 79% cured<br>4% improved<br>17% failed<br><br>6% reqd blood transfusion<br>11% voiding difficulty<br>15% <i>de novo</i> DO (2/8 with urge UI)<br>4% developed sinus (sling removed in 1, excised and left in situ in 1)<br>4% developed enterocele<br>4% PE | Funding:<br>Surgery undertaken between Sept 1985 and Dec 1987. |



| Study                                   | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up                         | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Duckett 2000 <sup>860</sup><br>UK study | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 7            | No baseline data; all 7 cured of stress UI but developed sinus  | Silicone sling   | –   | Sinus formation  | $n = 7$<br>All abdominal (1 abdominal/vaginal)<br>Slings removed in 5 at 3–16 months after insertion (slings had not become incorporated into the tissues)<br>1/5 developed UI immediately on sling removal  | Funding: none declared.<br>Reported to be part of series of 40 women undergoing procedure.   |
| Stanton 1985 <sup>859</sup>             | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 30           | F mean age 53 years (SD 13) with stress or mixed (60%) UI.<br>77% had prior continence surgery (mean 1.4 procedures per pt) | Silicone sling (reinforced with woven polyethylene; 1×20 cm) | 3 months<br>And 1 year<br>( $n = 22$ [73%]) | Subjective cure<br>Objective cure (pad test, unclear which)<br>Complications | 83% at 3 months<br>95% at 1 year (of $n = 22$ )<br>83% at 3 months<br>95% at 1 year (of $n = 22$ )<br>27% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>23% voiding difficulty (peak flow rate < 15 ml/s)*<br>Intra-op:<br>7% ( $n = 2$ ) vaginal entry<br>7% bladder or urethral entry (1 developed urethrovaginal fistula, and sling removed) | Funding: none declared. One author supported by Wellcome Trust Research Grant, and a grant from St George's Hospital Trustees.<br>*resolved in 3/7; sling released in 4/7. |

*Polytetrafluoroethylene controlled trials*

| Study                         | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention         | Comparison                           | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| Barbaliás 1997 <sup>861</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 48              | F median age ~45 (36–52), stress UI<br>17% DO, 92% had prior continence surgery. 52% hysterectomy | Goretex ( $n = 16$ ) | Rectus fascial sling<br>( $n = 32$ ) | 6 months and 30 months | Subjective cure or improvement (combined)<br>Complications | At 6 months:<br>88% vs 81%<br>At 30 months:<br>rate 'practically equal in goretex group'; UI recurred in 34% of rectus fascial sling grp<br>None in rectus fascial grp<br>In goretex grp:<br>13% urethral erosion; tape removed<br>19% recurrent UTI and occasional irritative symptoms<br>13% <i>de novo</i> DO | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 1–] No baseline data reported per treatment group, no analysis of results.<br>Included in Cochrane review of suburethral slings. <sup>876</sup> |

| Study                    | Study type and EL                     | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison                          | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|
| Choe 2000 <sup>862</sup> | Quasi-RCT (every other pt)<br>EL = 1– | 40              | F mean age 56 vs 63 years (29–87), with stress or mixed UI (60% vs 65% had mixed)<br>65% vs 85% had prior continence surgery<br>70% vs 90% also had surgery for co-existing prolapse | Polytetrafluoroethylene sling (MycroMesh) soaked in antibiotic<br><i>n</i> = 20 | Vaginal wall sling<br><i>n</i> = 20 | Mean 22 months (12–27) | Cure (combined subjective and objective)<br>Subjective assessment<br>Operative parameters<br>Complications | 95% vs 75%<br>100% vs 80% better<br>0% vs 10% same<br>0% vs 10% worse<br>Would have surgery again:<br>100% vs 80% yes<br>0% vs 10% maybe<br>0% vs 10% no<br>time to hosp discharge 20 (6–29) vs 24 (14–53) h<br>time to resume normal activities 3.5 (2–4) weeks both grps<br>Immediate post-op:<br>20% vs 10% and wound infection<br>5% vs 0% UTI<br>0% vs 5% bleeding<br>5% vs 5% vaginitis<br>13% vs 14% transient <i>de novo</i> urge UI (resolved at 3 months) | Funding: none declared.<br>cure = no urine loss demonstrated and none reported during physical activities. |

*Slings made of polytetrafluoroethylene – case series*

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size                       | Additional comments     |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Errando 1996 <sup>863</sup> | Case              | 33           | F mean age 54 years (34– | PTFE soft    | Mean                | Subjective cure  | 72% (continent without retention) | Funding: none declared. |

| Study   | Study type and EL     | No. patients             | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up           | Outcome measures                                 | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
|   | series<br>EL = 3      |                          | 79) with recurrent SUI after mean 1.5 surgical interventions. 64% pure stress UI, 36% mixed. 37% had 'associated rest UI'. none had bladder instability                            | tissue patch suburethral sling (2x30 cm)                              | 13 months (3–33)              | Complications                                    | 12% urge UI<br>6% recurrent stress UI<br>9% retention requiring surgery<br>48% discharged from hospital requiring ISC or suprapubic drainage<br>12% voiding dysfunction persisting > 3 months<br>3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) ISC for > 1 year<br>15% superficial wound infection<br>3% abscess requiring surgical revision<br>3% removal owing to <i>Staph aureus</i> infection at 2 months<br>0 intolerance to sling<br>0 vaginal wound infection  | Procedures undertaken between Oct 90 and May 1993 and were first experience of this sling for surgeon.   |
| Choe 1999 <sup>864</sup><br>Staskin 1997 <sup>865</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 90 (64% of 141 treated)* | F mean age 54 (32–86) years with UD stress (47%) or mixed (53%) UI. 34% had urethral hypermobility, 17% ISD, 49% both.<br>48% had prior continence surgery, 42% prior hysterectomy | PTFE soft tissue patch suburethral sling (size individually tailored) | 51 months (27–84 [2–7 years]) | Subjective cure<br>Satisfaction<br>Complications | 89% of stress UI (urge UI resolved in 64%)<br>82% 'better'<br>9% same as pre-op<br>9% worse<br>Would repeat same procedure:<br>81% yes<br>14% no<br>5% maybe<br>10% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>2% urethral obstruction reqd sling 'incision'<br>8% reqd CISC for retention for 3 months (2/7 reqd soling incision)<br>Overall 4% reqd incision for retention<br>6% reqd sling excision for persistent non-healing of vaginal incision (at mean 8 months)<br>0 bladder erosion<br>0 urethral erosion | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedure undertaken between Dec 1989 and June 1994 in consecutive women<br>*the 90 for whom complete data were available; post-op review conducted annually for 3 years then every 3 years. 31% were lost to follow-up and 6% did not respond to telephone survey.<br>Time to resume normal activities 3.1 weeks (range 1–12). |
| Barbalias 1997 <sup>866</sup>                           | Case series           | 24                       | F mean age 55 years (36–70), UD stress UI. 17% had   | PTFE suburethral  | 30 months (UD)                | Subjective cure/improvement                      | 83% cured (dry)<br>17% improved  | Funding: none declared.<br>Uroflowmetry and urethral   |

| Study  | Study type and EL     | No. patients   | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|  | EL = 3                |  | DO<br>92% prior continence surgery<br>42% prior hysterectomy  | sling (1.5 x 12 cm)   | evaluation);<br>pts with urethral erosion followed up to 3.5 years | Complications  | 8% <i>de novo</i> DO*<br>8% urethral erosion (sling removed at 3.5 years)<br>21% irritative symptoms and recurrent UTI (but continent)  | pressure profilometry data also reported – not reproduced here.<br>*of 17% ( <i>n</i> = 4) with DO pre-op, this improved in 1, persisted in 2, cured in 1.   |
| Yamada 1998 <sup>867</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 39 (81% of the 48 treated)   | F mean age 61 years (40–83) with UD stress UI who had undergone procedure and had follow-up data of 2 years, without urine leakage<br><br>Exclusions: moderate-severe cystocele<br>Follow-up by mailed questionnaire for purpose of study | PTFE patch sling (15x30 mm)   | > 24 months<br>Mean 66 months (SD29) in those reporting cure       | Subjective cure (mailed questionnaire)<br><br>Satisfaction<br>Complications  | 84% cure (no leakage and no protection worn)<br>11% improved (using 1 or 2 pads/day)<br>5% same or worse<br><br>82%<br>8% transient retention<br>3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) sling infection (removed)<br>16% slight pelvic pain<br>37% always or occasional strain to void<br>37% pollakiuria (frequency)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Posterior urethrovesical angle, pad test and uroflowmetry also undertaken in varying numbers of pts – data not reproduced here.<br>Yamada 2001 <sup>959</sup> compared results of the same intervention (and probably the same pts) with Gittes needle procedure; limited details given in report therefore not considered further. |
| Weinberger 1996 <sup>868</sup><br>and Weinberger 1995 <sup>869</sup><br>(predominantly urodynamic follow-up) | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 98 (91% of 108 treated, who could be contacted)<br>62 had UD follow-up | F mean age 60 years (29–86) with UD stress UI<br>64% were taking HRT<br>56% had prior continence surgery<br>26% had concomitant prolapse surgery<br>Telephone follow-up of 98 pts, and UD follow-up of 62                                 | PTFE suburethral sling (0.8 to 1.5 x 20 cm with elliptical central part 3x2.5 cm) | Mean 38 months (12–75)   | Subjective cure ( <i>n</i> = 98)<br>Objective cure (urodynamics; no definition of cure) <i>n</i> = 62 <sup>869</sup><br>Complications ( <i>n</i> = 98) | 76%<br>61%<br><br>22% ongoing voiding difficulty<br>8% continued self-catheterisation<br>30% had complete/partial sling removal or revision; 21% owing to reactions to sling (10 sinus formation, 4 granulation tissue, 4 abdominal wound abscess, 3 erosions vaginal mucosa); 9% owing to urinary retention<br>1% sling removed owing to persistent pain<br>40% wound complications (no details) | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedure done between Jan 1986 and May 1991.   |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Bent 1993 <sup>870</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 115          | F with documented tissue reaction (granulation tissue) or infection of incision sites, or who had sling removed<br>No further details of patients  | PTFE sling (0.8 to 1.5 x 20 cm with elliptical central part 3x2.5 cm) | -                     | Sling reactions or sling removal                    | 21% ( <i>n</i> = 24) reaction to sling material.<br>Site of reactions vagina (18), abdomen (8)<br>Onset: by month 1 (5), 1–3 months (12), > 3 months (7)<br>Treatment: excision and cautery of tissue (16), incl. 9 who had sling trimmed. Sling removed in 23 (< 6 months in 7, 6–12 months in 10, 13–31 months in 6,)<br>2% had sling removed owing to pain or retention | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases to follow-up those with documented tissue reaction (granulation tissue) or infection of incision sites, or who had sling removed. |
| Petros 1996 <sup>871</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 54           | F mean age 50 years (26–79) with symptoms of UI; 10% pure stress, 90% mixed. 50% had DO<br>37% had prior hysterectomy, 26% prior continence surgery<br>Concomitant surgery undertaken in 78% (prolapse repair) | PTFE 4 mm tape inserted using IVS tunneller                           | Mean 15 months (9–24) | Subjective cure<br>Objective cure*<br>Complications | 85%<br>89%<br>6% tape rejection (at 3–6 months; tape removed)<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) developed haematometra and needed dilatation of cervix<br>0 <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>0 reqd catheterisation   | Funding: none declared.<br>* < 0.3 g on pad test following provocation testing.  |

## Slings made of polyester (Mersilene) – case series

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                     | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Guner 1994 <sup>872</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 24           | F mean age 34 (26–52) with socially disabling (75%) or recurrent (25%) stress UI<br>Exclusions: DO   | Polyester graft mesh (Mersilene) | Mean 24 months (4–31)   | Subjective cure (no leakage during any activity)<br>Complications           | 96%<br>13% cellulitis on suprapubic incision line (responded to antibiotics)<br>33% transient retention (PVR > 100 ml)<br>4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) Nocturia and mild urgency at 45 day review, resolved<br>4% urge UI (with DO)<br>0 urethral necrosis<br>0 graft rejection<br>0 sinus formation<br>0 urethral injury<br>0 bladder injury | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures done from Aug 89 to Dec 91.   |
| Young 2001 <sup>873</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 200          | F mean age 56 (31–85) with stress UI. 31% ISD (MUCP < 20), 34% recurrent SUI, 35% chronically raised intra-abdominal pressure e.g. owing to chronic cough, | Polyester graft mesh (Mersilene) | ≥ 4 months in 88% ( <i>n</i> = 176)<br>mean 12.6 months (5–23) in | Objective cure (negative stress test during urodynamics)<br>Subjective cure | 95% at 12 months ( <i>n</i> = 127)<br>94% at 5 years ( <i>n</i> = 52)<br>95% at 12 months<br>90% at 5 years   | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken between March 90 and Feb 2000.<br>Urodynamic changes also reported – data not reproduced here. |

| Study                      | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                     | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                                     | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
|                            |                       |              | BMI > 30, occupational heavy lifting<br>50% had prior continence surgery<br>55% had concomitant surgery<br>69% of the 127 followed up for mean 12 months had urgency or urge UI<br>Exclusions: urethral hypermobility and a normal MUCP, perceived inability to learn self-catheterisation, prior vulvectomy |                                  | 127 (64%)<br>mean<br>63 months (20–107) in<br>52 (26%)                              | Complications  | Intra-op:<br>9% fever<br>4% UTI<br>2% superficial wound infection<br>3% atelectasis<br>40% discharged using CISC<br>4% discharged with indwelling catheters<br>(94% voiding normally at 6 weeks)<br>Long-term:<br>1.5% retention > 1 year<br>4% vaginal or inguinal sling erosion (0.5% sling removed)<br>1% refractory DO<br>15% <i>de novo</i> DO (of <i>n</i> = 52)<br>2% recurrent UTI<br>1.5% reqd surgical release for retention > 3 months<br>2.5% superficial groin seroma or abscess<br>2.5% dyspareunia<br>0.5% entrapped inguinal nerve*<br>0.5% cystotomy*<br>0.5% thigh numbness*<br>0.5% groin pain* | *treated successfully.  |
| Kersey 1988 <sup>874</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 100          | F, age not stated, stress UI<br>Exclusions: 'gross' DO (> 30 cmH <sub>2</sub> O rise in filling pressure)  | Polyester graft mesh (Mersilene) | 25% 6–12 months<br>23% 1–2 years<br>18% 2–3 years<br>13% 3–4 years<br>19% 4–5 years | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br><br>Complications | 78% cure<br>17% improved ('no longer troublesome')<br><br>2% haemorrhage<br>25% retention (delayed hosp discharge to > 10 days)<br>15% late voiding difficulty<br>11% wound haematoma/infection<br>2% exposure of prolene sutures<br>1% PE   | Funding: none declared.<br>Very limited baseline data.<br>Sling used modified since Kersey 1983 <sup>875</sup> case series by anchoring using prolene sutures.<br>87% attended follow-up for this study; data for others taken from notes.<br>Procedures undertaken between 1981–1986 |
| Kersey 1983 <sup>875</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 105          | F, age not stated, stress UI with objective demonstration of abnormal urethro-vesical junction descent   | Polyester graft mesh (Mersilene) | Minimum 6 months to 9 years   | Subjective cure/<br>improvement                      | 50% cure<br>25% improved (no longer troublesome)<br>14% failure  | Funding: none declared.<br>Very limited baseline data.<br>Procedures undertaken between   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics          | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|
|       |                   |                 | 54% had prior continence surgery |              |                     | Complications    | 2% vesico-vaginal fistulas, both repaired<br>1% PE<br>20% reqd catheterisation > day 5<br>7% minor abdominal wound complications<br>3% partial dehiscence of vaginal incision with exposure of part of sling; resolved by trimming | 1972–1981.<br>88% independently reviewed by 2 gynaecologists; 12% not available for review (case notes used in 2). |

*Traditional slings – comparative studies*

| Study                           | Study type and EL | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                  | Comparison                  | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|
| Viseshsindh 2003 <sup>877</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1–    | 26              | F mean age ~51 years (SD ~2), with “anatomical incontinence or ISD”. 5 (19%) had ISD.<br>Median duration of UI 1 year (rectus fascia) or 2 years (vaginal wall sling)<br>Exclusions: other genitourinary abnormalities, DO | Rectus fascial sling (n = 15) | Vaginal wall sling (n = 11) | Median 7 months (3–12) | Subjective cure<br>Satisfaction<br>QOL (SEAPI)<br>Hospital parameters<br>Complications | 93% vs 100%<br>40 vs 73% very satisfied<br>40% vs 27% satisfied<br>13% vs 0% no change<br>7% vs 0% dissatisfied<br>Median scores 2 vs 1, P = 0.02<br>Mean operating time 98 (SD 17) vs 64 (SD 8) mins<br>Median hospital stay 6.8 vs 6.5 days<br>13% vs 18% temporary CISC<br>13% vs 9% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>others (not stated by tx grp):<br>4% (n = 1) prolonged vaginal packing<br>4% suprapubic wound infection<br>8% recurrent stress UI<br>12% prolonged initiation of voiding<br>0 permanent retention | Funding: none declared.<br>Included in Cochrane review of suburethral slings. <sup>876</sup><br>One surgeon performed procedures.<br>[EL = 1–] lack of details re randomisation, analysis of results. |
| Kaplan 1996 <sup>878</sup>      | Cohort            | 79              | F mean age 58 (SD 8) vs 61 (8) with stress   | Rectus fascial sling          | Vaginal wall sling (n = 36) | Mean 21 months         | Failure (persistent SUI)   | 5% vs 3%  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of  |



| Study                         | Study type and EL   | No. of patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention            | Comparison                   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|---|
|                               | EL = 2-             |                 | UI owing to ISD; non-neurogenic and secondary to failed continence surgery (mean 1.6 vs 1.3 procedures per pt)<br>38% DO | (n = 43)                |                              | (6-51)              | Satisfaction (mean score on 1-5 scale, very sat to very dissat)<br><br>Operative parameters (Mean [SD])<br><br>Complications | 1.9 vs 1.3, $P < 0.05$<br>89% vs 94% satisfied or very satisfied<br>7% vs 6% no change<br>5% vs 0% dissatisfied<br><br>Op time 84 (18) vs 42 (13) mins, $P < 0.001$<br>Hosp stay 3.7 (2) vs 1.4 (1) day, $P < 0.001$<br>Return to work 28 (8) vs 18 (3) days, $P < 0.002$<br><br>12% vs 3% voiding dysfunction at 1 months<br>2% vs 0% persisting ISC > 3 months, $P < 0.03$<br>14% vs 3% superficial wound infection<br>6% vs 8% persisting urgency at 6 months<br>14% vs 8% <i>de novo</i> DO | consecutive pts treated by 1 surgeon.   |
| Rodrigues 2004 <sup>879</sup> | 'Cohort'<br>EL = 2- | 232             | F with UD stress UI.<br>Median age 47 vs 49 years; mean no. surgeries 1.8 vs 2.2 per pt                                  | Fascial sling (n = 128) | Vaginal wall sling (n = 104) | 70 vs 45 months     | Subjective outcomes<br><br>Time to return to normal activities   | Success (not defined): 94% vs 80%<br>Cure (no UI under stress, no voiding difficulty, no symptoms at filling): 73% vs 62%<br>Improved (still using pads but satisfied): 13% vs 17%<br><br>Mean 9.3 (SD 1.2) vs 5.3 (0.2) days   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2-] Difference in duration of follow-up between grps, and limited baseline data. |

| Study                     | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                     | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison   | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|--|---------------------|---|---|---|
|                           |                   |   |  |   |  |                     | Complications   | Urgency or urge UI or nocturia: 5% vs 8%<br>3.7 vs 3.8% bladder or urethral perforations<br>0.8% ( <i>n</i> = 1) vs 0 persistent pain in incisional area<br>42% seroma formation at donation site, 2 (4%) of which reqd drainage<br>2 vs 12.5% developed rectocele<br>11% vs 9% urethral obstruction and voiding difficulty   |   |
| Lucas 2000 <sup>880</sup> | RCT<br>EL = 1+    | 168 (3 found not to have UD SUI therefore excluded) | F median age 1 years (31–73), UD stress UI. 77% had nocturia, 82% urge UI, 73% had bladder hypermobility<br>89% had prior surgery.<br>43% had associated prolapse (34% central cystocele, 20% lateral weakness, 17% vault prolapse, 22% rectocele)<br>Exclusions; evidence of neurological disease, hypocompliance or DO on UD | Standard repair using fascial sling, ~20 cm long ( <i>n</i> = 81; 75 rectus, 6 abdominal) | Sling on a string, ~8–10 cm long, mounted on each end with nylon thread ( <i>n</i> = 84; rectus 83, abdominal 1) | 1 year              | Symptoms<br>Satisfaction<br>QOL (score change from baseline)<br>Hosp parameters | Stress UI 16% vs 16%<br>Urge UI 46% vs 38% ( <i>de novo</i> 7% vs 2%*<br>Nocturia 67% vs 50%<br>78% vs 76%<br>UDI: -128 vs -101 (95% CI for mean difference 1.12 to 52.99), <i>P</i> = 0.04<br>IIQ: -168 vs -127 (95% CI for mean difference -4.32 to 85.96, <i>P</i> = NS)<br>Operating time (without other procedures): median 58 (38–94) vs 49 (25–90)<br>Time to successful void: median 3 days post-op both grps<br>Hosp stay: post-op median 6 (4–17) vs 6 (3–23), <i>P</i> = NS; total duration 8 (4–19) vs 8 (4–25) | Funding: Welsh Office.<br>3 centres.<br>concomitant procedures in 26% vs 21%.<br>Baseline UDI scores significantly worse in std repair group (181 vs 157, <i>P</i> = 0.003), hence individual pt changes rather than raw data used in analysis of all outcomes where pts QOL on recruitment may have had an impact.<br>*58% vs 61% of those with pre-op urge UI were cured.<br>** listing those specific to urinary tract or to procedure.<br>Pain scores at 24 h and between day 4–5 post-op not |

| Study                     | Study type and EL   | No. of patients              | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
|                           |                     |                              |  |   |   |  | Complications  | Intra- /immediate post-op:**<br>3% vs 1% UTI<br>1% vs 3% bladder injury or trauma<br>1% vs 0% unable to void<br>2% vs 2% haematoma<br>Readmission rates (any reasons):<br>24% vs 11% for 0–3 months<br>7% vs 12% 3–6 months<br>12% vs 6% 6–12 months   | sig. different between grps.  |
| Maher 2001 <sup>881</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2–   | 51                           | F mean age 62 vs 58 years (39–87) with UD stress UI with low urethral pressure (MUCP < 20) who had failed conservative tx. 33% vs 30% had urge UI > 1/week<br>46% vs 22% had 'poorly supported bladder neck', 13% vs 7% DO<br>54% vs 59% prior hysterectomy, 71% vs 63% prior anterior colporrhaphy, 17% vs 33% prior continence surgery | Rectus fascial sling<br><i>n</i> = 24                                       | Rectus fascial sling reinforced with polyglactin (Vicryl) mesh<br><i>n</i> = 27 | Mean 8 (4–14) vs 5.5 (3–19) months,<br><i>P</i> = 0.05                 | Patient-determined success<br><br>Subjective success<br><br>Objective success<br><br>Complications | 58% vs 85%, <i>P</i> = 0.03 (satisfaction of ≥ 8 on VAS 0–10)<br><br>71% vs 93% <i>P</i> = NS (No or occasional [ <i>&lt;</i> 1/week] SUI or UUI)<br><br>50% vs 52%, <i>P</i> = NS (no leakage secondary to SUI or DO on urodynamics)<br><br>8% vs 7% wound infection<br>0% vs 4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) incisional hernia<br>8% vs 0% voiding difficulties (reqd ISC)<br>19% vs 7% UD evidence of voiding dysfunction<br>17% vs 7% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>0 vs 0 ≥ grade 2 rectoenterocele | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken between March 95 and Dec 97. Review at Jan-Mar 1998.<br>Nurses blind to procedure undertaken did UD review.<br>Surgery under supervision of 2 senior authors; up to 4 surgeons took part.<br>29% vs 22% underwent concomitant surgery. |
| Flynn 2002 <sup>882</sup> | 'Cohort'<br>EL = 2– | 134 (96% of the 140 treated) | F mean age ~53 years (21–77) with stress UI. 25% vs 19% had prior continence surgery, 45% vs 60% had mixed UI<br>Exclusions: neurogenic bladder,   | Autograft fascia<br>( <i>n</i> = 71;<br>rectus fascia 69%, fascia lata 31%) | Allograft fascia lata (cadaveric)<br><i>n</i> = 63                              | Minimum 24 months (mean 44 SD 7 vs 29 SD 3 months,<br><i>P</i> < 0.05) | Subjective cure/improvement<br><br>Symptoms<br><br>Satisfaction                                    | 77% vs 71% cured<br>13% vs 13% improved<br>10% vs 16% failed<br><br>10% vs 13% recurrent stress UI<br>16% vs 24% urge UI (28% vs 21% persistent, 5% vs 28% <i>de novo</i> )<br><br>90% vs 78%, <i>P</i> = 0.05   | Funding: none declared.<br>[EL = 2–] retrospective review of cases, difference in duration of follow-up.<br>Only autograft available from Dec 95 to Aug 97, then both available.  |

| Study  | Study type and EL            | No. of patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                          | Comparison                                     | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|--|------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
|  |                              |  | concomitant pelvic surgery  |                                       |  |                                      | Hospital parameters   | Mean operating time 116 (23) vs 69 (17) mins, $P < 0.05$<br>Mean hosp stay 1.9 (0.6) vs 1.2 (0.4) days, $P < 0.05$<br>Weeks lost from work 6.4 (2.6) vs 3.4 (2.2), $P < 0.05$   | One surgeon.   |
|  |                              |  |   |                                       |  |                                      | Complications   | 27% vs 6% UTI<br>6% vs 0% abdominal wound infection<br>1% vs 0% prolapse<br>4 vs 1.5% retention for > 30 days (resolved in 2/3 and 1/1; remaining pt reqd urethrolisis)<br>1.5% bladder perforation (unclear which grp) |  |
| Almeida 2004 <sup>883</sup>  | 'Cohort' EL = 2-             | 60   | F mean age 53 years (37-73) with stress UI  | Autograft fascia lata ( $n = 30$ )    | Allograft fascia lata (cadaveric) ( $n = 30$ ) | Mean 33 (24-41) vs 36 (22-44) months | Cure or improvement (no definition)<br>Hospital parameters                | 70% vs 40% cure<br>20% vs 28% improved, $P < 0.05$<br>Mean op time 81 vs 62 min, $P < 0.05$<br>Mean hosp stay 2.48 vs 1.25 days, $P < 0.05$   | Funding: none declared.<br>No description of procedures given.   |
|  |                              |  |   |                                       |  |                                      | Complications   | None 'with regard to sling erosion or infection'  |  |
| Soergel 2001 <sup>884</sup><br>Associated reference Heit 2000 <sup>180</sup> | 'Case-control study' EL = 2- | 45 (90% of the 50 treated; 5 did not return for follow-up) | F with UD stress UI complicated by ISD and urethral hypermobility (Q-tip angle > 30)<br>Mean ages 57 vs 66 years $P = 0.01$<br>Prior hysterectomy 85% vs 75%<br>52% vs 33% concomitant procedure<br>44% vs 83% prior continence surgery | Autologous rectus fascia ( $n = 33$ ) | Cadaveric fascia lata ( $n = 12$ )             | 25 (SD 26) vs 12 (SD 7) weeks        | Objective cure (no leakage during cough UPP)<br>Success (cured and no DO) | 70% vs 17%, $P = 0.006$<br>79% vs 33%, $P = 0.006$  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective analysis of cases- although described as a case-control study, nothing in the methods indicates that this was so. |

| Study   | Study type and EL   | No. of patients                      | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Comparison  | Length of follow-up                           | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| McBride 2005 <sup>885</sup>   | 'Cohort'<br>EL = 2- | 47 (66% of 71 treated)               | F mean age 61 vs 74 ( $P = 0.000$ ) who had undergone auto- or allo-graft fascia lata sling procedure, for UD stress UI<br><br>54% vs 62% had prior hysterectomy, 46% vs 38% prior prolapse or urological surgery, 60% vs 48% current HRT use | Autologous fascia lata sling<br>$n = 39$                                    | Allograft (cadaveric) fascia lata (Suspend Tutoplast)<br>$n = 32$       | Mean 42 (SD 10) vs 35 (7) months, $P = 0.007$ | Subjective cure<br><br>Pad use<br><br>QOL (mean scores)                 | 92% vs 91% (85% vs 91% reported $\leq 1$ leakage episode/day)<br><br>Mean 0.29 vs 0.9, $P = 0.024$ (73% vs 43% used none/day 27% vs 38% used 1 0% vs 19% used $\geq 2$ )<br><br>UDI-6: 21 (17) vs 21 (15), $P = NS$<br>IIQ-7: 10 (1.5) vs 4 (6.8), $P = NS$ | Funding: unrestricted grant from Mentor.<br>[EL = 2-] Differences between groups in duration of follow-up and in other procedures undertaken (46% vs 91%).<br>Case list and chart review, with request for review of patients in clinic; if pt declined invite to clinic, questionnaire administered over telephone.<br>Urodynamic/UPP findings reported for 62% - results not reproduced here.<br>No information on complications. |
| Wright 1998 <sup>886</sup>  | Cohort<br>EL = 2-   | 92                                   | F mean age 60 (16-82) years, with stress UI<br><br>57% had prior continence surgery<br>8% vs 20% underwent concomitant pelvic surgery   | Autologous fascia lata ( $n = 33$ )   | Allograft fascia lata (cadaveric)<br>$n = 59$                           | Mean 16 (15-28) vs 9.6 (1-20) months          | Subjective cure<br><br>Mean change in SEAPI scores<br><br>Complications | 94% vs 98%, $P = NS$<br><br>-86% vs -77%, $P = NS$<br><br>0% vs 2% ( $n = 1$ ) sling failure<br>0. vs 2% reqd blood transfusion<br>0 bladder perforation<br>0 infection<br>0 vaginal skin necrosis  | Funding: Grant from the Fonds de Perfectionnement, Geneva University hospital.<br>Duration of procedure and hospital stay also quoted but only when sling procedure undertaken solely.<br>[EL = 2-] differences in duration of follow-up.   |
| Brown 2000 <sup>887</sup><br>Associated publication (details of allograft failure cases: O'Reilly | Cohort<br>EL = 2-   | 167 (80% responded to Q; 65% vs 86%) | F mean age 62 years with stress or mixed UI (35% vs 50% pure stress, 65% vs 50% mixed)<br>73% vs 42% had prior continence surgery, 10% vs 34% had associated pelvic   | Autologous fascia lata sling<br>( $n = 46$ ; 30 responded to questionnaire) | Allograft (cadaveric) fascia lata (121; 104 responded to questionnaire) | Mean 44 vs 12 months                          | Subjective cure/improvement*<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Operating time  | 73% vs 74% cured<br>27% vs 19% improved<br>0% vs 7% failed**<br><br>90% vs 89% satisfied<br>83% vs 83% would recommend to friend<br><br>129 vs 82 min   | Funding: none declared.<br>Consecutive pts; autograft undertaken May 94 to July 97, and cadaveric from Feb 97 to June 99. Questionnaire mailed to pts to ask about subjective outcomes.<br>*cure = no or minimal leakage not requiring pads;  |

| Study                        | Study type and EL | No. of patients                                     | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                       | Comparison   | Length of follow-up                         | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| 2002 <sup>888</sup> )        |                   |   | surgery   |  |  |   | Complications   | 7% vs 2% prolonged retention (1/3 from autologous grp needed urethrolisis)<br>0% vs 2% suprapubic abscess<br>0% vs 1% lower extremity neuropathy<br>0% vs 1% persistent suprapubic pain at 6 weeks<br>0% vs 1% suprapubic haematoma<br>3% vs 0% CVA<br>11% vs 0% persistent thigh pain at 6 weeks<br>median duration of drainage post-op 14 (6–180) vs 9 (4–120) days | improvement = 1–3 pads/day; failed > 3 pads/day.<br>**failed at mean 6.5 months (range 4–13). <sup>888</sup>   |
| Simsiman 2005 <sup>889</sup> | Cohort<br>EL = 2  | 241 (of 354 treated; minimum 1 year follow-up reqd) | F mean age between 55 and 59 across grps, with stress UI<br>Prior surgery 24 vs 25% vs 14% ( $P < 0.05$ auto and allo vs xeno)<br>'attachment to rectus' 74 vs 84% vs 57% ( $P < 0.05$ xeno vs auto and allo)<br>Concomitant surgery 77 vs 82% vs 81% | Autograft (rectus fascia or fascia lata $n = 78$ ) | Allograft (cadaveric fascia lata, $n = 80$ )<br>Xenograft (porcine dermis, Pelvicol $n = 83$ ) | At least 1 year; mean 23 vs 25 vs 17 months | Objective failure<br>Subjective failure<br>Complications* | 13 vs 36% vs 46%<br>$P < 0.001$ allo- and xeno-graft vs autograft<br>31 vs 55% vs 53%<br>$P < 0.01$ allo- and xeno-graft vs autograft<br>5 vs 5 vs 2.4% underwent urethrolisis for persistent voiding dysfunction or worsened irritative symptoms   | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases performed between Jan 1997 and Jan 2003.<br>Objective failure = urinary leakage with cough stress testing at any time after 3 months postop. Objective cure = no leakage with a standing cough stress test with at least 200 mL bladder volume at a min 12 months post-op.<br>*data on complications not systematically collected by authors. |

*Rectus fascial slings – case series*

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up  | Outcome measures                                      | Effect size                     | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Chou 2003 <sup>890</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 98           | F median age 66 years (45–84) with stress (49%) or mixed (51%) UI<br>Exclusions: urethral | Autologous rectus fascial sling | Median 3 years (1–7) | Combined cure and improved rate (on UI Outcome Score) | 97% vs 93% (stress vs mixed UI) | Funding: Institute for Bladder and Prostate Research.<br>Retrospective review of cases |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients            | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                                 | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                    | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------|---|--|---|
|                              |                       |                         | diverticulum, neoplasm, urinary fistula   |  |                     | Complications                                       | 2% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>1% ( <i>n</i> = 1) prolonged retention (reqd surgical revision of sling)   | treated 1995–2001.  |
| Hassouna 1999 <sup>891</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 78 (70% of 112 treated) | F mean age 56 years (37–82) with stress UI owing to ISD. 49% had stress UI, 51% mixed. 13% had DO<br>70% had prior continence surgery, mean 1.4 (1–3) procedures<br>60% underwent concomitant surgery | Autologous rectus fascial sling (7 x 2.5 cm) | Mean 3.4 (0.5–8)    | Subjective success<br>Complications<br>Satisfaction | 81% success<br>19% failure (not improved and using > 1 pad per day)<br>21% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>1.3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) straining during voiding<br>25% discomfort or pain related to surgical procedure<br>0 retention<br>0 CISC for > 4 weeks<br>86% satisfied<br>79% would undergo same surgery<br>84% would recommend<br>74% procedure improved social activity<br>37% (of 51) reported improved sexual activity | Funding: none declared.<br>Questionnaire follow-up of cases treated by 1 surgeon between 1988 and 1996.<br>3rd party followed-up non-responders by telephone.<br>test–retest reliability of questionnaire evaluated in 28%. |
| Reichelt 2003 <sup>892</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 86 (67% of 129 treated) | F mean age 57 years with stress UI<br>Exclusions: neurogenic UI<br>Mean 0.4 continence surgical procedures per pt   | Autologous rectus fascial sling              | Mean 39 months      | Change in continence symptoms<br>Satisfaction       | 26% dry at all times.<br><i>% improvement:</i><br>65% reported 50–100% improvement<br>15% with 10–40% improvement<br>17% no change<br>2% worse<br>(61% using 0–2 pads/day)<br>63% satisfied<br>59% would recommend to others   | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken by 2 urologists between 1989 and 1998.<br>Questionnaire follow-up and retrospective review of charts.<br>No information on complications.                                  |
| Cross 1998 <sup>893</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 134 (89% of 150)        | F mean age 57 (24–79) with stress UI (34% mixed UI).<br>2% severe urgency   | Autologous rectus fascial sling              | 22 months (6–42)    | Objective cure (on urodynamics)                     | 93% cure<br>7% failure<br>(cure of urge UI in 36/48 [75%])   | Funding: none declared.<br>F unable to attend clinic follow-up interviewed by telephone by 3rd  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. patients              | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                    | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
|                               |                       | treated)                  | 36% type 2 UI (ALPP > 90 cmH <sub>2</sub> O): included if failed continence surgery, engaged in vigorous athletic activity, had chronic pulmonary condition, or grade 3 or 4 cystocele)<br>54% type 3; ALPP < 60.<br>12% had type 2/3<br>58% had prior continence surgery<br>42% underwent concomitant surgery (mainly cystocele or rectocele repair or hysterectomy) |                                 |                       | Complications   | 19% <i>de novo</i> urge UI or urgency at 3 months<br>3% persistent urge UI<br>0.7% ( <i>n</i> = 1) prolonged lower abdominal pain (suture removed, and pt pain free)<br>4% UTI<br>3% new, symptomatic enterocele<br>8% not voiding spontaneously at 1 month<br>4% ( <i>n</i> = 6) permanent ISC (4/6 [3%] had urethrolisis at 3 months; other 2 had undergone augmentation cystoplasty for neurogenic UI, and remain on ISC)  | party.  |
| Haweekins 2002 <sup>894</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 198 (80% of 246 treated)* | F mean age 51 (36–75) years with stress UI<br>26% had prior continence surgery<br>15% concomitant procedures undertaken   | Autologous rectus fascial sling | Median 6 years (2–18) | Subjective success<br><br>Patients perception<br><br>Complications (info derived from notes; <i>n</i> = 178)<br><br>Complications (questionnaire) | 72% (cured or much improved on symptom severity score and on pts perception of change)<br><br>41% cure<br>38% much better<br>15% little better<br>4% no change<br>25 worse<br><br>4% haemorrhage requiring transfusion<br>3% wound infection<br>1.7% bladder perforation<br>1.1% reqd sling release<br><br>9% often/always voiding difficulty<br>29% urgency<br>11% abdominal pain attributed to surgery<br>4% recurrent UTI<br>3% loss of abdominal tone<br>4.5% incisional hernia<br>4% had subsequent prolapse or UI surgery | Funding: UK study, DGH based.<br>*who responded to questionnaire sent to F treated between 1979 and 1996. |



| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients             | Patient characteristics   | Intervention   | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--|------------------------|---|--|---|
| Morgan 2000 <sup>895</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 235 (95% of 247 treated) | F mean age 55 years (10–84) with stress UI<br>54% type 2 SUI (ALPP > 90 cmH <sub>2</sub> O and urethral mobility > 2 cm);<br>46% type 3 (ALPP < 60)<br>73% had urgency, 45% urge UI<br>65% had concomitant procedures, incl. cystocele, rectocele, enterocele repair; hysterectomy)               | Autologous rectus fascial sling (6 to 8 x 1 to 1.5 cm) | Mean 52 months (24–70) | Subjective cure or stress UI (SUI resolved and no urge UI)<br>Subjective cure of urge UI<br>Satisfaction<br>Complications | 88% (91% type 2 grp, 84% type 3 grp)<br>In 88 pts with > 5 years follow-up, 85% cured<br>74%<br>92% highly satisfied<br>23% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>7% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>94% transient retention (reqd catheterisation for > 1 day)*<br>2% prolonged (> 3 months) catheterisation; reqd urethrolisis<br>3% sling failure<br>2% hypersuspended urethra<br>0.8% pelvic haematoma<br>0.8% incisional hernia<br>0.4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) DVT<br>0.4% PE<br>0 sling erosion | Funding: none declared but one author declared financial interest and/or other relationship with Bard Urologic.<br>Retrospective review with postal questionnaire; 95% response rate; all respondents retested by telephone.<br>Procedures undertaken Jan 1993–Dec 1996.<br>6% had secondary surgery for sling failure (collagen to repeat sling).<br>*mean duration catheterisation 8.4 days; 98% voided normally at 3 months. |
| Chaikin 1998 <sup>896</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 251                      | F mean age 56 years (19–80) with stress UI. 25% 'simple' cases (prior surgical failure or DO without urge UI); 75% cases complicated (urge UI, fistula, urethral diverticulum, grade 3 or 4 cystocele or neurogenic bladder)<br>Mean no. prior procedures 0.78 (0–3) simple vs 3.1 (0–19) complex | Autologous rectus fascial sling                        | Mean 3.1 years (1–15)  | Combined subjective and objective cure/improvement<br>Complications   | 73% cure (dry under all circumstances and < 2 g on 1 h pad test)<br>19% improved (≥ 50% reduction in UI symptoms and pad test results)<br>8% failure (< 50% reduction in UI symptoms and pad test results)<br>2% permanent retention<br>3% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>23% persistent urge UI<br>0.8% bladder injury<br>0.4% prolonged pain<br>0.4% death<br>0 urethral injury   | Funding: no funding declared.<br>Retrospective analysis of cases.<br>One surgeon.   |
| Muller 1993 <sup>897</sup>  | Case                  | 108                      | F mean age 47 years (22–  | Autologous   | Mean                   | Subjective cure   | 67%  | Funding: none declared.   |

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients         | Patient characteristics   | Intervention                         | Length of follow-up    | Outcome measures   | Effect size   | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------|--|---|---|
|                              | series<br>EL = 3      | (90% of 120 treated) | 76) with stress UI, not neurological or congenital or following gynae surgery or radiation<br><br>67% prior continence surgery<br>28% concomitant surgery (mainly hysterectomy)             | rectus fascial sling (~2 cm x 10–12) | 5 years (max. 15)      | Complications  | 33% transient retention (catheterisation for 4–6 weeks)<br>2% permanent CISC<br>7% bladder injury<br>2% retropubic haematoma or wound infection<br>2% hernia of the abdominal wall  | Operations between 1969 and 1987.   |
| Borup 2002 <sup>898</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 32                   | F mean age 50 (30–79) years with stress UI.<br>53% had prior pelvic surgery   | Autologous rectus fascial sling      | 5 years                | Subjective cure ( <i>n</i> = 31; 1 lost to follow-up)<br><br>Complications | 97% (dry during stress)<br>3% improved<br><br>16% <i>de novo</i> urgency (2/5 using antimuscarinics occasionally)<br>69% CISC post-op<br>38% at 6 months<br>16% at 1 year<br>6% at 5 years (1/2 used CISC pre-op)<br>41% UTI<br>22% recurrent UTI (≥ 2 episodes)<br>3% sling erosion into urethra<br>3% re-operation owing to difficulty with CISC<br>0 pain<br>0 dyspareunia | Funding: none declared.<br>Operations undertaken between Dec 92 and Dec 95. Consecutive pts.<br>All pts familiar with ISC pre-op.<br>6/7 with pre-op DO free of DO post-op.<br>residual volumes and uroflow data reported for each pt – data not reproduced here. |
| Zaragoza 1996 <sup>899</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 60                   | F mean age 57 (34–78) years with stress UI (42%) or mixed UI/stress UI with urgency (58%)<br>40% had prior continence surgery<br>5% prior pelvic radiation, 5% prior radical pelvic surgery | Autologous rectus fascial sling      | Mean 25 months (11–34) | Subjective cure<br><br>Complications                                       | 95% cure<br>5% failure (DO with urge UI)<br><br>60% transient retention (median 6.5 days [1 day to 5 weeks])<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urgency (none urge UI; urgency treated with antimuscarinic)<br>13% UTI<br>5% persistent incisional pain<br>0 bladder injury<br>0 urethral injury   | Funding: no funding declared.<br>Consecutive pts.   |

## Fascia lata slings – case series

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. patients  | Patient characteristics  | Intervention  | Length of follow-up                | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Fitzgerald 2004 <sup>900</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 27 (77% of 35 treated who had > 3 months follow-up) | F median age 59 years (38–79)<br>85% using HRT<br>37% had prior continence surgery   | Allograft fascia lata (freeze dried, irradiated)                    | Median 12 months (0.5–51)          | Failure (return of SUI symptoms at any time)<br><br>Complications   | 52% at between 2 weeks to 2 years following procedure (41% at 1 year)<br><br>4% ( <i>n</i> = 1) reqd sling division at 4 weeks owing to persistent urinary retention   | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective chart review; cases of sacrocolpopexy also reviewed in same paper.<br>Procedures undertaken 1997–99, by 3 urogynaecologists.<br>Fitzgerald 1999 <sup>960</sup> believed to be an earlier publication relating to same cases.  |
| Amundsen 2000 <sup>901</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 91 (88% of 104 treated)*                            | F mean age 62 (SD 12), with stress UI symptoms; 65% had mixed UI (16% DO)<br>70% used oestrogen<br>40% underwent concomitant surgery<br>Prior surgery:<br>38% suspension procedure, 80% hysterectomy, 14% collagen tx, 3% sling) | Allograft fascia lata (freeze-dried, non-irradiated, size: 2×15 cm) | Mean 19 (SD 10) months, range 3–37 | Subjective cure<br><br>Pad usage (mean change)<br><br>Complications | 63%<br>another 21% reported occasional SUI and used 0–1 pad/day<br>From 4.6 to 1.1, <i>P</i> < 0.0001<br>1% reqd urethrolisis for retention<br>1% blood transfusion intra-op<br>15% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>2% underwent subsequent surgery for new onset or recurrent POP | Funding: none declared.<br>*who responded to mailed questionnaire. No sig. difference between respondents and non-respondents in baseline data (age, parity, weight, oestrogen use, prior continence surgery, pad usage, VLPP). Procedure undertaken March 96–Jan 99.<br>urge UI resolved in 41% (24 of 59).<br>UDI and IIQ also evaluated, but only selective results reported (not reproduced here). |
| Elliott 2000 <sup>902</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 26 (of 40 cases treated, with ≥ 1 year follow-up)   | F mean age 56 years (31–81), stress UI; 42% had urgency<br>50% underwent concomitant surgery   | Cadaveric fascia lata (solvent dehydrated, irradiated,              | Mean 15 months (12–20)             | Continence status   | 77% dry<br>15% slight or rare leakage (wore 0–1 pads/day)<br>8% wore 2 pads/day  | Funding: none declared.<br>Retrospective review of cases undertaken since June 1998; telephone questionnaire by 3rd party (Tutoplast used).  |

| Study                       | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up                 | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                             |                       |              |   | size: 2×12 cm)  |                                     | Complications   | 8% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>0 recurrent cystocele   | Pre-op urgency persisted in 9/11.  |
| Huang 2001 <sup>903</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 18           | F mean age 52 years (37–76) with stress UI (50% mixed UI).<br>22% had ISD (VLPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O), 78% had urethral hypermobility<br>28% prior hysterectomy<br>6% prior needle suspension<br>11% underwent concomitant surgery | Cadaveric fascia lata (solvent dehydrated, irradiated: size 7×2 cm) | Mean 9 months (7–12)                | Subjective cure or improvement  | 72% cure or improved (mean improvement 83% [50–100%])<br>28% failed<br>6% ( <i>n</i> = 1) underwent further sling surgery using autograft fascia lata  | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken March 1999 to July 1999 (Tutoplast used).<br>Follow-up by mailed questionnaire.   |
| Walsh 2002 <sup>904</sup>   | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 31           | F mean age 63 years (40–75) with stress UI<br>65% prior continence surgery; 26% failed conservative tx; 55% were taking antimuscarinics for OAB<br>19% underwent concomitant vaginal repair   | Cadaveric fascia lata   | Mean 13.5 months (12–14)            | Subjective cure<br>Improvement (VAS)<br>Satisfaction<br>Complications | 94%<br>85% at 1 year<br>69% at 1 year<br>81% would repeat procedure<br>77% would recommend to friend<br>0 bleeding<br>0 wound infection<br>0 erosion<br>35% ISC at 4 months<br>3% ISC at 1 year      | Funding: none declared.<br>Surgery undertaken or supervised by 1 surgeon, unclear when.<br>Pts who failed to return for follow-up or to return questionnaire were telephoned by 3rd party. |
| Richter 2003 <sup>905</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 102          | F mean age 63 years (29–87) with stress UI owing to ISD (UCP ≤ 20 and/or VLPP ≤ 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O) combined with urethral hypermobility (cotton swab > 30°).<br>87% had mixed UI, 5%  | Cadaveric fascia lata (2×25 cm)*                                    | Mean 35 months (SD 12.5), median 36 | Quality of life (mean score change; reduction = improvement)          | IIQ-7:<br>–80% ( <i>P</i> < 0.001) at 1 year; –82% at 2 years, –80% at 3 years, –77% at 4 years)<br>UDI-6:<br>–58% ( <i>P</i> < 0.001) at 1 year; –62% at 2 years, –57% at 3 years, –58% at 4 years) | Funding: none declared<br>Procedure undertaken Oct 97 to Dec 2001.<br>Questionnaire follow-up annually; response rates: 88% at 1 year, 78% at 2 years, 84% at 3 years, 93% at 4 years.     |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                                  | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|---------------------|---|--|--|
|       |                   |              | pure stress UI, 8% no leakage<br>59% underwent concomitant surgery |              |                     | Continence status                                 | 80% better or much better at 1 year<br>(77% at 2 years, 75% at 3 and 4 years)  | *Lifecell Corp.<br>**30% said 'same or better',<br>61% not applicable. |
|       |                   |              |  |              |                     | Satisfaction                                      | 90% at 1 year<br>(90%, 85%, 86% at 2,3,4 years)  |  |
|       |                   |              |  |              |                     | Complications (responses to 1 year questionnaire) | 58% some voiding difficulty (34% 'slight')<br>28% vaginal pain, pressure or protrusion<br>33% bladder or kidney infection<br>5% less able to have sexual relations** |  |

*Other biological sling case series – porcine small intestine, porcine dermis, dura mater, dermal grafts, vaginal wall slings*

| Study                    | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                            | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures                  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Giri 2005 <sup>906</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 40           | F mean age 48 (28–66) with UD stress UI. 33% had ISD.<br>18% prior continence surgery<br>20% prior hysterectomy<br>Exclusions: UTI within 6 weeks, neuropathic bladder, uterovaginal prolapse, DO, voiding dysfunction (max. flow rate < 15 ml/s, pressure at max. flow rate > 40 cmH <sub>2</sub> O, PVR > 50 ml) | Porcine dermal sling (Pelvicol; 2×7 cm) | 6 months              | Cure/improvement                  | 75% cured (no leakage in any circumstances and dry cough stress test)<br>15% improved (≥ 50% reduction in leakage % dry on stress test)<br>10% failed (< 50% reduction and/or leakage on cough stress test)                                      | Funding: National Institute of Health Sciences, and Pfizer Sales Ireland.<br>Procedures undertaken June to December 2003.<br>Pts taught CISC pre-op; day case surgery was aim of series. 40% discharged 10 h after surgery (same day).<br>KHQ and SF36 used – results only presented in graphs. |
|                          |                       |              |  |   |                       | Complications                     | 0 bladder perforation<br>0 reqd urethrolisis<br>5% (n = 2) minor vaginal bleeding after removing pack<br>2.5% superficial wound infection<br>7.5% UTI<br>5% deep pelvic pain for 3 months<br>25% persisting urgency<br>5% <i>de novo</i> urgency |   |
| Kinn 1994 <sup>907</sup> | Case series           | 47           | F mean age 67 (47–79) years with stress unsuitable for colposuspension   | Porcine dermal sling (Zenoderm;         | Mean 20 months (7–49) | Cure/improvement (no definitions) | 68% cured<br>9% persistent leakage<br>25% failed   | Funding: none declared.<br>All underwent PFTM pre and post  |

| Study                          | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics   | Intervention  | Length of follow-up                  | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
|                                | EL = 3                |              | 26% prior continence surgery<br>43% prolapse, who underwent concomitant colporrhaphy  | 1×20 cm)  |                                      | Complications   | Early (within 6 weeks):<br>8.5% wound infection<br>8.5% UTI<br>2.1% sling erosion into urethral wall (sling removed)<br>2.1% DVT<br>15% retention > 7 days<br><br>Late (after 6 weeks):<br>2.1% retention, reqd sling removal<br>4.2% urgency needing tx (persisting post-op)]   | surgery.<br>Uroflowmetry and profilometry also reported post-op; not reproduced here.   |
| Jarvis 1985 <sup>908</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 50           | F mean age 51 (37–76) with UD stress UI. 14% had urge UI<br>100% prior continence surgery (82 procedures in total; 48% had > 1 operation) | Porcine dermis sling (Zenoderm; 30×1.5 cm, central part 3 cm) | Mean 21 months (6 months to 4 years) | Cure/<br>improvement (dry and no leakage on urodynamics)<br><br>Complications | 78% cure<br>22% failed (16% remained stress incontinent, 4% urge incontinent, 2% mixed UI)<br><br>64% voiding normally at end of day 10<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) catheter reqd for 24 days<br>2% bladder injury (repaired immediately)<br>UTI 'in small number'<br>Approx 50% abdominal wound infection (if defined as cellulitis around wound or discharge of fluid from wound)<br>0 reqd sling release or urethral dilatation | Funding: none declared.<br>Procedures undertaken 1979–83.   |
| Jones 2005 <sup>919</sup>      | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 34           | F with UD stress UI on urodynamics or stress test<br>32% underwent concomitant procedures   | Porcine small intestinal submucosa (Stratisis; 2×30 cm)       | 2 years                              | Subjective cure/<br>improvement<br><br>Complications                          | 79% cure<br>9% incomplete resolution<br>12% failed (persistent urge UI)<br><br>3% ( <i>n</i> = 1) <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>9% suprapubic inflammation (2 resolved with antibiotics, 1 had autologous fascial sling placed)<br>0 prolonged retention   | Funding: none declared. First author research consultant for Cook Urologist.<br>Results taken from case notes or first visit after 2 year period. |
| Rottenberg 1985 <sup>914</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 36           | F mean age 53 years (SD 9) with severe stress UI; 17% had urgency<br>100% had some degree of  | Lyophilised dura mater (Lyodura; 2×30 cm)                     | 6 months                             | Objective success   | 89%<br><br>(no leakage on coughing or straining with full bladder in upright position, detected by pad test)   | Funding: none declared.<br>Uroflowmetry and profilometry also reported post-op; not reproduced here.  |

| Study                     | Study type and EL     | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention                                  | Length of follow-up   | Outcome measures            | Effect size  | Additional comments  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
|                           |                       |              | POP<br>44% prior continence surgery<br>None had DO<br>Exclusions: UTI, DO, voiding difficulties (max. flow rate < 15 ml/s)                                     |   |                       | Complications               | 2.7% ( <i>n</i> = 1) sling passed through the bladder and replaced<br>2.7% haemorrhage requiring surgery for haemostasis<br>5% suction drain inside bladder      | Mean post-op drainage time 11 days (SD 6).   |
| Owens 2004 <sup>915</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 25           | F mean age 62 years (38–83), with stress, or mixed (28%) UI, owing to urethral hypermobility (> 30° on Q-tip test). None had DO<br>52% had concomitant surgery | Cadaveric dermal grafts (Duraderm; 2×12 cm)   | 6 months              | Subjective cure/improvement | 68% cure (no leakage and pt satisfied)<br>24% improved (minimal leakage, 0–1 pads/day, and pt satisfied)<br>8% failure (> 1 pad/day or pt perception of failure) | Funding: none declared.<br>Follow-up by chart review and a telephone interview.<br>Mean post-op drainage time 8 days (3–37). |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                       | Satisfaction                | 60% very satisfied<br>16% satisfied<br>24% not<br>68% would repeat surgery<br>68% would recommend to friend  |  |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                       | Complications               | 12% retention (catheter for > 2 weeks)<br>4% PVR > 75 ml<br>4% bladder perforation   |  |
| Onur 2005 <sup>916</sup>  | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 25           | F mean age 62 years, (39–77) with stress UI<br>16% prior continence surgery<br>56% prior hysterectomy  | Solvent-dehydrated cadaveric dermis (2×12 cm) | Mean 12 months (8–22) | Continence status           | 68% cure (no leakage, no pads used)<br>12% improved (slight leakage, small amounts, or using 0 to 1 pad)<br>20% failed (using > 1 pad per day)                   | Funding: none declared.<br>UDI-6 scores also presented, in graph – no numerical data.  |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                       | Satisfaction                | 76%  |  |
|                           |                       |              |  |   |                       | complications               | 12% ( <i>n</i> = 3) mild suprapubic or vaginal infection<br>28% required catheterisation for mean 9 days (4 to 42)<br>12% <i>de novo</i> urgency or urge UI      |  |
| Raz 1996 <sup>909</sup>   | Case                  | 163          | F aged 32–81 years with  | Vaginal wall                                  | 17 months             | Recurrent SUI               | 7%   | Funding: none declared.  |

| Study                         | Study type and EL     | No. patients          | Patient characteristics  | Intervention       | Length of follow-up      | Outcome measures  | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|---|---|--|
|                               | series<br>EL = 3      |                       | stress or mixed UI (47% mixed). 58% had ISD, and 42% 'anatomical UI'<br><br>54% had prior continence surgery   | sling              | (6–32)                   | Complications   | 5% retention for > 8 weeks<br>9% <i>de novo</i> urge UI (7/11 persisting at 11 months)<br><br>1% suture removal<br>1% enterocele<br>2% superficial wound infection<br>0.5% persistent pubic pain  | Aim of study was to compare outcomes in women with ISD vs hypermobility; results considered as a whole here.<br><br>Procedures done June 92 to 94.                                   |
| Kaplan 2000 <sup>910</sup>    | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 336 (90% followed up) | F mean age 56 years (18–85) with stress UI. 51% ISD, 49% anatomical UI<br><br>34% DO<br><br>71% had concomitant surgery  | Vaginal wall sling | Mean 40 months (4–77)    | Cure (no definition)<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Complications | 93% at 1 year (84% pts)<br>91% at 3 years (48% pts)<br>95% at 5 years (29% pts)<br><br>93% satisfied or very satisfied<br><br>8% <i>de novo</i> DO and urge UI<br>5% wound infection<br>3% UTI<br>2% sutures removed<br>7% POP                                | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Procedures done Jan 93 to Oct 99.<br><br>Aim of study was to compare outcomes in women with ISD vs hypermobility; results considered as a whole here. |
| Litwiller 1997 <sup>911</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 51                    | F mean age 70 years (52–86) with stress or mixed UI (65% mixed). 78% overall had urgency<br><br>73% ISD, 27% urethral hypermobility<br><br>86% prior hysterectomy<br>65% prior surgery | Vaginal wall sling | Mean 31 months (5–67)    | Continence status<br><br>Satisfaction<br><br>Complications    | 73% had improved urinary control<br>21% no change<br>5% worsening UI<br>(55% socially continent)<br><br>62%<br><br>12% ISC<br>10% <i>de novo</i> urge UI<br>8% <i>de novo</i> urgency<br>4% dyspareunia<br>2% ( <i>n</i> = 1) cystocele<br>2% suprapubic pain | Funding: none declared.<br><br>Procedures done Aug 90 to Jan 96.<br><br>Telephone follow-up.   |
| Palma 2002 <sup>912</sup>     | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 45                    | F mean age 53 (29–75), with UD stress UI owing to ISD (VLPP < 60 cmH <sub>2</sub> O)<br><br>Exclusions: grades 3 or 4 cystocele, POP, DO   | Vaginal wall sling | Median 40 months (26–61) | Cure*/improvement<br><br>Complications                        | 31% cure<br>38% improved<br>31% unchanged or worse<br><br>0 ISC<br>no further details   | Funding: none declared.<br><br>One surgeon.<br><br>Cure = no symptoms of UI or bladder dysfunction, no UI on valsalva.   |
| Mikhail 2004 <sup>913</sup>   | Case                  | 53                    | F mean age 45 (38–   | Vaginal wall       | Min                      | Success*  | 83%   | Funding: none declared.  |



| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics  | Intervention | Length of follow-up              | Outcome measures | Effect size   | Additional comments  |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|--|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
|       | series<br>EL = 3  |              | 63 years) with UI stress UI owing to urethral hypermobility<br>58% had grade 1 or 2 cysto- or recto-cele and underwent concomitant repair<br>None had prior continence surgery | patch sling  | 5 years (mean 67 months (63–98)) | Complications    | 4% ISC for 2 months<br>6% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>1.8% ( <i>n</i> = 1) superficial wound infection<br>1.8% bladder injury<br>1.8% transient neuropathy<br>0 urethral injury<br>0 ureter injury<br>0 enterocele | Retrospective review of cases 1989–2002.<br>*complete symptom improvement, no pads used, and negative stress test. |

## Competence of surgeons

### Outcome by case volume and hospital status

| Study   | Study type and EL | Aim of study  | Number of participants                  | Participant characteristics  | Outcomes   | Results  | Additional comments   |
|---|-------------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Hutchings 1998 <sup>126</sup><br>Associated reference Black 1997 <sup>125</sup><br>Only data relevant to competence question reproduced in this table | Cohort<br>EL = 2+ | To identify risk factors consistently predictive of a successful outcome up to 1 year after surgery for stress UI (outcomes explored were complications, symptom severity index, symptom impact index, and activities of daily living)<br><br>Health-service factors investigated: pre-op urodynamics, surgical procedure, concomitant procedure, surgeon specialty, (gynae or urology), grade (consultant or not), volume of cases per annum, hospital teaching status | 232*<br>82% responded to Questionnaires | 38 gynaecologists and 11 urologists from the North Thames region who carry out surgery for stress UI in NHS hospitals.** Completed questionnaires on pts prior tx, presentation, the procedure, urodynamic investigations, speciality and grade of surgeon, work volume, and hospital teaching status.<br><br>F undergoing stress UI surgery by 1 of these surgeons between Jan 93 and Jun 94 (excluded if unable to read or understand English). Completed questionnaires on sociodemographic factors, age, general health, UI history severity and impact, and co-existent conditions. Mean age 52 years. 50% underwent colposuspension, 29% anterior repair, 12% needle suspension, 4% missing info, 4% other | Odds for a better outcome of surgery (univariate analysis) according to high volume (20–42 cases per year vs 1–19 cases per year)<br><br>Odds for a better outcome for surgery according to hospital status (non-teaching vs teaching) | No complications (20–42 cases vs 1–19 per year):<br>OR 0.87 (95% CI 0.50 to 1.50)<br>Reduction in SSI:<br>OR 1.51 (95% CI 0.83 to 2.73)<br>Reduction in SII:<br>OR 1.77 (0.96, 3.27)<br>Improvement in ADL:<br>1.07 (0.60, 1.92)<br><br>Univariate analysis: (non-teaching vs teaching)<br>OR 2.32 (95% CI 1.01 to 5.29)<br>Multivariate analysis<br>No longer statistically significant (data not given in paper) | Funding: MRC Health Services Research and Public Health Board.<br>Multivariate analysis using logistic regression.<br>*for whom both patients and surgeons completed questionnaires (of 631 F invited to participate).<br>Of 64 (47%) who accepted request to participate in study; the 49 were selected because representative of surgeon's work volume, speciality, teaching status, and geographic location of hospital.<br>18% hospitals were teaching, 82% non-teaching.<br><br>**sig. higher risk of complications reported by surgeon speciality on univariate and multivariate analysis, but when wound problems excluded from analysis (because more gynae undertook anterior repair where there is no wound), this significance did not persist. When analysis restricted to colposuspension gynae associated with fewer complications than urologists (data not shown in paper). Also sig. greater improvement in SII for gynae vs urologists. |

## Other volume data in relation to continence surgery

| Study                        | Study type and EL     | No. patients                                 | Patient characteristics   | Intervention              | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures  | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---------------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|
| McLennan 2005 <sup>925</sup> | Case series<br>EL = 3 | 256 (of 278 treated)*                        | F mean age 58 years (30–85) undergoing TVT surgery.<br>Type of UI not stated<br>17% had prior 'bladder surgery'<br>56% had concomitant surgery<br>82% general anaesthetic, 18% spinal   | Tension-free vaginal tape | Not stated          | Bladder perforation rate  | 34%<br>(12.5% right sided, 15.2% left-sided, 6.3% bilateral)<br>By number of procedures undertaken by surgeon:**<br>40.9% for 1–5 cases<br>30.7% for 6–10 cases<br>25.9% for 11–15 cases | Funding: none declared.<br>*Pts considered in groups of 5 for learning curve- analysis. As median number of procedures undertaken by the 23 residents was 13 (range 3–22), mean 12, 22 pts (8%) only fell into the ≥ 16 pts category, therefore these 22 were excluded from analyses.<br>All procedures under guidance of one surgeon.<br>**significant inverse association between no. procedures and bladder perforation according to Kendall's rank correlation (–0.124), $P = 0.033$ .                                    |
| Duckett 2004 <sup>926</sup>  | Survey<br>EL = 3      | 1066 consultants sent q, 578 completed (54%) | National survey of consultants who perform continence surgery to describe the experience, current trends, and management of continence surgery for urodynamic stress UI in the UK<br>40% primary general gynaecologists<br>31% special interest urogynaecologists<br>25% urologists<br>3% subspecialist urogynaecologists<br>2% did not classify themselves | NA                        | NA                  | No. procedures/ study year*   | Total 16,412<br>By procedure:<br>45% TVT<br>27% colposuspension<br>13% anterior repair<br>9% periurethral injection<br>4% sling<br>0.05% needle suspension                               | Funding: none declared. Ethicon Ltd provided list of surgeons.<br>Questionnaire: 29 item, commissioned by the BSUG Audit Committee covering volume and type of surgery, complications, audit, pt follow-up.<br>*year ending 1st January 2002.<br>#also reported by speciality.<br>**question based on DH Good Practice in Continence Services stating that best surgical results achieved by teams that perform an adequate volume of operations. <sup>34</sup><br>Complete data for all volumes not given for this question. |
|                              |                       |  |   |                           |                     | No. procedures performed by surgeons#<br>(1–10, 11–25, 26–50, > 50) | TVT 45%, 28%, 20%, 8%<br>Colposuspension 72%, 21%, 7%, 0.2%<br>Anterior repair 62%, 28%, 10%, 0<br>Periurethral inj. 73%, 21%, 4%, 2%  |   |
|                              |                       |  |   |                           |                     | % performing pre-op urodynamics                                     | 91% (range 86% general gynae to 100% urogynae subspecialists)  |   |

| Study                       | Study type and EL | No. patients  | Patient characteristics   | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures   | Effect size  | Additional comments   |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|--------------|---------------------|--|--|---|
|                             |                   |               | Duration of consultant post:<br>25% < 5 years, 31% 5–10,<br>44% > 10 years  |              |                     | No. procedures considered adequate for good surgical results per annum** | 50% said < 50 pa; 50% > 50 pa<br>majority speciality view:<br>61% general gynae said 10–20 pa<br>68% urogynae subspecialists 20–50 pa<br>61% special interest gynae 20–50 pa<br>59% urologists 10–20 pa<br>36% urologists 20–50 pa |   |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | surgical complications (% surgeons reporting)                            | 13% persistent suprapubic pain<br>25% recurrent UTI<br>47% development urgency/urge UI<br>29% bladder perforations<br>19% voiding abnormality persisting > 6 weeks   |   |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | follow-up after surgery  | 26% for 6–8 weeks<br>43% for 2–6 months<br>31% for > 6 months  |   |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | % using QOL, pad test, UD to assess surgical outcome                     | By specialty:<br>general gynae 3, < 1, 3%<br>special interest gynae 8, 8, 8%<br>subspecialist 36, 58, 26%<br>urology 10, 6, 10%  |   |
| Duckett 2004 <sup>817</sup> | Survey<br>EL = 3  | 426 surgeons* | Surgeons who performed TVT (40% gen gynaecologists<br>31% urogynaecologists<br>3% subspecialists in urogynae<br>25% urologists) | NA           | NA                  | Continence surgery performed   | 7336 (45%) TVT<br>4430 (27%) Burch colposuspension   | Funding: none declared.<br>Setting: UK, data collected for 2001.  |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | Suggested criteria for gaining competence                                | 46% suggested performing 10–20 cases under supervision<br>43% suggested 20–50 cases required to gain competence, depending on previous experience  | 81% response rate.<br>Only data relevant to competence extracted. |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | TVT operation by group   | 44% performing ≥ 10 a year<br>91% gynaecologists and 87% of urologists performed ≥ 25 TVTs a year  |   |
|                             |                   |               |   |              |                     | Intra- and post-op complications noted                                   | 44% noted bladder perforations ( <i>n</i> = 1–5 in 90% of perforations)<br>37% <i>de novo</i> DO<br>28% voiding abnormality > 6 weeks  |   |

| Study | Study type and EL | No. patients | Patient characteristics | Intervention | Length of follow-up | Outcome measures                   | Effect size  | Additional comments |
|-------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | TVT + Concomitant prolapse surgery | 69% (34% of urologist, 76% of gynaecologists)  |                     |
|       |                   |              |                         |              |                     | Follow-up of patients              | 17% follow-up at 6 weeks<br>19% at 3 months<br>21% at 6 months<br>17% at 1 year<br>4% > 1 year<br>4% no follow-up<br>2% follow-up by nurses<br>1% by junior doctors<br>6% by other health professional<br>81% surgeons willing to audit their outcome data |                     |

## H.2 2013 evidence table

### Urinary incontinence (update)

#### Percutaneous PTNS vs NAT for OAB

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Finazzi-Agro,E., Petta,F., Sciobica,F., Pasqualetti,P., Musco,S., Bove,P., Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation effects on detrusor overactivity incontinence are not due to a placebo effect: a randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled trial, Journal of Urology, 184, 2001-2006, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100210</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 35<br/>PTNS = 18<br/>Placebo = 17</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>PTNS = 18/18 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 17/17 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean [SD not reported]</u><br/>PTNS = 44.9 years<br/>Placebo = 45.5 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/3 days - Mean ± SD (N)</u><br/>PTNS = 4.1 ± 1.8 (18)<br/>Placebo = 4.2 ± 2.1 (17)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N(%)</u><br/>PTNS = 18/18 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 17/17 (100%)</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Episodes of frequency/day - Mean ± SD</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Intervention = 12, 30-minute PTNS sessions, performed 3 times a week.<br/>Placebo = 12, 30-minute sham stimulation sessions, performed 3 times a week.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p><u>PTNS</u><br/>A 34 gauge needle was inserted percutaneously approximately 5cm cephalad to the medial malleolus of the right or left ankle. A surface electrode was placed on the medial aspect of the ipsilateral calcaneus. Needle and electrode were connected to a low voltage (9V) electrical stimulator. Stimulation current (0 to 10mA) with a fixed frequency of 20Hz and a pulse width of 200msec was increased until flexion of the big toe or fanning of all toes. If no clear motor response, the needle was removed and insertion procedure repeated. The current was set at the highest level tolerable to the patient.</p> <p><u>Placebo</u><br/>A 34 gauge needle was inserted in the medial head</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day at end point</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence/3 days - measured by 3-day voiding diary - Mean (range) (N)<br/>PTNS = 1.8 (1.2 – 2.2) (17)<br/>Placebo = 3.8 (3.0 – 4.5) (15)</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Patients with a 50% or greater reduction in urge incontinence episodes were considered responders (recorded in 3-day voiding diary).<br/>PTNS = 12/17 (71%)<br/>Placebo = 0/15 (0%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at end point</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence Quality of Life questionnaire (I-QOL) - Mean (range) (N)<br/>PTNS = 81.3 (73.4 – 89.2) (17)<br/>Placebo = 70.6 (62.2 – 79.1) (15)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>"No serious side effects were reported in either group but patients in both groups reported occasional transient</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual.Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>Selection bias</u><br/>A1: appropriate randomisation - yes, "computer generated randomisation list"<br/>A2: adequate concealment - unclear<br/>A3: groups comparable at baseline - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>Performance bias</u><br/>B1: same level of care for both groups - yes<br/>B2: participants blinded - yes<br/>B3: clinical staff blinded - unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: follow up equal for both groups - yes<br/>C2: groups comparable for dropout - yes, 1/18 in PTNS and 2/17 in placebo discontinued treatment due to personal reasons<br/>C3: groups comparable for missing data - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>Detection bias</u></p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|---|--|---------------|---|--|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|---|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the efficacy of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation in female patients with detrusor overactivity incontinence".</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2007 – February 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"Supported by a grant from Uroplasty, Inc".</p> | <p>PTNS = 13.6 ± 4.0 (18)<br/>           Placebo = 15.0 ± 5.7 (17)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>           Scale used -<br/>           Incontinence Quality of Life questionnaire (I-QOL) - Mean (range)<br/>           PTNS = 69.6 (65.8 – 73.3)<br/>           Placebo = 69.5 (65.5 – 73.5)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] Female</li> <li>2] Urge incontinence and urodynamically diagnosed detrusor overactivity incontinence</li> <li>3] Unresponsive to behavioural and rehabilitation therapy or antimuscarinics</li> <li>4] Able to give written, informed consent</li> <li>5] 18 years or older</li> <li>6] Mentally competent and able to understand all study requirements</li> <li>7] Able to understand the procedures, advantages and possible side effects</li> <li>8] Willing and able to complete a 3-day voiding diary and I-QoL questionnaire</li> </ol> |               | <p>of the gastrocnemius muscle. Stimulator was briefly activated for approximately 30 seconds so the patient felt a minor electrical sensation in the skin and turned off for the rest of the treatment.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>With a sample size of 15 in each group this study had a power of 82.3% to yield a statistically significant result assuming that the difference in proportions was 0.45. This magnitude is reasonable according to previous published findings. A 10% dropout rate was accounted for.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>pain at the stimulation site"<br/> <u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>           Not reported<br/> <u>Clinical measures</u><br/>           Not reported</p> <p><b>Continenence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>12</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 12 | 18 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 17 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 0 | 18 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 17 | <p>D1: follow up appropriate length - unclear, "after 12 treatments", exact timing of outcome assessment not reported<br/>           D2: outcomes defined precisely - yes<br/>           D3: valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - yes<br/>           D4: investigators blind to intervention - yes "results were collected by 2 physicians and analysed by a third physician and a statistician, both of whom were blinded regarding the procedure used in any single patient"<br/>           D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear<br/>           Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>           Population: Yes, All participants in the study had detrusor overactivity.<br/>           Intervention: Yes<br/>           Outcome: No. The main end point (reported here as continence status) was the number of responders. Response was defined as a 50% or greater reduction in incontinence episodes.<br/>           Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
|   | Events   | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 12   | 18            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 0  | 17            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|   | Events   | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 0  | 18            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 0  | 17            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |

| Study details                                  | Participants  | Interventions                | Methods                          | Outcomes and Results                                  | Comments   |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|
|  | <p>9] Bladder capacity 100ml or greater<br/> 10] No signs of neurologic abnormalities at objective examination; no history of neurologic pathology<br/> 11] No pharmacological treatment or pharmacological treatment unchanged for 30 days before beginning the study</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Pregnancy or intention to become pregnant during the study<br/> 2] Active urinary tract infection or recurrent urinary tract infections (more than 4 per year)<br/> 3] Presence of urinary fistula, bladder or kidney stones, interstitial cystitis, cystoscopic abnormalities that could be malignant<br/> 4] Diabetes mellitus<br/> 5] Cardiac pacemaker or implanted defibrillator</p> |                              |                                  |   | <p>Participants in both groups were told that they may not have any perception of the electrical sensation due to adaptation. 1/18 in PTNS and 2/17 in placebo discontinued treatment due to personal reasons. 32/35 (91%) were assessed at end of study: PTNS = 17/18, placebo = 15/17. "To verify patient blindness with respect to assigned treatment we observed that patient concordance between type of administered treatment and type of believed treatment was low (60%). This concordance was not significantly different from chance (<math>K = 0.18</math>, <math>P = 0.305</math>) suggesting a low ability to recognise the received treatment."</p> |
| <b>Full citation</b>                           | <b>Sample size</b>  | <b>Interventions</b>         | <b>Details</b>                   | <b>Results</b>  | <b>Limitations</b>   |
| Peters,K.M., Carrico,D.J., Perez-Marrero,R.A., | N = 220<br>PTNS = 110   | Intervention = 12 weekly 30- | <u>PTNS</u><br>A 34 gauge needle | <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at week 13</u> | NICE guidelines manual.Appendix D: Methodology checklist:  |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Khan,A.U.,<br/>Wooldridge,L.S.,<br/>Davis,G.L.,<br/>Macdiarmid,S.A.,<br/>Randomized trial of<br/>percutaneous tibial nerve<br/>stimulation versus Sham<br/>efficacy in the treatment of<br/>overactive bladder<br/>syndrome: results from<br/>the SUmT trial, Journal of<br/>Urology, 183, 1438-1443,<br/>2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>110327</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the<br/>study was carried out</b><br/>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled<br/>trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To assess the efficacy of<br/>PTNS compared to a<br/>validated sham<br/>intervention in subjects<br/>with OAB."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p>Placebo = 110</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%<br/>female)</u><br/>PTNS = 86/110 (78.2%)<br/>Placebo = 88/110<br/>(80.0%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ±<br/>SD</u><br/>PTNS = 62.5 (SD not<br/>reported)<br/>Placebo = 60.2 (SD not<br/>reported)</p> <p><u>Incontinence<br/>episodes/day - Mean ±<br/>SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity -<br/>n/N(%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB (years)<br/>- Mean ± SD</u><br/>PTNS = 10.2 ± 11.5<br/>Placebo = 9.8 ± 10.4</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of<br/>absolute symptoms</u><br/>*Episodes of<br/>incontinence (defined as<br/>an accident associated<br/>with moderate or severe<br/>urgency):<br/>Scale used - 3-day<br/>voiding diary - Mean ±<br/>SD (N)<br/>PTNS = 3.4 ± 3.5 (110)<br/>Placebo = 3.1 ± 3.5</p> | <p>minute PTNS<br/>sessions<br/>Placebo = 12<br/>weekly 30-<br/>minute sham<br/>sessions</p> | <p>electrode was inserted at a<br/>60 degree angle<br/>approximately 5cm<br/>cephalad to the medial<br/>malleolus and slightly<br/>posterior to the tibia. PTNS<br/>surface electrode was<br/>placed on the ipsilateral<br/>calcaneus as well as 2<br/>inactive sham surface<br/>electrodes, 1 under the little<br/>toe and 1 on the top of the<br/>foot. The PTNS lead set<br/>was connected to the<br/>Urgent PC stimulator and a<br/>current level of 0.5 to 9mA<br/>at 20Hz was selected<br/>based on each subject's<br/>foot and plantar motor and<br/>sensory responses.</p> <p><u>Placebo</u><br/>A Streitberger placebo<br/>needle was used to<br/>stimulate the location and<br/>sensation of PTNS needle<br/>electrode insertion. An<br/>inactive PTNS surface<br/>electrode was placed on<br/>the ipsilateral calcaneus.<br/>Two active TENS surface<br/>electrodes were placed, 1<br/>under the little toe and 1 on<br/>top of the foot. Sham<br/>stimulation parameters<br/>were determined based on<br/>subject first sensory level of<br/>localised stimulation<br/>through a TENS unit.</p> | <p>Scale used – 7-level global response<br/>assessment (GRA). "Responder was<br/>defined as moderately or markedly<br/>improved".<br/>PTNS = 60/110 (54.5%)<br/>Placebo = 23/110 (20.9%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom<br/>reduction at week 13</u><br/>*Episodes of incontinence (defined as<br/>an accident associated with moderate<br/>or severe urgency):<br/>Scale used - 3-day voiding diary -<br/>Mean ± SD (N)<br/>PTNS = 1.4 ± 2.4 (103)<br/>Placebo = 1.9 ± 2.6 (105)</p> <p>*Episodes of urgency (defined as<br/>voids with moderate/severe urgency):<br/>Scale used - 3-day voiding diary -<br/>Mean ± SD (N)<br/>PTNS = 4.6 ± 3.6 (103)<br/>Placebo = 6.1 ± 4.2 (105)</p> <p>* Data supplied by author</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>change from baseline to week 13</u><br/>Scale used - Overactive Bladder<br/>Questionnaire (OAB-q) Symptom<br/>Severity Score - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>PTNS = -36.7 ± 21.5 (101)<br/>Placebo = -29.2 ± 20.0 (102)<br/>[lower score is better]</p> <p>Scale used - Short Form-36 (SF-36) -<br/>Mean ± SD (N)<br/>PTNS = 34.2 ± 21.3 (103)<br/>Placebo = 20.6 ± 20.6 (105)<br/>[higher score is better]</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at week<br/>13</u><br/>Ankle bruising</p> | <p>Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>Selection bias</u><br/>A1: appropriate randomisation -<br/>yes "random block design<br/>stratified by investigational site"<br/>A2: adequate concealment -<br/>unclear<br/>A3: groups comparable at<br/>baseline - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>Performance bias</u><br/>B1: same level of care for both<br/>groups - yes<br/>B2: participants blinded - yes<br/>B2: clinical staff blinded -unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: follow up equal for both<br/>groups - yes<br/>C2: groups comparable for<br/>dropout - unclear, 4/110 in PTNS<br/>and 1/110 in placebo "withdrew<br/>consent" prior to week 13<br/>C3: groups comparable for<br/>missing data - unclear, 3/110 in<br/>PTNS and 4/110 in placebo did<br/>not contribute data to analysis due<br/>to "lost to follow-up" or "other".<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Detection bias</u><br/>D1: follow up appropriate length -<br/>unclear, outcome measurement<br/>was performed at week 13 after 12<br/>weeks of treatment<br/>D2: outcomes defined precisely -<br/>yes<br/>D3: valid and reliable methods<br/>used to assess outcome - yes<br/>D4: investigators blind to<br/>intervention - yes "study"</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
|--|--|---------------|---|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|-----|---------|------|------|-----|---|
| <p>September 2008 – January 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Uroplasty, Inc.</p> | <p>(110)</p> <p>*Episodes of urgency (defined as voids with moderate/severe urgency):</p> <p>Scale used - 3-day voiding diary - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>PTNS = 8.5 <math>\pm</math> 4.2 (110)</p> <p>Placebo = 8.2 <math>\pm</math> 4.5 (110)</p> <p>* Data supplied by author</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women and men more than or equal to 18 years</p> <p>2] A score of more than or equal to 4 on the OAB-q short form for urgency</p> <p>3] Average urinary frequency of more than or equal to 10 voids per day</p> <p>4] Self reported bladder symptoms more than or equal to 3 months</p> <p>5] Self-reported failed conservative care</p> <p>6] Discontinued all antimuscarinics for more than or equal to 2 weeks</p> <p>7] Capable of giving informed consent</p> <p>8] Ambulatory and able to use toilet</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample size estimate of around 214 subjects, 107 per study arm was calculated using a 2 sided-Fisher's exact binomial test based on an estimated 60% responder rate in the PTNS group and a 40% responder rate in the sham group with a 5% significance level and 80% power.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"An intent to treat analysis which counted any subject not assessed at 13 weeks as a failure was planned for the study primary end point."</p> | <p>PTNS = 1/110 (0.9%)</p> <p>Placebo = 0/110 (0%)</p> <p>Discomfort at needle site</p> <p>PTNS = 2/110 (1.8%)</p> <p>Placebo = 0/110 (0%)</p> <p>Bleeding at needle site</p> <p>PTNS = 3/110 (2.7%)</p> <p>Placebo = 0/110 (0%)</p> <p>Tingling in the leg</p> <p>PTNS = 1/110(0.9%)</p> <p>Placebo = 0/110 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>60</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>23</td> <td>110</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1.40</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1.90</td> <td>2.60</td> <td>105</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 60 | 110 | Control | 23 | 110 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 1.40 | 2.40 | 103 | Control | 1.90 | 2.60 | 105 | <p>coordinators who administered questionnaires and reviewed voiding diary outcome measures were blinded to the assigned treatment intervention throughout the trial."</p> <p>D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes (although unclear whether participants were refractory to drug treatment).</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>All participants were informed that they may or may not feel a sensory stimulus effect on their lower extremities as a result of the intervention.</p> <p>Participants were assessed at week 13 after receiving 12 weeks of intervention sessions. 208/220 (95%) were evaluated at week 13; PTNS = 103/110, placebo = 105/110.</p> <p>At week 13 the percentage of subjects who correctly identified their randomised intervention assignment was equivalent</p> |
|  | Events   | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
| Experimental   | 60   | 110           |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
| Control  | 23   | 110           |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
|  | Mean   | SD            | Total   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
| Experimental   | 1.40   | 2.40          | 103   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |
| Control  | 1.90   | 2.60          | 105   |  |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |   |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|--|----------|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|-----|---------|------|------|-----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|--------|-------|-----|---------|--------|-------|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|-----|--|
|               | <p>independently without difficulty<br/>9] Capable and willing to follow all study-related procedures</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Pregnant or planning to become pregnant during the study duration<br/>2] Neurogenic bladder<br/>3] Botox use in bladder or pelvic floor muscles within past one year<br/>4] Pacemakers or implantable defibrillators<br/>5] Current urinary tract infection<br/>6] Current vaginal infection<br/>7] Use of interstim<br/>8] Use of Bion<br/>9] Current use of TENS in pelvic region, back or legs<br/>10] Previous PTNS treatment<br/>11] Use of investigational drug/device therapy within past 4 weeks<br/>12] Participation in any clinical investigation involving or impacting gynecologic, urinary or renal function within past 4 weeks</p> |               |         | <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1256 384 1597 604"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>4.60</td> <td>3.60</td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>6.10</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>105</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1256 715 1608 935"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>-36.70</td> <td>21.50</td> <td>101</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>-29.20</td> <td>20.00</td> <td>102</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1256 1045 1561 1265"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>110</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 4.60 | 3.60 | 103 | Control | 6.10 | 4.20 | 105 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | -36.70 | 21.50 | 101 | Control | -29.20 | 20.00 | 102 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 110 | Control | 0 | 110 | <p>between groups (52% in PTNS group, 58% in sham group), confirming the validity of the sham model.</p> |
|               | Mean  | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 4.60  | 3.60          | 103     |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 6.10  | 4.20          | 105     |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Mean  | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | -36.70  | 21.50         | 101     |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | -29.20  | 20.00         | 102     |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 6   | 110           |         |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 0   | 110           |         |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Finazzi-Agro,E., Rocchi,C., Pachatz,C., Petta,F., Spera,E., Mori,F., Sciobica,F., Marfia,G.A., Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation produces effects on brain activity: Study on the modifications of the long latency somatosensory evoked potentials, Neurourology and Urodynamics, 28, 320-324, 2009 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 24<br>PTNS = 16<br>Placebo = 8<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br>PTNS = 16/16 (100%)<br>Placebo = 8/8 (100%)<br><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br>PTNS = 47 ± 10.5<br>Placebo = 42 ± 7<br><u>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Duration of OAB (months) - Mean (range)</u><br>PTNS = 23 (6 – 48)<br>Placebo = 20 (6 – 52)<br><br><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br>1] Female patients (male patients were excluded to minimise the variables in analysing patients population) | <b>Interventions</b><br>Intervention = 12, 30-minute PTNS sessions, performed 3 times a week for 4 weeks<br>Placebo = 12, 30-minute sham stimulation sessions, performed 3 times a week for 4 weeks | <b>Details</b><br><u>Intervention</u><br>A 34 gauge needle was inserted percutaneously 5cm proximal to the medial malleolus of the right and left ankle alternatively. A surface electrode was placed over the ipsilateral calcaneus. A low voltage electrical stimulator furnished a stimulation current of (0 to 10mA) with a fixed frequency of 20Hz and a pulse width of 200msec. Stimulation current was increased until flexion of the big toe or fanning of all toes. The current was set at the highest level tolerable to the patient.<br><u>Placebo</u><br>A 34 gauge needle was inserted in the medial head of the gastrocnemius muscle. Stimulator was briefly activated for approximately 30 seconds so the patient felt a minor electrical sensation in the skin and turned off for the rest of the treatment.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b> | <b>Results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Episodes of incontinence: Not reported<br>Episodes of frequency: Not reported<br><u>Continence status</u><br>Scale used – "Patients showing reduction > 50% of urgency episodes were defined 'responders' to treatment." (3-day voiding diary used at baseline, unclear whether this was used to measure outcome)<br>PTNS = 10/16 (62.5%)<br>Placebo = 0/8 (0%)<br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Continence status</b><br><table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>10</td> <td>16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 10 | 16 | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual.Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><u>Selection bias</u><br>A1: appropriate randomisation - unclear "randomly assigned to group A (PTNS) or gorup B (sham PTNS)."<br>A2: adequate concealment - unclear<br>A3: groups comparable at baseline - unclear<br>Level of bias: unclear<br><u>Performance bias</u><br>B1: same level of care for both groups - yes<br>B2: participants blinded - unclear<br>B2: clinical staff blinded - unclear<br>Level of bias: unclear<br><u>Attrition bias</u><br>C1: follow up equal for both groups - unclear<br>C2: groups comparable for dropout - yes, all participants completed treatment<br>C3: groups comparable for missing data - yes, all partiicpants contributed data to analysis<br>Level of bias:low<br><u>Detection bias</u><br>D1: follow up appropriate length - unclear, not specified when outcome measurement performed<br>D2: outcomes defined precisely: yes |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |   |
| Experimental   | 10  | 16  |  |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments       |   |   |  |
|--|--|---------------|---|--|----------------|---|---|--|
| <p>syndrome treated by means of PTNS.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Research grant: Uroplasty</p> | <p>2] Presence of OAB syndrome nonresponding to conventional treatments (behavioural and rehabilitative therapy, antimuscarinics), lasting since at least 6 months. OAB syndrome was diagnosed by means of OAB-q SF part A questionnaire (score &gt;20%).</p> <p>3] Presence of at least three urgency episodes in 3 days in a 3-day bladder diary.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urinary tract infections<br/> 2] Pregnancy<br/> 3] Age under 18 years<br/> 4] Central or peripheral neurological disorders<br/> 5] Severe cardiopulmonary disease</p> |               | <p>With the proposed sample size, the study power to yield a statistically significant result was estimated to be of 99.3%.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <table border="1" data-bbox="1256 272 1561 344"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1256 272 1400 344"><b>Control</b></td> <td data-bbox="1400 272 1489 344">0</td> <td data-bbox="1489 272 1561 344">8</td> </tr> </table> | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 8 | <p>D3: valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome -unclear<br/> D4: investigators blind to intervention - unclear<br/> D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear<br/> Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: No. Sessions were performed three times per week.<br/> Outcome: No. The main end point (reported here as continence status) was the number of responders. Response was defined as a 50% or greater reduction in incontinence episodes.<br/> Indirectness: Serious</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Focus of study was "effects of neuromodulation technique on the activity of cerebral centers".<br/> Number of controls was chosen to be significantly lower than those of patients for ethical considerations.<br/> A significant reduction of OAB-q SF part A score was also noticed only in patients who underwent PTNS (from 83% to 42%, <math>P =</math></p> |
| <b>Control</b>   | 0  | 8             |   |  |                |   |   |  |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|----------|
|               |              |               |         |                      | 0.001).  |

## Percutaneous PTNS versus drugs

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Peters,K.M., MacDiarmid,S.A., Wooldridge,L.S., Leong,F.C., Shobeiri,S.A., Rovner,E.S., Siegel,S.W., Tate,S.B., Jarnagin,B.K., Rosenblatt,P.L., Feagins,B.A., Randomized trial of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus extended-release tolterodine: results from the overactive bladder innovative therapy trial, Journal of Urology, 182, 1055-1061, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100388</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the effectiveness of PTNS with tolterodine extended release for the treatment of OAB</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 100</p> <p>Percutaneous Tibial Nerve Stimulation (PTNS) = 50<br/>Tolterodine extended release (TOL ER) = 50</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>PTNS = 48/50 (96%)<br/>TOL ER= 46/50 (92%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>PTNS = 57.5 ± 15.2<br/>TOL ER = 58.2 ± 11.3</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/ days<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency/day<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>PTNS given as 12 weekly 30 minute sessions using Urgent PC (an office based neuromodulation system to deliver retrograde stimulation to the sacral nerve plexus through percutaneous electrical stimulation of the posterior tibial nerve via temporary insertion of a 34 gauge needle electrode, slightly cephalad to the medial malleolus.</p> <p>TOL ER given as 4mg daily for 90 days with a decrease to 2 mg/day if intolerability was experienced.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>A standardized checklist was used at weekly visit to elicit information about adverse effects and to keep number of clinical contacts equal in both groups</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size calculated on assumptions of a significance level of 5%, power of 80% and expected mean reduction in b=voids of 1.8 for TOL ER and 3.6 for PTNS.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Investigator rated as cured<br/>PTNS = 2/50 (4%)<br/>TOL ER= 2/50 (4%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Scale used: OAB-q Health related QoL score<br/>PTNS: 25.3 ± 21.5 (N = 44)<br/>TOL ER: 22.1 ± 20.7 (N = 43)</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>PTNS: 8/49 (16.3%)<br/>TOL ER: 7/49 (14.3%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>Selection bias</u><br/>A1: appropriate randomisation - yes, "random block design stratified by study site"<br/>A2: adequate concealment - unclear - not reported<br/>A3: groups comparable at baseline - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>Performance bias</u><br/>B1: same level of care for both groups - yes<br/>B2: participants blinded - no<br/>B3: clinical staff blinded - no<br/>Level of bias: some</p> <p><u>Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: follow up equal for</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|--|--|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|----|----------------|-------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>June 2006 to September 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Uroplasty, Inc.</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB (Years) -<br/>Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>PTNS: 9.8 <math>\pm</math> 12.3<br/>TOL ER: 9.4 <math>\pm</math> 12.1</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] ambulatory adults with OAB symptoms with or without prior anticholinergic use<br/>2] at least 8 voids per 24 hours documented by history and diary</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] OAB pharmacotherapy within previous month<br/>2] primary complaint of stress urinary incontinence<br/>3] demonstrated sensitivity to tolterodine or its ingredients<br/>4] pacemakers or implantable defibrillators<br/>5] excessive bleeding<br/>6] urinary or gastric retention</p> |               |         | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>25.30</td> <td>21.50</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>22.10</td> <td>20.70</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>8</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>7</td> <td>49</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 2 | 50 | <b>Control</b> | 2 | 50 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 25.30 | 21.50 | 44 | <b>Control</b> | 22.10 | 20.70 | 43 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 8 | 49 | <b>Control</b> | 7 | 49 | <p>both groups - yes<br/>C2: groups comparable for dropout - yes, 6/50 in PTNS and 7/50 in TOL ER<br/>C3: groups comparable for missing data - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>Detection bias</u><br/>D1: follow up appropriate length - yes<br/>D2: outcomes defined precisely - yes<br/>D3: valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - yes<br/>D4: investigators blind to intervention - no<br/>D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes.<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |
|  | Events   | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 2  | 50            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 2  | 50            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|  | Mean   | SD            | Total   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 25.30  | 21.50         | 44      |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 22.10  | 20.70         | 43      |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|  | Events   | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 8  | 49            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 7  | 49            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |



| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|----------------------|---|
|               | 7] nerve damage or neuropathy<br>8] uncontrolled narrow angle glaucoma<br>9] positive urinalysis for infection or pregnancy<br>10] current pregnancy<br>11] planning of becoming pregnant during trial period |               |         |                      | <b>Other information</b><br><br>Inadequate reporting of adverse effects as it is not clear how many in each group experienced any adverse effect. |

## Transcutaneous PTNS for OAB

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Svihra,J., Kurca,E., Luptak,J., Kliment,J., Neuromodulative treatment of overactive bladder--noninvasive tibial nerve stimulation, Bratislavske Lekarske Listy, 103, 480-483, 2002</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>125307</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Slovakia</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To produce non-invasive stimulation and achieve comparable effect by superficial electrode without iatrogenic damage to the tibial nerve"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 28</p> <p>Transcutaneous PTNS = 9</p> <p>Oxybutynin = 10</p> <p>No treatment = 9</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>Transcutaneous PTNS = 9/9 (100%)</p> <p>Oxybutynin = 10/10 (100%)</p> <p>No treatment = 9/9 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age</u></p> <p>Average = 54 years</p> <p>Range = 45 - 63 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Transcutaneous PTNS (Stoller afferent nerve stimulation) 30 mins once a week for 5 weeks.</p> <p>Oxybutynin 5mg three times a day</p> <p>No treatment</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>An electromyographic device Nicolet Viking IIE was used. The patient stayed in a horizontal position on her back and the the electrodes were placed behind the medial ankle of the left lower extremity. Cathode was placed proximally and anode distally. After control stimulation accompanied by optimalization of the electrode position and set intensity of the stimulation of tibial nerve. Intensity of the surface SANS was equal to 70% of intensity. Frequency of stimulation was 1 HZ and duration of square impulse was 0.1ms. Surface stimulation of 30 mins duration was repeated once a week for 5 weeks.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Transcutaneous PTNS: 5/9</p> <p>Oxybutynin: Unclear</p> <p>No Treatment: 0/9</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at end point</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p>Transcutaneous PTNS: 0/9</p> <p>Oxybutynin: 2/10</p> <p>No treatment: 0/9</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1: appropriate randomisation - Unclear - sys women were randomly chosen for each group</p> <p>A2: adequate concealment - unclear</p> <p>A3: groups comparable at baseline - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1: same level of care for both groups - Unclear</p> <p>B2: participants blinded - Unclear</p> <p>B3: clinical staff blinded - unclear</p> <p>Level of bias:</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results                                | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|---|
| <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N(%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Overactive bladder without bladder outlet obstruction</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> |               |         | <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>unclear</p> <p><u>Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1: follow up equal for both groups - unclear</p> <p>C2: groups comparable for dropout - Yes</p> <p>C3: groups comparable for missing data - No</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1: follow up appropriate length - unclear</p> <p>D2: outcomes defined precisely - no</p> <p>D3: valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - no</p> <p>D4: investigators blind to intervention - unclear</p> <p>D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
|  |  |   |  |  | None  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Bellette,P.O., Rodrigues-Palma,P.C., Hermann,V., Riccetto,C., Bigozzi,M., Olivares,J.M., [Posterior tibial nerve stimulation in the management of overactive bladder: a prospective and controlled study]. [Spanish], Actas Urologicas Espanolas, 33, 58-63, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>132186</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Brazil</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the impact of transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve electrical stimulation on the quality of life of women with clinical symptoms of OAB"</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 37</p> <p>Transcutaneous stimulation = 21<br/>Sham stimulation = 16</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>Transcutaneous = 21/21 (100%)<br/>Sham = 16/16 (100%)</p> <p>Age Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>47.73 <math>\pm</math> 10.9 years</p> <p>Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N(%)<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation<br/>8 30 mins sessions twice weekly</p> <p>Sham stimulation<br/>8 30m mins sessions twice weekly without electricity</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Transcutaneous stimulation was given using a Dualplex 961 device, with positioning of electrodes over tibial nerve according to Amarenco 2003</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status*</u><br/>Transcutaneous: 12/21<br/>Sham: 16/15</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life change scores (Mean <math>\pm</math> SD N)</u><br/><u>OAB-q total score</u><br/>Transcutaneous: 31.73 <math>\pm</math> 23.44 N = 21<br/>Sham: 15.71 <math>\pm</math> 19.46 N = 16</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Transcutaneous: 0/21<br/>Sham: 0/16</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>Selection bias</u><br/>A1: appropriate randomisation - Unclear<br/>A2: adequate concealment - unclear<br/>A3: groups comparable at baseline - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Performance bias</u><br/>B1: same level of care for both groups - Unclear<br/>B2: participants blinded - Unclear<br/>B3: clinical staff blinded - unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: follow up equal for both groups - unclear</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>6.86 <math>\pm</math> 7.06 years</p> <p>Micturitions per day - Mean (No SD reported)<br/>Trabscutaneous: 11.35<br/>Sham: 13.88</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Age between 18 and 65<br/>2] Presence of overactive bladder symptoms for more than 6 months<br/>3] Urinary frequency greater than 8 micturitions per day<br/>4] episodes of nocturia and/or urinary urgency</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] pregnancy<br/>2] neurological problems<br/>3] pronounced dystopias (ICS Stage II or III)<br/>4] urinary infection<br/>5] stress urinary incontinence</p> |               |         | <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*we used number who has no symptoms of urgency as a proxy for being 'continent'</p> | <p>C2: groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3: groups comparable for missing data - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>Detection bias</u><br/>D1: follow up appropriate length - unclear<br/>D2: outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3: valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - no<br/>D4: investigators blind to intervention - unclear<br/>D5: investigators blinded to confounding factors - unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

| <b>Study details</b> | <b>Participants</b> | <b>Interventions</b> | <b>Methods</b> | <b>Outcomes and Results</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
|                      |                     |                      |                |                             |                 |

In women with OAB, what is the comparative effectiveness of pharmacological interventions?

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chapple,C., DuBeau,C., Ebinger,U., Rekedo,L., Viegas,A., Darifenacin treatment of patients &gt;or= 65 years with overactive bladder: results of a randomized, controlled, 12-week trial, Current Medical Research and Opinion, 23, 2347-2358, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100152</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United Kingdom, United States, Poland, South Africa, Hungary, Sweden, Germany</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the efficacy, tolerability and safety, and associated QoL in patients ≥ 65 years with OAB following 12 weeks of darifenacin treatment"</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 400<br/>Darifenacin = 266<br/>Placebo = 144</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>DAR: 206/266 (77.4%)<br/>PLA: 100/133 (75.2%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>DAR: 72 ± 5<br/>PLA: 73 ± 5</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Median (range)<br/>DAR: 19.8 (4 - 142)<br/>PLA: 21 (7 - 155.4)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Median (range)<br/>DAR: 7.6 (1 - 24.4)<br/>PLA: 7.4 (1.3 - 22.2)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Following a 2-week screening period, candidates entered a 1-week placebo run-in period. Eligible patients were then allocated to Darifenacin 7.5 mg qd or placebo. After 2 weeks dose could be titrated up to Darifenacin 15mg qd or sham titration</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Efficacy was based on 3-day diaries completed prior to clinical visit at week, 1, 2 and 6. A seven-day diary was completed at baseline and 12 weeks. Tolerability and safety were monitored throughout the study. Post-void residual volumes were recorded at week 12 A standard 12-lead ECG was conducted on day 1 and week 12. Vital signs and laboratory variables were assessed at screening and study end.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size calculation was based on a previous study and the aim was to include 399 patients. This number was expected to achieve 81% power for the primary efficacy variable and a probability of 0.59 for darifenacin superiority over placebo using a 2-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test with an assumed dropout rate of 5%</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - reported as mean change from baseline<br/>DAR: - 2 (no SD) N = 166<br/>PLA: -1.86 (no SD) N = 133</p> <p>Urgency episodes - reported as mean change from baseline<br/>DAR: -13.3 (no SD) N = 266<br/>PLA: -13.1 (no SD) N = 133</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Study was funded by Novartis Pharmaceuticals Inc.</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] OAB symptoms ≥ 6 months</li> <li>2] aged ≥ 65 years</li> <li>3] capable of independent toileting</li> <li>4] able to complete the diary independently</li> </ol> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] treatment with drugs known to affect urinary bladder function or the external urethral sphincter</li> <li>2] a total daily volume &gt; 3000ml</li> <li>3] mean volume voided per micturition of &gt; 300ml</li> <li>4] clinically significant stress urinary incontinence or bladder outlet obstruction</li> <li>5] post-void residual urinary volume &gt; 100ml</li> <li>6] women with marked cystocele or other clinically significant Stage 3 or Stage 4 pelvic prolapse</li> <li>7] had received bladder training or received electric stimulation within 3 months of screening</li> <li>8] serious or intermittent urinary tract infection</li> <li>9] any clinically significant congenital or acquired disorder of the urinary tract</li> <li>10] any urinary bladder dysfunction (other than OAB)</li> <li>11] a history of chronic pain syndrome of the low urinary tract</li> <li>12] other significant medical conditions which in the trialists</li> </ol> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used where variables were missing if at least 1 dose of Darifenacin or placebo was taken.</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>DAR: 80/266 (30.7%)<br/>PLA: 21/134 (15.7%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - OAB-q - mean change from baseline<br/>DAR: 20.9 (no SD) N = 266<br/>PLA: 15.3 (no SD) N = 133</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>DAR: 99/266 (37.2%)<br/>PLA: 24/134 (19%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>DAR: 59/266 (22.2%)<br/>PLA: 5/134 (3.8%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>DAR: 22/266 (8.3%)<br/>PLA: 17/134 (12.7%)</p> | <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
|  | opinion made them an unsuitable candidate for the study  |   |   | <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>DAR: 12/266 (4.5%)<br/>PLA: 9/134 (6.7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Mean change from baseline (95% CI)<br/>DAR: 11.9 (1.7 to 22.1) ml N = 266<br/>PLA: 17.3 (-18.1 to 52.8) ml N = 133</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p>   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chapple,C., Van,Kerrebroeck P., Tubaro,A., Haag-Molkenteller,C., Forst,H.T., Massow,U., Wang,J., Brodsky,M., Clinical efficacy, safety, and tolerability of once-daily fesoterodine in subjects with overactive bladder.[Erratum appears in Eur Urol. 2008 Jun;53(6):1319], European Urology, 52, 1204-1212, 2007</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1135<br/>Tolterodine extended release 4mg = 290<br/>Fesoterodine 4mg = 272<br/>Fesoterodine 8mg = 288<br/>Placebo = 285</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>TOL ER 4mg = 226/290 (78%)<br/>FES 4mg = 220/272 (81%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients were randomised to one of four treatments once daily for 12 weeks:<br/>tolterodine ER 4mg<br/>fesoterodine 4mg<br/>fesoterodine 8mg<br/>placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients recruited into the trial entered a two-week placebo 'wash out' phase in which they received either a capsule (tolterodine placebo) or a tablet (fesoterodine placebo).</p> <p>For assessment of efficacy, patients were required to complete a 3-day micturition diary noting the time of each micturition and/or urgency</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>No data reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u> reported as response<br/>TOL ER 4mg: 72/290 (24.8%)<br/>FES 4mg: 75/272 (27.6%)<br/>FES 8mg: 79/288</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. bAppendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - computer-generated schedule<br/>A2 - Was there adequate</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100153</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Russia, Spain, Ukraine, United Kingdom, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To investigate the efficacy, tolerability, and safety of fesoterodine 4 and 8 mg versus placebo in subjects with OAB."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>The study was supported by Schwarz Biosciences GmbH and Pfizer Inc</p> | <p>FES 8mg = 235/287 (82%)<br/>Placebo = 229/283 (81%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER 4mg = 57.7 ± 14.6 years<br/>FES 4mg = 57.1 ± 13.2 years<br/>FES 8mg = 55.6 ± 14.1 years<br/>Placebo = 56.0 ± 13.7 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes (UUI) / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER 4mg: 3.8 ± 3.1<br/>FES 4mg: 3.8 ± 3.4<br/>FES 8mg: 3.7 ± 3.0<br/>Placebo: 3.7 ± 3.1</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER 4mg: 11.0 ± 3.4<br/>FES 4mg: 11.0 ± 4.2<br/>FES 8mg: 11.5 ± 4.2<br/>Placebo: 11.4 ± 4.0</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB (mean ± SD)</u><br/>TOL ER 4mg =: 8.7 ± 10.1 years<br/>FES 4mg: 9.0 ± 11.2 years<br/>FES 8mg: 7.6 ± 8.4 years<br/>Placebo: 7.9 ± 9.6 years</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] ≥ 18 years old<br/>2] ≥ 8 micturitions/24hr and ≥ 6 urgency episodes or ≥ 3 UUI episodes in 24hrs</p> |               | <p>episode, urine volume (each micturition), any episodes of incontinence and severity of urgency (1 = none; 2 = mild or 3 = moderate or 4 = severe) before visit 2 and days immediately preceding visits 3, 5 &amp; 6. In addition, on one of the three days the patients had to record their micturition volume.</p> <p>Safety assessments were conducted at each clinic visit and after the safety follow-up.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not described. Table 3 refers to LOCF used to calculate baseline and baseline to end of treatment in bladder efficacy variables.</p> | <p>(27.4%)<br/>Placebo: 53/285 (18.6%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean ± sd (Change scores)<br/>TOL ER 4mg: -1.74 ± 2.39 N = 223<br/>FES 4mg: -1.95 ± 2.40 N = 199<br/>FES 8mg: -2.22 ± 2.40 N = 223<br/>Placebo: -1.14 ± 2.32 N = 211</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>TOL ER 4mg: -2.03 ± 3.20 N = 283<br/>FES 4mg: -1.88 ± 3.26 N = 265<br/>FES 8mg: -2.36 ± 3.22 N = 276<br/>Placebo: -1.07 ± 3.17 N = 279</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes</p> | <p>concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|--|
|               | <p>3] Indicated OAB caused them at least moderate problems on a Likert scale<br/>4] Negative pregnancy test</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] lower urinary tract pathology that could be responsible for urgency or incontinence (e.g. genuine SUI, bladder stones, interstitial cystitis, urothelial tumours)<br/>2] pelvic prolapse (grade III or higher)<br/>3] clinically relevant outlet obstruction<br/>4] polyuria (&gt; 3l per 24 hr)<br/>5] symptomatic recurrent UTIs<br/>6] postvoid residual volume (PVR) &gt; 100ml<br/>7] currently receiving treatment or treated within 2 wks of screening visit with antimuscarinic drugs<br/>8] treated in past 4 wks with electrostimulation for bladder training<br/>9] active UTI<br/>10] underlying neurological disease causing their OAB symptoms<br/>11] clinically relevant cardiac arrhythmia and/or unstable angina<br/>12] QtcB interval &gt; 500ms</p> |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse event<br/>TOL ER 4mg: 144/290 (49.7%)<br/>FES 4mg: 135/272 (49.6%)<br/>FES 8mg: 167/288 (58.2%)<br/>Placebo: 107/285 (37.5%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER 4mg: 49/290 (16.9%)<br/>FES 4mg: 59/272 (21.7%)<br/>FES 8mg: 97/288 (33.8%)<br/>Placebo: 20/285 (7.0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>TOL ER 4mg: 37/290 (12.8%)<br/>FES 4mg: 42/272 (15.4%)<br/>FES 8mg: 37/288 (12.8%)<br/>Placebo: 34/285 (11.9%)</p> | <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/>"After the start of the trial, the protocol was amended to ensure enrollment of the planned 80% of subjects with UUI at baseline; the</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|  |   |   |  | <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> TOL ER 4mg: 9/290 (3.1%)<br/> FES 4mg: 7/272 (2.6%)<br/> FES 8mg: 14/288 (4.9%)<br/> Placebo: 6/285 (2.1%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> Post-void residual volume<br/> Not reported</p>                     | amendment required $\geq 3$ UUI episodes per 24 h in all remaining subjects".   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Choo,M.S., Lee,J.Z., Lee,J.B., Kim,Y.H., Jung,H.C., Lee,K.S., Kim,J.C., Seo,J.T., Paick,J.S., Kim,H.J., Na,Y.G., Lee,J.G., Efficacy and safety of solifenacin succinate in Korean patients with overactive bladder: a randomised, prospective, double-blind, multicentre study, International Journal of Clinical Practice, 62, 1675-1683, 2008</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 357</p> <p>Solifenacin 5mg = 120<br/> Solifenacin 10mg = 119<br/> Tolterodine IR = 118</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Baseline characteristics:<br/> <u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/> SOL 5mg: 90/107 (84.11%)<br/> SOL 10mg:83/111 (74.77%)<br/> TOL 4mg: 88/111 (79.28%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Solifenacin 5mg once-daily<br/> Solifenacin 10mg once-daily<br/> Tolterodine immediate-release 4 mg<br/> All medications taken for 12 weeks.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients received two weeks of placebo medication twice-daily and after this patients were randomised to take solifenacin 5mg, 10mg or tolterodine 4mg. Three days before the second visit (4 weeks into the study), patients recorded episodes of urgency and urgency incontinence, times of voiding and volumes voided per void in a bladder diary. Patients visited the investigational sites at the</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/> Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd (endpoint scores)<br/> TOL IR 4mg: 0.90 <math>\pm</math> 1.16 N = 100</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/> A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Not reported<br/> A2 - Was there adequate</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>100168</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised Controlled Trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare the efficacy and tolerability of solifenacin 5 and 10 mg once daily and tolterodine 2mg twice daily in patients with symptoms of OAB.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Research grant received from Astellas Pharma, Inc. Toyko, Japan.</p> | <p><u>Age - mean and SD</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 53.07 ± 10.52 years<br/>SOL 10mg: 52.65 ± 12.7 years<br/>TOL 4mg: 53.05 ± 12.19 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes - mean and SD</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 1.92 ± 2.19<br/>SOL 10mg: 2.59 ± 2.91<br/>TOL 4mg: 1.74 ± 1.55</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes - mean and SD</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 4.29 ± 3.45<br/>SOL 10mg: 3.81 ± 3.04<br/>TOL 4mg: 3.89 ± 3.12</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] an average frequency of ≥ 8 voids per 24 hr<br/>2] at least 3 episodes of urgency OR 3 episodes of urgency incontinence in the 3-day voiding diary period</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] clinically significant bladder</p> |               | <p>following intervals:<br/>- Screening (visit 1)<br/>- 2-week placebo run-in period (visit 2)<br/>- Week 4 (visit 3)<br/>- Week 8 (visit 4)<br/>- Week 12 (visit 5 = endpoint)</p> <p>The following data were collected at each visit:<br/>Mean daily micturition frequency;<br/>Mean micturition vol per voiding;<br/>Mean daily urgency incontinence freq;<br/>Mean daily no. of urgency episodes;<br/>Mean no. of nocturia episodes</p> <p>Adverse events elicited by general questioning by the investigator or volunteered by the patient.<br/>Weeks 4, 8 and 12 safety assessments were made and these inc. vital signs, physical exam and electrocardiograms and AE recordings.</p> <p>Baseline and 12 weeks: PVR volume was assessed by bladder scanning.</p> <p>Quality of life was assessed at baseline and endpoint using the King's Health</p> | <p>SOL 5mg: 0.97 ± 1.49 N = 98<br/>SOL 10mg: 0.76 ± 1.10 N = 98</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>TOL IR 4mg: 2.32 ± 2.86 N = 92<br/>SOL 5mg: 2.32 ± 3.00 N = 83<br/>SOL 10mg: 2.09 ± 2.49 N = 88</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Not applicable</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b></p> | <p>concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - No - more dropouts abd protocol violation in SOL 5mg group<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - LOCF used<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
|               | <p>outlet obstruction<br/>           2] PVR volume of &gt; 200ml;<br/>           3] incontinence for which stress was determined to be the predominant factor;<br/>           4] presence of a neurological cause for detrusor muscle overactivity;<br/>           5] evidence of urinary tract infection or bladder stones, previous pelvic irradiation, or previous or current malignant disease in the pelvic organs;<br/>           6] any medical condition contraindicating the use of antimuscarinic medication;<br/>           7] non-pharmacological treatment for OAB including electrostimulation therapy or bladder training during the 2 weeks before or during the study;<br/>           8] use of any drugs with cholinergic or anticholinergic side effects and participation in a clinical trial within 30 days before study entry;<br/>           9] women of childbearing potential who were pregnancy or nursing, intending to become pregnant during the study, or who were not using reliable contraceptive methods were ineligible.</p> |               | <p>Questionnaire.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"For subject withdrawal, data available at the point of withdrawal were analysed. Missing data were accepted as such. Nonetheless, data analysis with the last observation carried forward (LOCF) method were performed and presented for efficacy analysis".</p> | <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>           Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>           Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd (endpoint scores)<br/>           TOL IR 4mg: 0.67 <math>\pm</math> 1.16 N = 100<br/>           SOL 5mg: 0.78 <math>\pm</math> 1.76 N = 98<br/>           SOL 10mg: 0.72 <math>\pm</math> 1.51 N = 98</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>           TOL IR 4mg: 1.68 <math>\pm</math> 2.88 N = 100<br/>           SOL 5mg: 1.77 <math>\pm</math> 2.74 N = 98<br/>           SOL 10mg: 1.42 <math>\pm</math> 2.21 N = 98</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>           Incontinence episodes<br/>           Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>           Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>           Not reported</p> | <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>           D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>           D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>           D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>           D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>           D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>           Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>           1] Population: Yes<br/>           2] Intervention: Yes<br/>           3] Outcomes: Yes<br/>           Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Patients were regarded compliant if they had taken at least 70% of the required study medication.</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL IR 4mg:<br/>22/118 (18.6%)<br/>SOL 5mg: 9/120<br/>(7.5%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 23/119<br/>(19.3%)</p> <p>Dropout for any<br/>reason<br/>TOL IR 4mg:<br/>18/118 (15.3%)<br/>SOL 5mg: 22/120<br/>(18.3%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 21/119<br/>(17.6%)</p> <p>Dropout for<br/>adverse event<br/>TOL IR 4mg:<br/>2/118 (1.7%)<br/>SOL 5mg: 5/120<br/>(4.2%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 7/119<br/>(5.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological<br/>outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Post-void residual<br/>volume<br/>TOL IR 4mg: 4.8 ±</p> | <p>Data from SOL 5mg<br/>group used in meta-<br/>analysis based on BNF<br/>starting dose</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
|  |  |   |  | 31.5 N = 108<br>SOL 5mg: 8.4 ± 40.78 N = 110<br>SOL 10mg: 4.6 ± 50.5 N = 111  |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dmochowski,R.R., Sand,P.K., Zinner,N.R., Staskin,D.R., Trospium 60 mg once daily (QD) for overactive bladder syndrome: results from a placebo-controlled interventional study, Urology, 71, 449-454, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100195</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United states</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the effects of Trospium 60mg (QD) compared with placebo on urinary frequency, UUI, and other symptoms related to</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 564<br/>Trospium extender release (TRO ER) = 280<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 284</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TRO ER: 230/280 (82.1%)<br/>PLA: 249/284 (87.7%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD*<br/>TRO ER: 61.2 ± 11.7<br/>PLA: 58.4 ± 11.8</p> <p>Number of incontinence episodes/week Mean ± SD*<br/>TRO ER: 4.0 ± 2.2<br/>PLA: 4.0 ± 3.4</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Subjects were allocated to receive Trospium extended release (60 mg) oral capsules or matching placebo once daily for 12 weeks</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>3-day bladder diary was completed for visits at 1, 4 and 12 weeks. Urgency severity was measured using the Indevus Urgency Severity Scale. The OAB Symptom Composite Score was used to assess the overall complex of OAB symptoms. Complaints and adverse effects were assessed at 1, 4 and 12 weeks.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used to account for any missing data</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfiactiopn with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - change from baseline reported<br/>TRO ER: -2.3 ± 3.3 N = 267<br/>PLA: -1.5 ± 3.3 N = 276</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TRO ER: 78/280</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - Randomizatyon was stratified by number of voids/day<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p>OAB over a 12-week treatment period"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>September 2005 to June 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Study supported by Esprit Phama and Indevas Pharmaceuticals INC</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged ≥ 18 years<br/> 2] OAB ≥ 6 months<br/> 3] symptoms of urinary frequency (a mean of 10 or more toilet voids per day)<br/> 4] urgency (1 or more episodes of severe urgency related to toilet voids)<br/> 5] UUI (a mean of 1 or more UUI episodes per day)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] total voided volume ≥ 3000ml/day or a mean volume volume voided/void ≥ 250ml<br/> 2] predominant stress, insensate or overflow incontinence<br/> 3] history of neurogenic bladder<br/> 4] history of indwelling or intermittent catheterization<br/> 5] history of significant renal disease (serum creatinine ≥ 1.5mg/dl)<br/> 6] uninvestigated hematuria<br/> 7] urinary tract infection during screening<br/> 8] history of &gt; 3 urinary tract infections in previous 12 months<br/> 9] other baldder pathogies, including clinically significant urinary retention (postvoid residual volume &gt; 100ml), cancer, institial cystitis</p> |               |         | <p>(27.8%)<br/> PLA: 48/284<br/> (16.9%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/> Not reported at 4 weeks</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 Patient satisfiactiopn with treatment</b><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/> UUI episodes - change from baseline reported<br/> TRO ER: -2.4 ± 3.3 N = 267</p> | <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/> C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/> C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               | 10] a prostate specific antigen level $\geq 4$ ng/ml, prostate cancer or chronic prostatitis |               |         | PLA: $-1.6 \pm 3.3$ N = 276<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>TRO ER: 95/280 (33.9%)<br>PLA: 58/284 (20.4%)<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br>OAB-SCS used<br>TRO ER: - 9.9. (No SD) N = 267<br>PLA: -6.5 (No SD) N = 276<br><br><u>Adverse effects</u><br>Any adverse effect<br>TRO ER: 154/280 (55.0%)<br>PLA: 130/284 (45.8%)<br><br>Dry mouth<br>TRO ER: 36/280 (12.9%)<br>PLA: 13/284 | Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b><br><br>SD for continuous data calculated by NCC-WCH from SEM reported<br>Data for "Dropout for any reason" taken from pooled analysis in "Dmochowski et al., 2010" |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
|   |   |   |  | (4.6%)<br><br>Dropout for any reason<br>TRO ER: 37/280 (13.2%)<br>PLA: 36/284 (12.3%)<br><br>Dropouts for adverse effects<br>TRO ER: 18/280 (6.4%)<br>PLA: 8/284 (2.8%)<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported |   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Dmochowski,R.R., Peters,K.M., Morrow,J.D., Guan,Z., Gong,J., Sun,F., Siami,P., Staskin,D.R., Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of flexible-dose fesoterodine in subjects with overactive bladder.[Erratum appears in Urology. 2010 Jun;75(6):1519], Urology, 75, 62-68, 2010 | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 896<br>Fesoterodine (FES) = 448<br>Placebo (PLA) = 448<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>FES: 368/446 (82.1%)<br>PLA: 364/448 (82.1%)<br><br>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br>FES: 60.1 ± 12.9 | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>Women were allocated to FES 4mg or matching placebo to be taken once daily with 4 hours of bedtime. After 2 weeks, women could, after a consultaion regarding efficacy and adverse effects, increase dose to FES 8mg once daily or sham dose escalation for the remaining 10 weeks. No dose adjustment were permitted after week 2. | <b>Details</b><br><br>Subjects completed a 3-day bladder diary before the baseline visit and at each subsequent visit. Subjects recorded all micturitions, including incontinence episodes. The Urinary Sensations Scale, Patient Perception of Bladder Condition and Urgency Perception Scale were also completed at baseline and all visits and the Overactive | <b>Results</b><br><br><b>Week 4 results</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Week 12 results</b><br>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br>FES: 310/448 (69.2%)<br>PLA: 257/448 (57.4%)<br><br>Self-reported rate of absolute   | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - computer generated<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100197</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>The study assessed the efficacy, safety and tolerability of a flexible-dose regimen of fesoteridine in subjects with OAB.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>August 2007 to April 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Study was funded by Pfizer Inc</p> | <p>PLA: 59.7 ± 13.7</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Mean ± SD<br/>Urge incontinence data used<br/>FES: 2.2 ± 2.7<br/>PLA: 2.0 ± 1.9</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>FES: 9.2 ± 4.3<br/>PLA: 9.2 ± 3.8</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] OAB symptoms ≥ 3 months before screening<br/>2] recorded mean of ≥ 8 micturitions per 24 hours and ≥ 3 urgency episodes per 24 in a 3-day bladder diary<br/>3] rated their bladder problem condition as baseline as causing at least some moderate problems using Patient Perception of Bladder Condition</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] history of acute urinary retention requiring catheterisation</p> |               | <p>Bladder Questionnaire</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Using published studies it was calculated that 350 subjects per arm would provide ≥ 85% power to detect a difference in 24-hour micturitions using a 2-sided t test with a 0.05 significance level.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>symptom reduction per day (LS mean change from baseline, no SD reported)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>FES: -1.5 (No SD) N = 267<br/>PLA: -1.2 (No SD) N = 251</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>FES: -4 (No SD) N = 434<br/>PLA: -3 (No SD) N = 428</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Incontinence episodes - incontinent at baseline only<br/>FES: 162/257 (63%)<br/>PLA: 133/260 (51%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects</p> | <p>not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
|   | <p>2] severe voiding difficulties</p> <p>3] urinary incontinence symptoms attributed to stress urinary incontinence</p> <p>4] significant pelvic organ prolapse or lower urinary tract surgery in preceding 6 months</p> <p>5] clinically significant hepatic or renal disease</p> <p>6] neurologic disease that significantly affects bladder function</p> <p>7] treatment with an antimuscarinic OAB medication or potent CYP3A4 inhibitor within 2 weeks of screening</p> <p>8] any contraindications to fesoterodine</p> <p>9] men with intermittent or unstable use of alpha blockers or 4-alpha-reductase inhibitors or who started such treatment within 4 weeks of screening</p> |   |  | <p>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>FES: 113/448 (25.2%)<br/>PLA: 34/448 (7.6%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>FES: 66/448 (14.7%)<br/>PLA: 63/448 (14.1%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>FES: 34/448 (7.6%)<br/>PLA: 21/448 (4.7%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>blinded to intervention - Yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Only continence status and discontinuation for any reason data used in the network meta-analysis</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Herschorn,S., Swift,S., Guan,Z., Carlsson,M., Morrow,J.D., Brodsky,M., Gong,J., Comparison of fesoterodine and tolterodine</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1712</p> <p>Fesoterodine (FES): 679</p> <p>Tolterodine (TOL ER): 684</p> <p>Placebo (PLA): 334</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Fesoterodine (4mg for 1 week then 8mg for 11 weeks)</p> <p>Tolterodine ER 4mg</p> <p>Placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were randomised in the ratio in a 2:2:1 to fesoterodine (4mg for 1 week then 8mg for 11 weeks), tolterodine ER or placebo.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment Improved on Patients</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|--|--|---|
| <p>extended release for the treatment of overactive bladder: a head-to-head placebo-controlled trial, BJU International, 105, 58-66, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100249</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"The primary objective of the present study was to assess whether the efficacy of fesoterodine 8 mg is superior to that of tolterodine ER 4 mg and placebo in improving symptoms of OAB and patient-reported outcomes."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"The study was sponsored by</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>TOL ER = 564/684 (82.5%)<br/>FES = 558/679 (82.2%)<br/>PLA = 269/334 (80.5%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER = 58.5 ± 13.2 years<br/>FES = 57.8 ± 12.8 years<br/>PLA = 58.4 ± 13.7 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes (UUI) / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER: 11.7 ± 3.1<br/>FES: 11.7 ± 3.4<br/>PLA: 11.9 ± 3.5</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER: 9.3 ± 3.9<br/>FES: 9.3 ± 3.7<br/>PLA: 9.4 ± 4.2</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB (mean ± SD)</u><br/>TOL ER: 6.9 years<br/>FES: 7.1 years<br/>PLA: 7.3 years</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged ≥ 18 years<br/>2] symptoms of OAB (self-</p> |               | <p>All patients took their medication once a day in the morning. Treatment was double-blind with all patients receiving one tablet (fesoterodine 4 mg or 8 mg or matching placebo) or a capsule for those taking tolterodine 4mg or matching placebo.</p> <p>At baseline and 12 weeks, patients completed 3-day bladder diaries recording UUI episodes per 24 hours (primary endpoint), mean volume voided, nocturnal voids, urgency episodes, severe urgency episodes and frequency-urgency sum per 24 hours. They also completed the Perception of Bladder Condition (PPBC) and the Urgency Perception Scales (UPS) and the Overactive Bladder Questionnaire (OAB-q) at both time points.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample size of 606 patients per active treatment group was required to detect a difference between fesoterodine and tolterodine</p> | <p>Perception of Bladder Condition<br/>TOL ER: 370/684 (54.1%)<br/>FES: 420/679 (61.9%)<br/>PLA: 152/334 (45.5%)</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Episodes of incontinence / day - Mean ± sd (change scores)<br/>TOL ER: -1.40 ± 1.50 N = 626<br/>FES: -1.52 ± 1.49 N = 618<br/>PLA: -1.06 ± 1.75 N = 307</p> <p>Episodes of urgency / day - Mean ± sd (change scores)<br/>TOL ER: -2.4 ± 5.0 N = 631<br/>FES: -2.6 ± 5.00 N = 627<br/>PLA: -1.2 ± 3.5 N = 311</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: 290/684</p> | <p>trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - block randomisation using a centralised system<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation schedule generated and stored off site<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| Pfizer Inc."  | <p>assessed) for <math>\geq 3</math> months before screening</p> <p>3] mean of one or more UUI episodes/24hr</p> <p>4] <math>\geq 8</math> voids/24h reported in 3-day bladder diaries completed at baseline</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] clinically significant hepatic or renal disease</p> <p>2] lower genitourinary pathology or having undergone surgery that could cause voiding dysfunction;</p> <p>3] neurological conditions, e.g. stroke, MS, spinal cord injury, or Parkinson's disease;</p> <p>4] previous history of acute urinary retention requiring catheterization</p> <p>5] predominately SUI symptoms (in the opinion of the investigator)</p> <p>6] treatment with antimuscarinic medication within 2 weeks before screening:</p> <p>7] use of any electrostimulation, bladder training or pelvic floor exercises within 4 weeks of screening;</p> <p>8] female pts of childbearing age, heterosexually active and not using contraception</p> <p>9] pregnant, nursing or with a positive pregnancy test.</p> |               | <p>ER in the change in UUI episodes from baseline to week 12 using a two-sided t-test at the 5% significance level with 90% power. Based on the previously observed mean (SD) treatment differences of 1.07 (2.85) between fesoterodine 8 mg and placebo groups in an earlier study.</p> <p>303 patients were required in the placebo group for <math>\geq 88\%</math> power for each comparison. Thus, 1515 patients were required. Assuming that approximately 90% of the randomized patients would contribute to the full analysis set, it was planned to randomize 1675 patients</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"Missing postbaseline data were imputed based on the last-observation-carried forward principle using data from interim visits; baseline data were not carried forward".</p> | <p>(42.4%)<br/>FES: 306/679<br/>(45.1%)<br/>PLA: 97/334<br/>(29.0%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropout for adverse event<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p><b>12 weeks results</b><br/> Patient satisfaction with treatment - Improved on Patients<br/> Perception of Bladder Condition<br/> TOL ER: 399/684 (58.3%)<br/> FES: 452/679 (66.6%)<br/> PLA: 169/334 (50.6%)</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/> Episodes of incontinence / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd (change scores)<br/> TOL ER: <math>-1.61 \pm 1.50</math> n = 626<br/> FES: <math>-1.72 \pm 1.72</math> n = 619<br/> PLA: <math>-1.46 \pm 1.75</math> n = 307</p> <p>Episodes of urgency / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd (change scores)<br/> TOL ER: <math>-3.5 \pm 5.0</math> n = 631<br/> FES: <math>-3.5 \pm 5.00</math> n = 628<br/> PLA: <math>-2.00 \pm 5.30</math> n = 311</p> | <p>1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/> Additional data on baseline levels and results taken from NCT00444925 (www.clinicaltrials.gov)</p> |



| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Continence status</p> <p>Incontinence episodes</p> <p>TOL ER: 358/684 (52.3%)</p> <p>FES: 396/679 (58.3%)</p> <p>PLA: 138/334 (41.3%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life (endpoint week 12)</p> <p>Scale used - OAB-q: Total HRQOL</p> <p>TOL ER: 16.3 ± 24.2 n = 588</p> <p>FES: 19.3 ± 23.9 n = 572</p> <p>PLA: 12.0 ± 21.3 n = 289</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment</p> <p>Any adverse effect</p> <p>TOL ER: 232/684 (33.9%)</p> <p>FES: 305/679 (44.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 84/334 (25.1%)</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> <p>TOL ER: 112/684</p> |          |

| Study details                                     | Participants | Interventions                                     | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments                            |
|---|--------------|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|
|   |              |   |   | <p>(18.6%)<br/>FES: 189/679<br/>(27.8%)<br/>PLA: 20/334<br/>(6.0%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>TOL ER: 56/684<br/>(8.2%)<br/>FES: 81/679<br/>(11.9%)<br/>PLA: 30/334<br/>(9.0%)</p> <p>Dropout for adverse event<br/>TOL ER: 28/684<br/>(4.1%)<br/>FES: 44/679<br/>(6.5%)<br/>PLA: 6/334<br/>(2.08%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>- Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> |                                     |
| Full citation                                     | Sample size  | Interventions                                     | Details   | Results   | Limitations                         |
| Hill,S., Khullar,V., Wyndaele,J.J., Lheritier,K., | N = 439      | DAR 7.5, DAR 15, DAR 30 and PLA was given as once | After a screening visit (history and urinalysis) eligible | <b>Week 4</b><br>Not reported   | NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Darifenacin Study Group., Dose response with darifenacin, a novel once-daily M3 selective receptor antagonist for the treatment of overactive bladder: results of a fixed dose study, International Urogynecology Journal, 17, 239-247, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>100250</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To evaluate 'the efficacy, tolerability, and safety of varying doses of darifenacin in patients with OAB'</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Study was funded by Pfizer Inc.</p> | <p>Darifenacin 7.5mg (DAR 7.5) = 108<br/>Darifenacin 15mg (DAR 15) = 107<br/>Darifenacin 30mg (DAR 30) = 115<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 109</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>DAR 7.5: 94/108 (87.0%)<br/>DAR 15: 92/107 (86.0%)<br/>DAR 30: 99/115 (86.1%)<br/>PLA: 90/109 (82.6%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean (range)<br/>DAR 7.5: 56.1 (23 - 88)<br/>DAR 15: 55.1 (24 - 82)<br/>DAR 30: 54.0 (23 - 79)<br/>PLA: 53.7 (21 - 85)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Median (95% CI)<br/>DAR 7.5: 13.7 (11.8 to 17.8)<br/>DAR 15: 17.3 (13.5 to 21.5)<br/>DAR 30: 19.1 (15.8 to 22.8)<br/>PLA: 16.1 (14.0 to 19.4)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Median (range)<br/>DAR 7.5: 8.5 (7.0 to 8.7)<br/>DAR 15: 8.6 (7.8 to 9.4)<br/>DAR 30: 8.4 (7.8 to 8.8)<br/>PLA: 8.1 (7.4 to 8.7)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</p> | <p>daily controlled release tablets or matching placebo</p> | <p>patients entered a 2-week placebo washout phase (if required) before screening assessments. Patients then entered a 2-week run-in phase with daily assessments using an electronic urinary diary. Patients still eligible were randomized to 12 weeks of active treatment or placebo. A double dummy technique was used to maintain blinding. No dose adjustments were allowed and compliance was measured by a pill count.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size calculation was based on previous darifenacin studies. Assuming a difference vs. placebo of 5 incontinence episodes per week and using a two-sided 5% significance level with 90% power to the the null hypothesis of no difference it was estimated that 85 patients would be needed. Assuming a 20% withdrawal rate 424 patients (106 per group) would be required.</p> | <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per week<br/>Incontinence episodes (Median change from baseline)<br/>DAR 7.5: -8.1 N = 107<br/>DAR 15: -10.4 N = 106<br/>DAR 30: -11.4 N = 114<br/>PLA: -5.9 N = 108</p> <p>Urgency episodes (Median change from baseline)<br/>DAR: -1.8 N = 107<br/>DAR 15: -2.3 N = 106<br/>DAR 30: -3.0 N = 114<br/>PLA: -1.2 N = 108</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day) - n/N (%)<br/>Incontinence episodes - Reported as 7-</p> | <p>Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - blocks of eight used<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
|               | <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged ≥ 18<br/> 2] urge incontinence (at least 10 episodes over 14 days)<br/> 3] high micturition frequency (mean of at least 8 voids per day)<br/> 4] urinary urgency (a strong desire to void on average at least once a day)<br/> 5] OAB symptoms ≥ 6 months</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] clinically significant stress incontinence (judged by investigator)<br/> 2] bladder outlet obstruction<br/> 3] postvoid residual urinary volume &gt; 200ml<br/> 4] local pathology that could cause urinary symptoms (e.g. interstitial cystitis, bladder stones, severe constipation (≤ bowel movements per week)<br/> 5] history of intermittent urinary tract infections<br/> 6] urogenital surgery in previous 6 months<br/> 7] cystoscopy in previous 30 days<br/> 8] patients with an indwelling catheter or using intermittent self-catheterization<br/> 9] clinically significant systemic disease</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>consecutive dry days<br/> DAR 7.5: Not reported<br/> DAR 15: 26/107 (24/3%)<br/> DAR 30: 29/115 (25.2%)<br/> PLA: 17/109 (15.6%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects - n/N (%)<br/> Any adverse effect<br/> DAR 7.5: 62/108 (57.4%)<br/> DAR 15: 73/107 (68.2%)<br/> DAR 30: 92/115 (82.0%)<br/> PLA: 54/110 (49.5%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> DAR 7.5: 25/108 (23.1%)<br/> DAR 15: 43 /107 (40.2%)<br/> DAR 30: 68/115 (59.1%)<br/> PLA: 6/109 (5.5%)</p> | <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from Darifenacin 7.5 mg group used in review</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
|  | <p>10] pregnant or lactating women<br/> 11] patients who intended to start bladder training<br/> 12] any contraindication to antimuscarinic therapy</p> |   |  | <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> DAR 7.5: 9/108 (8.3%)<br/> DAR 15: 14/107 (13.1%)<br/> DAR 30: 19/115 (16.5%)<br/> PLA: 8/109 (7.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> DAR 7.5: 2/108 (1.9%)<br/> DAR 15: 6/107 (5.6%)<br/> DAR 30: 13/115 (11.3%)<br/> PLA: 3/109 (2.8%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/> Not reported</p> |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b><br/> Ho,C.H., Chang,T.C., Lin,H.H., Liu,S.P., Huang,K.H., Yu,H.J., Solifenacin and tolterodine are equally effective in the treatment of overactive bladder symptoms, Journal of</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b><br/> N = 75<br/> Solifenacin 5mg = 39<br/> Tolterodine ER 4mg = 36</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b><br/> Patients received either 5 mg solifenacin once daily or 4 mg tolterodine once daily for 12 weeks.<br/> Patients were asked to complete a 3-day voiding</p> | <p><b>Details</b><br/> Patients completed a voiding diary three days before clinic visits at 4, 8 and 12 weeks, and completed the Patient Perception of Bladder Condition (PPBC) and a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS)</p> | <p><b>Results</b><br/> <b>Week 4</b><br/> Not reported<br/> <b>Week 12</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> Scale:Patient</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b><br/> NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>the Formosan Medical Association, 109, 702-708, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>100252</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Taiwan</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To compare the efficacy and safety of 5mg solifenacin once daily and 4mg tolterodine once daily"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Feb 2007 - May 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported.</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Baseline characteristics</p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>SOL:26/39 (66.7%)<br/>TOL ER:24/36 (66.7%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL: 58.9 ± 15.1 years<br/>TOL ER: 55.3 ± 15.7 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL: 3.21 ± 3.05<br/>TOL ER: 6.19 ± 5.83</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL: 4.57 ± 5.83<br/>TOL ER: 3.68 ± 4.45</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL:4.2 ± 6.2 years<br/>TOL ER:4.4 ± 4.9 years</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged ≥ 18 years old<br/>2] offered informed consent<br/>3] willing and able to complete the micturition diary daily<br/>4] have OAB symptoms (inc. urine freq, urgency or urge incontinence) ≥ 3 months</p> | <p>diary</p> <p>Dry mouth was assessed using a Visual Analogue Scale</p> | <p>scales for dry mouths. Any other adverse events were recorded by researchers at these time points.</p> <p>PVR assessed by ultrasonography at the visit in week 12.</p> <p>Response to treatment was assessed by patients and investigators using a 3-point scale (not, a little and much improved).</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>None - All efficacy analyses were based on 'per protocol set'</p> | <p>Perception of Bladder Condition (PPBC)<br/>SOL: 32/39 (82.1%)<br/>TOL ER: 28/36 (77.8%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>SOL: -2.79 ± 2.82<br/>N = 34<br/>TOL ER: -4.67 ± 9.29<br/>N = 32</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL: -1.70 ± 3.07<br/>N = 34<br/>TOL ER:-1.15 ± 2.68<br/>N = 32</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> | <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - randomisation method not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - No - study was open-label<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - No - study was open-label<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
|               | <p>5] Must have experienced frequency, defined as <math>\geq 8</math> micturitions/24 hrs</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] pregnant or lactating patients or those intending to become pregnant<br/> 2] clinical significant bladder outflow obstruction (females with bladder outlet obstruction or benign prostatic hyperplasia in males)<br/> 3] significant post-void residual volume (PVR)<br/> 4] stress incontinence<br/> 5] evidence of symptomatic UTI, chronic inflammation, bladder stones, previous pelvic radiation therapy, previous or current malignant disease of the pelvic organs<br/> 6] patients with a medical condition that contraindicated the use of antimuscarinic drugs<br/> 7] uncontrolled narrow angle glaucoma, urinary or gastric retention, or any additional medication condition that, in the opinion of the investigator, contraindicated the use of antimuscarinics.</p> |               |         | <p>Not measured</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/> Any adverse effect<br/> SOL: 15/39 (38.5%)<br/> TOL ER: 9/36 (25.0%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> SOL: 7/39 (17.9%)<br/> TOL ER: 3/36 (8.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> SOL: 5/39 (12.8%)<br/> TOL ER: 4/36 (11.1%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> SOL: 1/39 (2.6%)<br/> TOL ER: 1/36 (2.8%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> - Post-void residual volume<br/> SOL: <math>0.60 \pm 44.6</math> mL N = 34<br/> TOL ER: <math>3.51 \pm 2.26</math> mL N = 32</p> | <p>comparable for dropout - Yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - No - study was open-label<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - No - study was open-label<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
|  |  |  |   |  | <b>Other information</b><br><br>Unclear on dropout numbers  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Junemann,K.P., Hessdorfer,E., Unamba-Oparah,I., Berse,M., Brunjes,R., Madersbacher,H., Gramatte,T., Propiverine hydrochloride immediate and extended release: comparison of efficacy and tolerability in patients with overactive bladder, Urologia Internationalis, 77, 334-339, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100270</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, UK, Spain, Ukraine, Romanian, Austria and France.</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 988</p> <p>Propiverine IR = 395<br/>Propiverine ER = 391<br/>Placebo = 202</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>PRO IR: 353/395 (89.4%)<br/>PRO ER: 348/391 (89.0%)<br/>PLA: 13/202 (90.6)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>PRO IR: 56.3 (no SD given)<br/>PRO ER: 55.3<br/>PLA: 57.2</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/ day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>PRO IR: 3.29 ± 2.65<br/>PRO ER: 3.38 ± 2.75<br/>PLA: 3.50 ± 3.63</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes/ day - Mean ±</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Propiverine hydrochloride immediate release 15mg twice daily</p> <p>Propiverine hydrochloride extended release 30mg once daily</p> <p>Placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Following a run-in period of seven days, patients received propiverine hydrochloride IR 15mg twice a day, propiverine hydrochloride ER 30mg once a day or a placebo for 32 days. Investigators undertook regular assessments of efficacy and tolerability.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Reference made to the intention to treat population but no details offered on how missing data was treated.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>PRO IR: 249/395 (63.0%)<br/>PRO ER: 245/391 (62.7%)<br/>PLA: 87/202 (43.1%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute risk reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean ± SD (endpoint scores)<br/>PRO IR: 1.08 ± 2.10 N = 360<br/>PRO ER: 0.91 ± 1.70 N = 363<br/>PLA: 1.72 ± 2.78 N = 187</p> <p>Urgency episodes - Mean ± SD<br/>PRO IR: 4.10 ± 3.67 N = 360</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation -<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment -<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline -<br/>Level of bias:</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care -<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded -<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded -</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---------|--|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the efficacy and tolerability of propiverine hydrochloride immediate release (IR), propiverine hydrochloride extended release (ER) and placebo for the treatment of overactive bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2001 to August 2003</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Apogepha Arzneimittel GmbH</p> | <p><u>SD</u><br/>PRO IR: 6.13 ± 3.83<br/>PRO ER: 6.37 ± 4.13<br/>PLA: 6.05 ± 4.08</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] ≥18 years old<br/>2] able to provide voluntarily signed informed consent<br/>3] at least 2 incontinence episodes within 3 days<br/>4] at least 10 micturitions within 24 hours</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress incontinence<br/>2] intermittent catheterization<br/>3] neurogenic detrusor under- and overactivity<br/>4] postvoid residual urine ≥100ml<br/>5] acute UTI<br/>6] electrostimulation therapy, bladder training if performed within 4 weeks before the run-period for the study<br/>7] anomalies of the lower GU tract (e.g. ectopic ureters, fistulas etc)<br/>8] pre-existing medical</p> |               |         | <p>PRO ER: 3.79 ± 3.29 N = 363<br/>PLA: 4.44 ± 4.06 N = 187</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>(zero episodes per day) n/N (%)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>PRO IR: 184/395 (46.6%)<br/>PRO ER: 199/391 (50.1%)<br/>PLA: 76/202 (35.1%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale: Kings's Health Questionnaire (total score)<br/>PRO IR: 40.38 ± 21.70 N = 360<br/>PRO ER: 40.58 ± 21.86 N = 363<br/>PLA: 44.23 ± 21.28 N = 187</p> <p><u>Adverse event n/N (%)</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>PRO IR: 152/395 (38.5%)</p> | <p>Level of bias:</p> <p><b>C Attrition bias</b><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups -<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout -<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data -<br/>Level of bias:</p> <p><b>D Detection bias</b><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length -<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely -<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome -<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention -<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors -<br/>Level of bias:</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               | <p>contraindications for anticholinergics (e.g. obstruction of the bowel)</p> <p>9] cardiac insufficiency</p> <p>10] multiple sclerosis</p> <p>11] evidence of severe renal, hepatic or metabolic disorders</p> <p>12] history of drug or alcohol abuse</p> <p>13] concomitant medications known to have a potential to interfere with the study medication</p> <p>14] pregnant or breast feeding women</p> <p>15] women of childbearing potential not using a reliable form of contraception.</p> |               |         | <p>PRO ER: 134/391 (34.3%)<br/>PLA: 41/202 (20.3%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>PRO IR: 90/395 (22.8%)<br/>PRO ER: 85/391 (21.7%)<br/>PLA: 13/202 (6.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>PRO IR: 26/395 (6.6%)<br/>PRO ER: 23/391 (5.9%)<br/>PLA: 11/202 (5.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse event<br/>PRO IR: 15/395 (3.8%)<br/>PRO ER: 11/391 (2.8%)<br/>PLA: 1/202 (0.5%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Intervention: Yes<br/>3] Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from the PRO IR group not used in review or network meta-analysis as dose used (15mg twice daily) was less than the recommended starting doses of 15mg three times daily</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
|  |  |   |  | <b>Week 12</b><br>Not applicable   |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Karram,M.M., Toglia,M.R., Serels,S.R., Andoh,M., Fakhoury,A., Forero-Schwanhaeuser,S., Treatment with solifenacin increases warning time and improves symptoms of overactive bladder: results from VENUS, a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, Urology, 73, 14-18, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100280</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 739<br/>Solifenacin (SOL) = 372<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 367</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)*<br/>SOL: 317/372 (85%)<br/>PLA: 305/367 (83%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD*<br/>SOL: 57 ± 14<br/>PLA: 57 ± 15</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 2.82 ± 2.71<br/>PLA: 2.56 ± 2.72</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 6.15 ± 3.93<br/>PLA: 6.03 ± 3.90</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>SOL or PLA given as 5mg/day for 4 weeks, then the dose could be maintained or increased to 10mg/day. At 8 weeks dose could be maintained or increased from 5mg/day to 10mg/day or decreased from 10mg/day to 5mg/day</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants completed 3-day bladder diaries before each study visit (weeks 0, 4, 8, 12) to record each urinary event including micturitions, incontinence episodes and urgency episodes.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Triallists determined that 289 patients per treatment arm would provide 90% power at <math>\alpha</math> - 0.05 to detect a group difference of 1 urgency episode/day with a standard deviation of 3.7. Using a 20% dropout rate, 720 would be required*</p> <p>*data from secondary publication (Toglia et al., 2009)</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4 results</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Reported as improved on PPBC<br/>SOL: 207/372 (55.6%)<br/>PLA: 145/367 (39.5%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - mean ± SD change from baseline<br/>SOL: -2.10 ± 2.39<br/>n = 229<br/>PLA: -1.24 ± 2.30<br/>n = 224</p> <p>Urgency episodes - mean ± SD change from baseline<br/>SOL: -3.91 ± 3.54</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual.Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Astellas Pharma US, Inc and GlaxoSmithKline</p> | <p>*data from secondary publication (Toglia et al., 2009)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged 18 or over<br/>2] OAB defined as at least 1 urgency episode/day, with or without urge incontinence, usually accompanied by frequency (at least 8 micturitions/day), nocturia or both for at least 3 months</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress incontinence or mixed incontinence with predominant stress<br/>2] urinary tract infection<br/>3] chronic inflammation (e.g. institial cystitis)<br/>4] bladder stones<br/>5] clinically significant bladder outflow obstruction<br/>6] other conditions (including hypersensitivity to anticholinergic drugs) that might prevent safe completion of the study</p> |               |         | <p>n = 348<br/>PLA: -2.73 ± 3.84<br/>n = 336</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes reported as no episodes at endpoint (week 12 or last observation)<br/>SOL: 133/229 (58.1%)<br/>PLA: 93/224 (41.5%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>SOL: 160/372 (43.0%)<br/>PLA: 88/367 (24.0%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>SOL: 94/372 (25.3%)<br/>PLA: 33/367 (9.0%)</p> | <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
|   |  |   |   | <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>SOL: 58/372 (15.6%)<br/>PLA: 64/367 (17.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>SOL: 25/372 (6.7%)<br/>PLA: 16/367 (4.4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on continence status and dropouts for any reason used in network meta-analysis</p> <p>Data on dropouts taken from secondary publication "Toglia et al., 2009"</p>                    |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Malone-Lee,J.G., Al-Buheissi,S., Does urodynamic verification of overactive bladder determine treatment success? Results from a randomized placebo-controlled study, BJU International, 103, 931-937, 2009</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 307</p> <p>Tolterodine extended release (TOL ER) 4mg QD = 165<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 142</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>Not reported by group but overall</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Participants received either TOL ER 4mg qd or placebo for 12 weeks</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Subjects completed a diary card for the 7 days before the first (baseline) study visit. They were assessed for eligibility and after urodynamic study returned for two further visits at 4 and 12 weeks, and completed diary cards for the 7 days before each study visit.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom</u></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - independent stratified</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100338</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To determine whether patients with OAB manifest different treatment responses, dependent on whether a urodynamics study had demonstrated detrusor overactivity</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Sponsored by Pharmacia (now Pfizer)</p> | <p>228/307 (74.3%) were female</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported by group but overall age = 56.4 <math>\pm</math> 14.1</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/week<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>TOL ER: 81/165 (49.1%)<br/>PLA: 73/142 (51.4%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged <math>\geq</math> 18 years<br/>2] urinary frequency (defined as an average of <math>\geq</math> 8 voids/24 h, measured over a 7-day period) and urgency (with or without UUI)<br/>3] symptoms of OAB for <math>\geq</math> 6 months with no significant stress UI<br/>4] Female subjects were required to use a medically accepted form of contraception for the duration of the study.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] significant hepatic or renal</p> |               | <p>The information to be recorded on the diary card included the time of each bladder void and whether the void was voluntary or involuntary, the number of incontinence pads used, and the number of laundry loads. Subjects were also asked to record the volume at each void for 3 of the 7 days.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The study was designed with 90% power to detect any difference in treatment by outcome interaction assuming that the interaction effect was 30 ml (standard deviation [SD], 40 ml) at a 5% level of significance (two-tailed test). With an expected discontinuation rate of 20%, it was calculated that 450 subjects would have to be recruited to the study.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used.</p> | <p><u>reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>reported as no UI episodes (of those incontinent at baseline)<br/>TOL ER: 41/96 (42.7%)<br/>PLA: 26/73 (35.6%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL ER: 88/165 (53%)<br/>PLA: 67/142 (47%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>DAR: 21/165 (12.7%)</p> | <p>randomization<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
|   | <p>disease</p> <p>2] symptomatic UTI</p> <p>3] diagnosed interstitial cystitis</p> <p>4] un-investigated haematuria</p> <p>5] clinically significant bladder outlet obstruction</p> <p>6] receiving anticholinergic drugs or other treatments for OAB in the 14 days before randomization</p> <p>7] known hypersensitivity to tolterodine-ER or any of its excipients</p> <p>8] receiving oral cytochrome P450 3A4 inhibitors (e.g. macrolide antibiotics)</p> <p>9] had received electrostimulation or bladder retraining in the 3 months before randomization.</p> |   |  | <p>PLA: 19/142 (13.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>DAR: 7/165 (4.2%)<br/>PLA: 2/142 (1.4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on continence status and discontinuation for any reason only used in network meta-analysis</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Minassian,V.A., Ross,S., Sumabat,O., Lovatsis,D., Pascali,D., Al-Badr,A., Alarab,M., Drutz,H.P.,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 72</p> <p>Oxybutynin XL = 39</p> <p>Oxybutynin IR = 33</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Oxybutynin XL 5mg once-daily</p> <p>Oxybutynin IR 2.5 mg three</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Interventions were given for 12 weeks</p> <p>A medical history was taken from all patients.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>No data reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b></p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions      | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--------------------|--|--|---|
| <p>Randomized trial of oxybutynin extended versus immediate release for women aged 65 and older with overactive bladder: lessons learned from conducting a trial, Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Canada: JOGC, 29, 726-732, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>100357</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To investigate whether the once daily administration of oxybutynin XL is more effective than the three times per day administration of oxybutynin IR in reducing symptoms of OAB, including urgency, frequency, and nocturia with or without urge incontinence, in a community-dwelling female population over the age of 65."</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>OXY XL: 39/39 (100%)<br/>OXY IR: 33/33 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY XL:75 ± 6 years<br/>OXY IR:73 ± 5 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/ day Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes/ day Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity -n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] female<br/>2] over 65 years old<br/>3] symptoms of OAB including urgency, frequency and nocturia (as defined by the International Continence Society)<br/>4] experiencing mixed symptoms of OAB and stress urinary incontinence, with the former being the main presenting symptom</p> | <p>times a day</p> | <p>A focused physical and pelvic examination was performed that included testing the patient lying and standing for stress incontinence and staging of concurrent pelvic organ prolapse. Uroflowmetry and measurement of post-void residual bladder volume by ultrasound were performed. Patients with urinary tract infection were treated with a one-week course of antibiotics prior to enrolment in the study.</p> <p>Patients were randomised to either oxybutynin XL 5 mg once-daily or oxybutynin IR 2.5 mg three times a day for 12 weeks.</p> <p>Drug dosage was increased, in non-responders, after four weeks of treatment to 10mg in the oxybutynin XL group and 5mg three times a day in the oxybutynin IR group for the remainder of the trial.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample of 120 subjects (60 per group) was needed for 80% power to detect a difference fo 1.5 in the</p> | <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence / day - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - U-UDI - Mean ± SD - Endpoint week 12<br/>OXY XL: 2.1 ± 1.0<br/>n = 37<br/>OXY IR: 1.7 ± 1.0<br/>n = 28</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>OXY XL: 19/39</p> | <p>trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - central telephone randomisation service<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - central randomisation to reduce bias by conealing allocation<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Unclear - Not reported<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2003 to December 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Study was supported by a grant from Janssen-Ortho Inc.</p> | <p>5] able to give written informed consent</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] bedridden<br/> 2] permanent indwelling catheter<br/> 3] MMSE score &lt; 24<br/> 4] incontinence due to causes other than predominant urge incontinence<br/> 5] evidence of glaucoma, gastric retention or bowel obstruction<br/> 6] history of allergy to oxybutynin or anticholinergic drugs<br/> 7] taking antidepressants or anticholinesterase inhibitors<br/> 8] post-void residual bladder vol. of more than 100mL<br/> 9] history of neurologic disorder, e.g. multiple sclerosis, spinal cord injury or demyelinating disorder.</p> |               | <p>number of micturitions per 24 hours at a two-tailed alpha level of 5%, a sample of 120 subjects (60 per group) was needed. Allowing for a drop-out rate of 10%, the estimated sample required was 132 (66 per group)</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Analysis of data was conducted by "intent to treat"</p> | <p>(48.7%)<br/> OXY IR: 16/33<br/> (48.5%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> OXY XL: 14/39<br/> (35.9%)<br/> OXY IR: 16/33<br/> (48.5%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> OXY XL: 13/39<br/> (33.3%)<br/> OXY IR: 16/33<br/> (48.5%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects:<br/> OXY XL: 12/39<br/> (30.8%)<br/> OXY IR: 13/33<br/> (39.4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> Post-void residual volume<br/> Not reported</p> | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/> C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/> C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   |   |  |  |   | 2] Intervention: Yes<br>3: Outcomes: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b><br><br>Study stopped recruitment early due to difficulty in recruitment   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Nitti,V.W., Dmochowski,R., Sand,P.K., Forst,H.T., Haag-Molkenteller,C., Massow,U., Wang,J., Brodsky,M., Bavendam,T., Efficacy, safety and tolerability of fesoterodine for overactive bladder syndrome, Journal of Urology, 178, 2488-2494, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100367</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 836</p> <p>Fesoterodine 4mg (FES 4) = 283<br/>Fesoterodine 8mg (FES 8) = 279<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 274</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female, n/N (%)<br/>FES 4: 213/282(76%)<br/>FES 8: 218/279 (78%)<br/>PLA: 200/271 (74%)</p> <p>Age (years). Mean (range)<br/>FES 4: 59 (21 - 85)<br/>FES 8: 59 (23 - 91)<br/>PLA: 59 (24 - 88)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes / day Mean <math>\pm</math></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Participants were randomised to either fesoterodine 4mg, fesoterodine 8mg or matching placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants completed a 3-day bladder diary before randomisation, and 2, 8 and 12 weeks after starting treatment</p> <p>Voided volumes were recorded on 1 on the 3 days</p> <p>Treatment response was assessed using a self-administered treatment benefit scale</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u> defined as improved from 4 point treatment benefit scale<br/>FES 4: 171/283 (60%)<br/>FES 8: 198/279 (71%)<br/>PLA: 120/274 (44%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u> reported as Mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - computer generated<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy, safety and tolerability of 4mg and 8mg fesoterodine for OAB</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>October 20 2003 to February 10 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Schwarz BioSciences GmbH abd Pfizer, Inc.</p> | <p>SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>OAB duration (years) Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES 4: 9.1 <math>\pm</math> 10.3<br/>FES 8: 10.1 <math>\pm</math> 11.5<br/>PLA: 9.8 <math>\pm</math> 10.3</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged &gt; 18 with OAB symptoms for at least 6 months<br/>2] at least 8 micturitions per day, at least 6 urinary urgency episodes per day or 3 UUI epsiodes per day</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] lower urinary tract pathology that could cause urgency or incontinence<br/>2] pelvic organ prolapse grade III or greater<br/>3] clinically relevant bladder outlet obstruction<br/>4] PVR volume greater than 100ml<br/>5] polyuria<br/>6] symptomatic or recurrent urinary tract infections<br/>7] current treatment with antimuscarinic drugs<br/>8] a neurogenic cause for OAB<br/>9] clinically relevant arrhythmia, unstable angina or a corrected QT</p> |               |         | <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>FES 4: -1.65 <math>\pm</math> 2.42 N = 228<br/>FES 8: -2.28 <math>\pm</math> 2.36 N = 218<br/>PLA: -0.96 <math>\pm</math> 2.43 N = 205</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>FES 4: -1.91 <math>\pm</math> 3.27 N = 267<br/>FES 8: -2.3 <math>\pm</math> 3.27 N = 267<br/>PLA: -0.79 <math>\pm</math> 2.86 N = 205</p> <p><u>Continance status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>FES 4: 171/283 (60%)<br/>FES 8: 193/279 (69%)<br/>PLA: 149/274 (55%)</p> | <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
|  | interval (Bazett's formula) of greater than 500 milliseconds 10] current treatment or within 4 weekks with electrostimulation or baldder training |  |   | <p>Dry mouth<br/>FES 4: 45/283 (16%)<br/>FES 8: 99/279 (36%)<br/>PLA: 19/274 (7%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>FES 4: 60/283 (21%)<br/>FES 8: 57/279 (20%)<br/>PLA: 42/274 (15%)</p> <p>Dropout for adverse event<br/>FES 4: 17/283 (6%)<br/>FES 8: 25/279 (9%)<br/>PLA: 11/274 (4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/>N/A</p> |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Rackley,R., Weiss,J.P., Rovner,E.S., Wang,J.T., Guan,Z., Study Group., Nighttime dosing with | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 850<br>Tolterodine extended release (TOL ER) = 429  | <b>Interventions</b><br>After a 2-week placebo run-in period, eligible patients were given TOL 2R (4mg qd) or PLA to be taken 4 hours or | <b>Details</b><br>7-day bladder diaries were completed for studies visists at baseline and weeks 4 and 12 | <b>Results</b><br><b>Week 4</b><br>Not reported<br><b>Week 12</b>  | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled                                     |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions               | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>tolterodine reduces overactive bladder-related nocturnal micturitions in patients with overactive bladder and nocturia, Urology, 67, 731-736, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100392</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of nighttime tolterodine extended release dosing on urgency and urgency-related micturition in patients with OAB and nocturia</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Placebo (PLA) = 421</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL ER: 223/429 (52%)<br/>PLA: 211/421 (50%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>TOL ER: 59 <math>\pm</math> 14<br/>PLA: 58 <math>\pm</math> 14</p> <p>Urge incontinence episodes/week - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>TOL ER: 5.04 <math>\pm</math> 11.27<br/>PLA: 4.13 <math>\pm</math> 11.06</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not report</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged 18 or over<br/>2] OAB symptoms (8 or more micturitions/day and urgency with or without UUI)<br/>3] nocturia (mean of 2.5 or more episodes per night)<br/>4] mean voided volume of</p> | <p>less before bedtime.</p> | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>To detect a difference of 7% nighttime micturitions compared with placebo, 722 patients (361 per group) would be needed to reject the null hypothesis at a significance level of 5% with a power of 80%.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used.</p> | <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>TOL ER: 231/429 (54%)<br/>PLA: 183/421 (43%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL ER: 47/429 (11%)<br/>PLA: 25/421 (6%)</p> | <p>trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias</p> |

| Study details                                  | Participants  | Interventions                                     | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | <p>200ml/micturition or less<br/>5] mean nighttime voided volume of less than 40% of total voided volume</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] significant stress urinary incontinence<br/>2] postvoid residual volume greater than 200ml<br/>3] maximum flow rate of less than 20ml/s<br/>4] 24 hour urine volume greater than 3000ml</p> |   |   | <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER: 39/429 (9%)<br/>PLA: 8/421 (2%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>TOL ER: 56/429 (13.1%)<br/>PLA: 63/421 (15.0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>TOL ER: 4/429 (0.9%)<br/>PLA: 17/421 (4.0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on Dropouts for any reason used in network meta-analysis</p> |
| <b>Full citation</b>                           | <b>Sample size</b>  | <b>Interventions</b>                              | <b>Details</b>  | <b>Results</b>  | <b>Limitations</b>  |
| Rogers,R., Bachmann,G., Jumadilova,Z., Sun,F., | N = 413<br>Tolterodine extended release (TOL  | TOL ER (4mg) or PLA was given once daily within 4 | 5-day bladder diaries were completed at baseline and at | <b>Week 4</b><br>No data reported   | NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D:   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions                        | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>Morrow,J.D., Guan,Z., Bavendam,T., Efficacy of tolterodine on overactive bladder symptoms and sexual and emotional quality of life in sexually active women, International Urogynecology Journal, 19, 1551-1557, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>100403</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To evaluate the efficacy of tolterodine ER in treating OAB symptoms in sexually-active women with OAB and UUI</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Study was funded by Pfizer.</p> | <p>ER) = 202<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 211</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL ER: 202/202 (100%)<br/>PLA: 211/211 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL ER: 49 ± 12<br/>PLA: 47 ± 12</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL ER: 2.5 ± 2.1<br/>PLA: 2.2 ± 1.8</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL ER: 6 ± 8<br/>PLA: 5 ± 6.5</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] female outpatients aged 18 or more<br/>2] mean of 8 or more micturitions/day<br/>3] 0.6 or more UUI episodes/day<br/>4] 3 or more OAB micturitions</p> | <p>hours of bedtime for 12 weeks</p> | <p>week 12 to record time of each micturition and incontinence pad usage.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The sample size was determined based on a projected treatment difference of 1.02 in the number of UUI episodes. Using a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05 and 80% power to detect this difference 174 subjects were required for each treatment group. Assuming a 15% dropout rate 400 subjects were to be randomized.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used.</p> | <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment*</u><br/>TOL ER: 139/202 (68.8%)<br/>PLA: 110/211 (52.1%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes / day - LS Mean ± SD<br/>Change from baseline<br/>TOL ER: -1.8 ± 1.37 N = 189<br/>PLA: -1.4 ± 1.35 N = 182</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: 93/202 (46.0%)<br/>PLA: 70/211 (33.2%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of</u></p> | <p>Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
| Inc           | <p>(associated with moderate or severe urgency or UUI)/day</p> <p>5] reporte at leazst some moderate problems on Patient Perception of Bladder Condition Questionnaire</p> <p>6] in a stable, sexually active relationship with a male partner for 6 or more months</p> <p>7] OAB symptoms for 3 or more months</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stage 3 or greater pelvic organ prolapse</p> <p>2] history of lower urinary tract surgery</p> <p>3] lifelong sexual dysfunction unrelated to lifelong UUI</p> <p>4] predominant stress urinary incontinence</p> |               |         | <p><u>life</u></p> <p>IIQ scale used - mean change from baseline</p> <p>TOL ER: -71.6 ± 78.3 N = 182</p> <p>PLA: -59.2 ± 77.0 N = 189</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u></p> <p>Any adverse event</p> <p>TOL ER: 114/202 (56.7%)</p> <p>PLA: 111/211 (52.9%)</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> <p>TOL ER: 26/202 (12.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 19/211 (9.0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason</p> <p>TOL ER: 38/202 (18.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 43/211 (20.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects</p> <p>TOL ER: 9/202 (4.5%)</p> <p>PLA: 6/211 (2.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>D Detection bias</p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcomes: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on Continence status and Dropouts for any reason used in network meta-analysis</p> <p>Satisfaction data taken from secondary publication "Rogers et al., 2009"</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |  |   | <u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported  | SD for IIQ change from baseline scores calculated from the reported SEM  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Rudy,D., Cline,K., Harris,R., Goldberg,K., Dmochowski,R., Multicenter phase III trial studying trospium chloride in patients with overactive bladder, Urology, 67, 275-280, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100414</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomise controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To examine the effect of trospium chloride 20mg twice daily as treatment for urinary frequency and other related symptoms in patients with OAB.</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 658</p> <p>Trospium (TRO) = 329</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 329</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)</p> <p>TRO: 267/329 (81.2%)</p> <p>PLA: 269/329 (81.8%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SE</p> <p>DAR: 61.1 ± 0.69</p> <p>PLA: 61.0 ± 0.70</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Median</p> <p>TRO: 2.86 (No range reported)</p> <p>PLA: 2.86 (No range reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients who met the inclusion criteria at baseline were randomised to either Trospium chloride 20mg twice daily or placebo for 12 weeks.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patient urinary diaries were completed for 7 days prior to each study visit at 1 wee, 4 weeks and 12 weeks.</p> <p>Primary outcomes was number of toilet voids in 24 hours</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was determined on the basis for two efficacy outcomes; change in number of voids per day and in urge urinary incontinence per day, assuming 90% power and 80% power respectively. Patients lost to follow-up during the study were not replaced.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) used</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes</p> <p>TRO: -1.71 (No SD) N = 323</p> <p>PLA: -1.14 (No SD) N = 325</p> <p>Urgency episodes</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes</p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias</p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Funded by Indevus Pharmaceuticals, Inc</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 18 years or older<br/>2] OAB symptoms for at least 6 months<br/>3] minimal urinary frequency of 10 or more toilet voids per day<br/>4] symptoms or urgency (at least 1 'mild', 'moderate' or 'severe' severity rating on patient diary)<br/>5] at least 7 urge urinary incontinence episodes per week</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] predominantly stress, insensate or overflow in nature<br/>2] neurogenic bladder disorders<br/>3] significant renal disease<br/>4] uninvestigated hematuria<br/>5] urinary tract infection at washout or more than twice during the first year<br/>6] significant bladder outlet obstruction (postvoid residual volume &gt; 100ml) in clinical opinion of trial investigator<br/>7] concurrent use of any anticholinergic or other drug for OAB with 21 days of strat of study<br/>8] bladder surgery with 6 months<br/>9] cancer or interstitial cystitis<br/>10] men with a prostate antigen level of 10ng/ml or greater<br/>11] diuretic use</p> |               |         | <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 Patient satisfaction with treatment</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence</p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|--|---|
|               | 11] estrogen therapy<br>12] non-medical bladder therapy as part of a long-standing treatment program<br>13] pregnancy<br>14] other contraindication to antimuscarinic therapy |               |         | episodes - Median change from baseline<br>TRO: -1.86 (No SD) N = 323<br>PLA: -1.29 (No SD) N = 325<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Adverse effects</u><br>Any adverse effect<br>TRO: 196/329 (59.6%)<br>PLA: 153/329 (46.5%)<br><br>Dry mouth<br>TRO: 65/329 (19.8%)<br>PLA: 17/329 (5.2%)<br><br>Dropouts for any reason<br>TRO: 42/329 (8.3%)<br>PLA: 32/329 | <b>Other information</b><br><br>All data used in review |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | (12.7%)<br><br>Dropouts for adverse effects<br>TRO: 25/329 (4.5%)<br>PLA: 16/329 (6.7%)<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br>Not reported   |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Staskin,D., Sand,P., Zinner,N., Dmochowski,R., Trospium Study Group., Once daily trospium chloride is effective and well tolerated for the treatment of overactive bladder: results from a multicenter phase III trial, Journal of Urology, 178, 978-983, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100455</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 601</p> <p>Trospium extended release (TRO ER) = 298</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 303</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TRO ER: 254/296 (85.2%)<br/>PLA: 256/303 (84.5%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SE<br/>TRO ER: 59.6 ± 0.77<br/>PLA: 59.3 ± 0.70</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TRO ER (60mg) or matching PLA was given once daily for 12 weeks</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants underwent a 7-day washout period before completing a written bladder diary for 3 days. Eligible patients were the randomized by stratification by average baseline daily urinary frequency. 3 day bladder diaries were completed before each study visit at weeks 1, 4 and 12. Diaries and drug accountability were reviewed at each visit and adverse effects were logged and assessed.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>UUI episodes - change from baseline reported<br/>TRO ER: -2.36 ± 2.22 N = 292<br/>PLA: -1.75 ± 2.25 N = 300</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| <p><b>study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the effects of tiroprium chloride (60mg qd) capsules compared with placebo in subjects iwth OAB with predominant UUI</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>August 2005 to May 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Esprit Pharma and Indevus Pharaceuticals</p> | <p>Number of incontinence episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] mean and women 18 years and older with symptoms of OAV for 6 months or greater<br/>2] symptoms of urgency (at least 1 'severe' urgency severity rating per 3 days as measured using Indevus Urgency Severity Scale)<br/>3] minimum urgency frequency of 30 or greater toliet voids per 3 days with an average of 1 or greater UUI episode/day<br/>4] average total volume voided 3000ml or less per day and 250ml or less per void</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress, insensate or overflow incontinence<br/>2] neurogenic bladder disorder<br/>3] significant renal disease<br/>4] uninvestiagted hematuria</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample size of 300 in each arm was required to provide sufficient statistical power based on the co-primary efficacy outcomes with the primary timepoint for analysis at week 12.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used consisting of data recorded or carried forwad at each visit.</p> | <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/>Scale used = OAB-SCS - change from baseline<br/>TRO ER: -9.67 <math>\pm</math> 9.57 N = 292<br/>PLA: -6.13 <math>\pm</math> 11.10 N = 300</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> | <p>differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               | <p>5] urinary tract infection at washout, or greater urinary tract infections requiring treatment during the previous year</p> <p>6] significant bladder outlet obstruction (defined as postvoid residual urine volume greater than 100ml) or an indwelling catheter</p> <p>7] active inflammatory bowel disease</p> <p>8] diagnosis of interstitial cystitis or bladder cancer with the past 6 months</p> <p>9] males with prostate specific antigen 4ng/ml or greater, prostate cancer or chronic prostatitis</p> <p>10] subjects undergoing/likely to undergo bladder retraining or a bladder drill program</p> <p>11] diuretic estrogen use outside of a long-term stable program</p> |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u></p> <p>UUI episodes - change from baseline reported<br/>TRO ER: <math>-2.48 \pm 2.9</math> N = 292<br/>PLA: <math>-1.93 \pm 2.8</math> N = 300</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>TRO ER: 54/298 (18.1%)<br/>PLA: 31/303 (10.3%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used = OAB-SCS - change from baseline<br/>TRO ER: <math>-11.2 \pm</math></p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on continence status and dropouts for any reason only used in network meta-analysis</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>9.4 N = 292<br/>           PLA: <math>-7.8 \pm 11.6</math> N = 300</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>           Any adverse effect<br/>           TRO ER: 80/298 (26.8%)<br/>           PLA: 53/303 (17.5%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>           TRO ER: 28/298 (8.7%)<br/>           PLA: 9/303 (3.0%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>           TRO ER: 35/298 (11.7%)<br/>           PLA: 30/303 (9.9%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>           TRO ER: 12/298 (4.0%)<br/>           PLA: 11/303 (3.6%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>           Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>           Not reported</p> |          |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Staskin,D.R., Dmochowski,R.R., Sand,P.K., MacDiarmid,S.A., Caramelli,K.E., Thomas,H., Hoel,G., Efficacy and safety of oxybutynin chloride topical gel for overactive bladder: a randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled, multicenter study, Journal of Urology, 181, 1764-1772, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100463</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy and safety of Oxybutynin topical gel in adults with overactive bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 789<br/>Oxybutynin topical gel (OXY TG) = 389<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 400</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female, n/N (%)</u><br/>OXY TG: 352/389 (90.5%)<br/>PLA: 352/400 (88.0%)</p> <p><u>Age (Years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TG: 59.5 ± 12.5<br/>PLA: 59.3 ± 12.2</p> <p><u>Urge Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TG: 5.4 ± 3.3<br/>PLA: 5.4 ± 3.3</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>OAB duration (Months) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TG: 106.6 ± 121.6<br/>PLA: 97.4 ± 96.8</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>OXY TG (10% weight per weight ethanol-based oxybutynin formulation) and matching PLA gel was applied (1gm) daily to rotating sites on the abdomen, upper arm pr shoulder and thigh</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were instructed to maintain a consistent level of fluid intake and initiate/maintain behavioral management for incontinence during the screening period.</p> <p>A 2 week period between visits 1 and 2 provided a washout for patients on antimuscarinics for OAB. At visit 2 patients received training to distinguish episodes and to properly complete the bladder diary</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample size of 700 equally divided between groups could be needed to provide 85% power to detect a real difference with the two-tailed t test and an <math>\alpha</math> of 0.05.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>MITT population included all randomized patients who received 1 or more doses of study drug and provided data for the baseline efficacy assessment.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - change from baseline - Mean ± SD<br/>OXY TG 3.9mg: - 3.0 ± 2.7 N = 389<br/>PLA: -2.5 ± 3.1 N = 400</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>OXY TG: 108/389 (27.8%)<br/>PLA: 69/400 (17.3%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p>June 2006 to May 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc</p> | <p>1] urge or mixed UI with a preponderance of urge UI episodes</p> <p>2] mean of 8 or more urinary voids per day</p> <p>3] 4 or more urge UI episodes per day</p> <p>4] mean voided volume of 350ml or less during a 2 day urine collection period</p> <p>5] PVR of 250ml or less on ultrasonography or catheterization</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] pregnancy</p> <p>2] breast-feeding</p> <p>3] inadequate birth-control by premenopausal women not using birth control</p> <p>4] Contraindication to oxybutynin (uncontrolled narrow angle glaucoma, gastric obstruction or retention, known hypersensitivity to oxybutynin related compounds or any component of the gel</p> <p>5] treatable condition that could cause urinary incontinence or urgency (acute urinary tract infection, prostatitis, hematuria, urinary tract obstruction, urethral diverticulum, bladder tumor, bladder stones, fecal impaction, conditions that require diuretic use)</p> <p>6] interstitial cystitis</p> <p>7] urethral syndrome</p> <p>8] painful bladder syndrome</p> <p>9] overflow incontinence</p> |               |         | <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u></p> <p>Dropouts for any reason</p> <p>OXY TG: 43/389 (11.1%)</p> <p>PLA: 45/400 (11.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects</p> <p>OXY TG: 19/389 (4.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 13/400 (3.3%)</p> <p>Any adverse effects</p> <p>OXY TG: 221/389 (56.8%)</p> <p>PLA: 193/400 (48.3%)</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> <p>OXY TG: 27/389 (6.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 11/400 (2.8%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void</u></p> | <p>comparable for missing data - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias</p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcomes: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on continence status and dropouts for any reason used in network meta-analysis</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p>secondary to outlet obstruction or underactive detrusor</p> <p>10] lower urinary tract surgery in previous 6 months</p> <p>11] unstable diabetes mellitus</p> <p>12] anticipated hormonal changes</p> <p>13] recurrent urinary tract infections (more than 3 in previous year)</p> <p>14] clinically significant systemic disease</p> <p>15] abnormal baseline laboratory test result</p> <p>16] concomitant medications that affect detrusor activity (antimuscarinics or tricyclic antidepressants)</p> <p>17] prostate cancer or prostate specific antigen plasma concentration greater than 4ng/ml</p> <p>18] active skin condition affecting treatment sites</p> <p>19] excessive consumption of caffeinated beverages (more than 5 cups per day)</p> <p>20] alcohol or drug use in the previous year</p> <p>21] participation in another clinical trial in the previous 30 days</p> <p>22] failure to complete baseline 3-day diary</p> |  |   | <p><u>residual volume</u></p> <p>Not reported</p>                  |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Yamaguchi,O., Marui,E., Kakizaki,H., Itoh,N.,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1593 (9 subjects were non-compliant so not included in group)</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Solifenacin 5mg</p> <p>Solifenacin 10mg</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients received placebo medication once daily during</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p>No data reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual.Appendix D:</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions                       | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <p>Yokota,T., Okada,H., Ishizuka,O., Ozono,S., Gotoh,M., Sugiyama,T., Seki,N., Yoshida,M., Japanese Solifenacin Study Group., Randomized, double-blind, placebo- and propiverine-controlled trial of the once-daily antimuscarinic agent solifenacin in Japanese patients with overactive bladder, BJU International, 100, 579-587, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100508</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Japan</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To assess whether soifenacin 5mg and 10mg once daily was comparable with placebo and propiverine 20 mg once daily (the most commonly prescribed dose in Japan), respectively, in a large population of Japanese patients with OAB"</p> | <p>numbers)</p> <p>SOL 5mg = 398<br/>SOL 10mg = 381<br/>PRO 20mg = 400<br/>PLA = 405</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 318/383 (83%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 316/371 (85.7%)<br/>PRO 20mg: 321/384 (83.6%)<br/>PLA: 333/395 (84.3%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD (range)</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 60.4 ± 13.3 years<br/>SOL 10mg: 59.9 ± 13.0 years<br/>PRO 20mg: 59.6 ± 13.6 years<br/>PLA: 60.8 ± 12.5 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/24hr Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 2.35 ± 2.45<br/>SOL 10mg: 2.19 ± 2.04<br/>PRO 20mg: 2.15 ± 2.3<br/>PLA: 1.99 ± 2.11</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes/24hr Mean ± SD</u><br/>SOL 5mg: 4.40 ± 3.30<br/>SOL 10mg: 4.42 ± 3.30<br/>PRO 20mg: 4.07 ± 3.19<br/>PLA: 4.04 ± 3.11</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity -n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Propiverine 20mg<br/>Placebo</p> | <p>a 2-week run-in period and were then randomised to one of four treatment arms: solifenacin 5mg, solifenacin 10mg, propiverine 20mg or placebo for 12 weeks after a three-day diary were recorded</p> <p>Patients were evaluated every four weeks for the following variables: mean number of voids/24h, urgency incontinence episodes/24hr, urgency episodes, nocturia episodes, volume voided per void, incontinence episodes.</p> <p>Safety assessments were performed at weeks 4,8 and 12 and included physical assessments and recording of adverse events. Vital signs and laboratory test results were assessed at 0, 4 and 12 weeks. 12-lead ECG carried out during the run-period and at the end of the study. Patient quality of life assessed at baseline end of study.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"The required enrolment was ≥350 patients per arm to detect superiority to placebo at a power of 90%, and the non-inferiority of solifenacin</p> | <p><b>Week 12</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean ± sd (Change scores)<br/>SOL 5mg: -1.60 ± 1.81 n = 274<br/>SOL 10mg: -1.59 ± 2.12 n = 270<br/>PRO 20mg: -1.25 ± 2.79 n = 295<br/>PLA: -0.72 ± 1.95 n = 283<br/>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL 5mg: -2.41 ± 2.88 n = 383<br/>SOL 10mg: -2.78 ± 2.82 n = 371<br/>PRO 20mg: -2.30 ± 3.08 n = 384<br/>PLA: -1.28 ± 2.90 n = 395</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>SOL 5mg: 154/274 (56.2%)<br/>SOL 10mg:</p> | <p>Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>June 2003 to January 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Astellas Pharma Inc (formerly Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd), Tokyo, Japan.</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] adults ≥20 years old</li> <li>2] symptoms of OAB reported ≥6 months</li> <li>3] mean number of voids ≥8/24hr</li> <li>4] ≥3 episodes of urgency and/or ≥3 episodes of urgency incontinence during a 3-day voiding diary</li> </ol> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] significant bladder outlet obstruction (assessment based on measuring the postvoid urine volume.</li> <li>2] Patients with a PVR of ≥100mL were excluded</li> <li>3] symptoms of bladder outlet obstruction</li> <li>4] urinary retention</li> <li>5] demonstrable stress incontinence</li> <li>6] bladder stones</li> <li>7] UTI</li> <li>8] interstitial cystitis</li> <li>9] previous or current malignant disease of the pelvic organs</li> <li>10] previous pelvic radiation</li> <li>11] concomitant anticholinergic medications</li> <li>12] known of suspected hypersensitivity to anticholinergic medications or lactose</li> </ol> |               | <p>to propiverine 20 mg at a power of 80%"</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"Efficacy data were measured at week 12, and the last-observation-carried-forward approach was used to determine endpoint values if week 12 data were not available."</p> | <p>161/270 (59.6%)<br/>PRO 20mg: 165/295 (55.9%)<br/>PLA: 105/283 (37.1%)<br/>Urgency episodes SOL 5mg: 126/400 (31.5%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 138/385 (35.8%)<br/>PRO 20mg: 128/402 (31.8%)<br/>PLA: 82/406 (20.2%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect Not reported<br/>Dry mouth<br/>SOL 5mg: 67/400 (16.8%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 130/385 (33.8%)<br/>PRO 20mg: 103/402 (25.6%)<br/>PLA: 23/406 (5.7%)<br/>Dropouts for any reason<br/>SOL 5mg: 34/400 (8.5%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 32/385 (8.3%)<br/>PRO 20mg:</p> | <p>comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Intervention: Yes<br/>3] Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
|   |   |   |   | 36/402 (9.0%)<br>PLA: 34/406 (8.4%)<br>Dropouts for adverse effects<br>SOL 5mg: 20/400 (5.0%)<br>SOL 10mg: 26/385 (6.8%)<br>PRO 20mg: 26/402 (6.5%)<br>PLA: 11/406 (2.7%)<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>- <u>Post-void residual volume</u><br>Not reported | <b>Other information</b>  |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Zat'ura,F., Vsetica,J., Abadias,M., Pavlik,I., Schraml,P., Brod'ak,M., Villoria,J., Sust,M., Study Group., Cizolirtine citrate is safe and effective for treating urinary incontinence secondary to overactive bladder: a phase 2 proof-of-concept study, European Urology, 57, 145-152, 2010 | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 135<br><br>Cizolirtine (CIZ) = 34<br>Oxybutynin immediate release (OXY IR) = 27<br>Placebo (PLA) = 54<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>CIZ: 50/54 (92.6%) | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>Participants were randomised in a proportion of 2:2:1 to cizolirtine 230 mg two times per day (bid; given as 400 mg bid of citrate salt), placebo three times per day (tid), or oxybutynin 5 mg tid, respectively, took place after a 21-d run-in period. All treatments were given for 12 weeks. | <b>Details</b><br><br>Participants completed a bladder diary and underwent a baseline urodynamic evaluation throughout the last week prior to randomisation.<br><br>A 21-d wash-out period was kept by patients entering the study following treatment with any of the forbidden drugs. | <b>Results</b><br><br><b>Week 4</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Week 12</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u>   | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - based on random block permutations |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100512</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Czech Republic</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To demonstrate the efficacy of cizolirtine by showing its superiority over placebo</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2002 to April 2003</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Laboratorios Doctor Esteve S.A. sponsored the study</p> | <p>OXY IR: 22/27 (81.5%)<br/>PLA: 53/54 (98.1%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>CIZ: 51.9 <math>\pm</math> 11.7<br/>OXY IR: 54.7 <math>\pm</math> 13.0<br/>PLA: 50.2 <math>\pm</math> 13.9</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>CIZ: 1.6 <math>\pm</math> 1.4<br/>OXY IR: 2.1 <math>\pm</math> 2.0<br/>PLA: 2.0 <math>\pm</math> 2.0</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Median (range)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] outpatients aged 18–80 yr with a diagnosis of urinary incontinence with urgency<br/>2] idiopathic detrusor overactivity confirmed by urodynamic study<br/>3] showing signs of lower urinary tract dysfunction (i.e. increased 24-h frequency [eight or more micturitions per 24 h] and/or urge incontinence [one incontinent episode or more per 24 h] as assessed by a bladder diary filled</p> |               | <p>After randomisation, visits were done after 2, 4, 8, and 12 wk. Shortly before the last visit, the urodynamic evaluation was repeated.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Based on previous studies, a sample size of 46 in each group would provide an 80% power to detect a between-group difference in means of 1.6 voidings per 24 h with a common standard deviation (SD) of 2.7 using a student t test at a 5% two-sided significance level.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used to impute missing data.</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>CIZ: -1.2 <math>\pm</math> 1.4 N = 52<br/>OXY IR: -1.4 <math>\pm</math> 1.8 N = 26<br/>PLA: -0.6 <math>\pm</math> 1.9 N = 54</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>CIZ: -5.2 <math>\pm</math> 7.7 N = 52<br/>OXY IR: -4.8 <math>\pm</math> 4.0 N = 26<br/>PLA: -2.2 <math>\pm</math> 4.0 N = 54</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes reported as 'complete dryness'<br/>CIZ: 25/54 (46.3%)<br/>OXY IR: 17/27 (63.0%)<br/>PLA: 17/54 (31.5%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation code kept in sealed envelopes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               | <p>out throughout the week prior to randomisation<br/>4] present with detrusor overactivity (phasic, terminal, or both) and/or increased bladder sensation during filling cystometry at a physiologic filling rate in the baseline urodynamic evaluation performed for the study.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] evidence of a prevailing obstructive component (maximum flow rate &lt; 10 ml per second with a postvoiding residual volume &gt; 200 ml or chronic retention of urine)<br/>2] urodynamic stress incontinence (involuntary leakage of urine during increased abdominal pressure in the absence of detrusor contraction)<br/>3] an average total voided volume &gt; 3000 ml per 24 h<br/>4] obstructive conditions affecting the urethra<br/>5] prostatic diseases<br/>6] malignant hypertension<br/>7] allergy or hypersensitivity to study drugs or to structurally related drugs<br/>8] history of recurrent bacterial cystitis, bladder pain, or urethral pain on voiding; urinary tract infection within 1 wk prior to study enrolment; or any other clinically relevant disease which, in the opinion of the investigator, could</p> |               |         | <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>CIZ: 12/54 (22.2%)<br/>OXY IR: 8/27 (29.6%)<br/>PLA: 5/54 (9.3%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>CIZ: 6/54 (11.1%)<br/>OXY IR: 5/27 (18.5%)<br/>PLA: 0/54 (0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>CIZ:15/54 (27.8%)<br/>OXY IR: 3/27 (11.1%)<br/>PLA: 3/54 (5.6%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>CIZ:8/54 (14.8%)<br/>OXY IR: 2/27 (7.4%)<br/>PLA: 0/54 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>- <u>Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on continence status and discontinuation for any reason for both OXY IR and PLA groups only used in network meta-analysis</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | <p>interfere with the evaluation of the study drug.</p> <p>9] pregnant or breast-feeding</p> <p>10] receiving pharmacologic treatment for incontinence, diuretics, long-acting benzodiazepines, central or peripheral <math>\alpha</math>-adrenergic agonists or antagonists, or changing doses (ie, dose adjustments expected during the study) of drugs with anticholinergic side effects</p> <p>11] had undergone urogenital surgery within the prior 3 mo or who received concomitant conservative treatment for urinary incontinence (eg, vaginal cones, behavioural modification, intermittent urinary catheterisation).</p> |  |  |  |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Cartwright,R., Srikrishna,S., Cardozo,L., Robinson,D., Patient-selected goals in overactive bladder: a placebo controlled randomized double-blind trial of transdermal oxybutynin for the treatment of urgency and urge incontinence, BJU International, 107, 70-76, 2011</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 96</p> <p>Oxybutynin Trensdermal (OXT TD) = 48</p> <p>Placebo = 48</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female, n/N (%)</u></p> <p>OXY TD 3.9mg: 48/48 (100%)</p> <p>PLA: 48/48 (100%)</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Oxybutynin transdermal was given in a matrix patch (functionally identical to EU and US licensed Kentera and Oxytrol)</p> <p>Placebo was given in matching patches</p> <p>Both OXY TD and plaecbi patches were stored in identical sealed foil sachets that fully mainteined blinding</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>After recruitment, patients entered a 2-week unblinded placebo period. Those already taking OAB medication stopped the medication and completed all baseline assessments. Patients then entered the 4-week double-blind period and further efficacy assessments were carried out at the end of this period. Safety assessments were carried</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes</p> <p>OXY TD 3.9mg: - 0.47 <math>\pm</math> 0.81 N not</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - true number method used</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>129148</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To assess patient-reported goal improvement with 3.9mg/day transdermal oxybutynin in comparison with placebo over a 4-week period.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>October 2006 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>UCB Pharma</p> | <p><u>Age (Years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 53.1 ± 14.5<br/>PLA: 50.5 ± 13.7</p> <p><u>Urge Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 1.0 ± 0.8<br/>PLA: 0.6 ± 0.6</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day Mean ± SD</u><br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 3.9 ± 2.88<br/>PLA: 2.74 ± 1.82</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>OAB duration Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] &gt; 3 months history of OAB symptoms<br/>2] with or without urgency urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] history of hypersensitivity to oxybutynin<br/>2] previous transdermal skin patch<br/>3] pregnancy<br/>4] breast feeding<br/>5] voiding difficulties (flow rate &lt; 15 ml/s)</p> | <p>for both patients and clinicians. Patients were instructed to apply patches twice weekly. Patches were applied to dry intact skin over the abdomen, hip or buttock, immediately after removal from sealed foil patches. Patients were asked to place patch on a new site each application.</p> | <p>out throughout the 6-week study period.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>A sample size of 74 was estimated to provide an 80% power to detect a 30% difference between OXY TD and placebo with alpha set at 0.05. Anticipating a 20% loss to follow-up, trialists planned to randomize 96 patients.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>ITT analysis reported but no details given</p> | <p>reported<br/>PLA: -0.23 ± 0.61<br/>N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: -1.23 ± 1.4<br/>N not reported<br/>PLA: -0.21 ± 1.58<br/>N not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported as means and SD's</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Dropouts for any reason<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 11/48 (22.9%)<br/>PLA: 7/48 (14.6%)<br/>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 4/48 (8.3%)<br/>PLA: 2/48 (4.2%)</p> <p>Any adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
|   | <p>6] postvoid residual &gt; 50mLs<br/> 7] current UTI<br/> 8] one of a number of complaints contraindicating anticholinergic treatment as detailed in SPC for Kentera including narrow angle glaucoma and myasthenia gravis</p> |  |   | <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> Not applicable</p> | <p>assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Only data on dropouts for any reason used in network meta-analysis</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Kaplan,S.A., Schneider,T., Foote,J.E., Guan,Z., Carlsson,M., Gong,J., Superior efficacy of fesoterodine over tolterodine extended release with rapid onset: a prospective, head-to-head, placebo-controlled trial, BJU International, 107, 1432-</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 2417</p> <p>Tolterodine (TOL ER) 4mg = 973<br/> Fesoterodine (FES) = 960<br/> Placebo = 478</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female, n/N (%)</p>                                   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Tolterodine 4mg Extended Release<br/> Fesoterodine 8mg<br/> Placebo (dummy capsule or tablet)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>A two-week single-blind placebo run-in period predated the study.</p> <p>Subjects were randomly allocated to fesoterodine 8mg (*week 1 subjects received 4mg and from weeks 2-12 8mg), tolterodine</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> TOL ER: 588/973 (60.4%)<br/> FES: 614/960 (64.0%)<br/> PLA: 235/478 (49.2%)</p>    | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p>  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|---|
| <p>1440, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>129248</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>North America, South America, Europe, Asia and Africa</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To prospectively assess the superiority of the maximum available dose of fesoterodine (8mg) over the maximum available dose of tolterodine ER (4mg)"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Feb 2008 - Oct 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"This study was funded and conducted by Pfizer Inc."</p> | <p>TOL ER: 817/973 (84%)<br/>FES: 816/960 (85%)<br/>PLA: 410/478 (86%)</p> <p><u>Age. Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER: 58.1 ± 13.8 years<br/>FES: 57.9 ± 13.5 years<br/>PLA: 59.5 ± 13.2 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>OAB duration Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOL ER: 6.5 ± 7.3 years<br/>FES: 6.6 ± 7.7 years<br/>PLA: 6.3 ± 7.2 years</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Men and women ≥ 18 years old<br/>2] self-reported AOB symptoms for three or more months<br/>3] a mean of at least one UUI episode and ≥ 8 micturitions/24hr noted in a 3-day bladder diary at baseline.</p> |               | <p>4mg ER or placebo for twelve weeks. All subjects took one tablet (fesoterodine) or capsule (tolterodine) daily or matching placebo.</p> <p>All subjects completed a three-day bladder diary at baseline, weeks 1, 4 and 12.</p> <p>Subjective improvement scales, the Patient Perception of Bladder Condition (PPBS) and the Urgency Perception Scale (UPS) was collected at baseline, 1, 4 and 12 weeks.</p> <p>Patients completed the Overactive Active Bladder questionnaire (OAB-q) at baseline and the endpoint of the study.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>606 subjects per active treatment group were required for 90% power for comparisons at the 5% significance level. 303 subjects were required in placebo group for 88% power for each comparison. 1515 subjects were required</p> | <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: -1.52 ± 1.53 N = 932<br/>FES: -1.68 ± 1.52 N = 920<br/>PLA: -1.31 ± 1.49 N = 456</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes</u><br/>TOL ER: -2.5 ± 6.1 N = 929<br/>FES: -3.1 ± 6.0 N = 915<br/>PLA: -1.9 ± 4.3 N = 453</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: 432/963 (43.4%)<br/>FES: 464/950 (48.3%)<br/>PLA: 177/472 (37.0%)</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - block randomisation using a centralised system<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation schedule generated and stored off site<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
|               | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Clinically significant hepatic or renal disease<br/> 2] Voiding dysfunction attributable to lower genitourinary pathology or surgical treatment<br/> 3] Neurological conditions (stroke, multiple sclerosis, spinal cord injury or Parkinson's disease)<br/> 4] History of acute urinary retention requiring catheterization<br/> 5] Symptoms of incontinence being predominately stress urinary incontinence in the opinion of the investigator<br/> 6] Antimuscarinic medication within two weeks before screening or electrostimulation, bladder training or pelvic floor exercises within four weeks of screening<br/> 7] Pregnant or nursing<br/> 8] women of childbearing potential who were heterosexually active without using adequate contraceptive measures.</p> |               | <p>assuming 90% of subjects would contribute to full analysis set.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last-observation-carried-forward was used for all missing post-baseline data but baseline data were not used.</p> | <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Not applicable</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>- <u>Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 Patient satisfaction with treatment</b><br/>TOL ER: 629/973 (64.6%)<br/>FES: 676/960 (70.4%)<br/>PLA: 272/478 (56.9%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes of incontinence - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd change scores<br/>TOL ER: <math>-1.74 \pm 1.82</math> N = 926<br/>FES: <math>-1.95 \pm 1.51</math> N = 908<br/>PLA: <math>-1.62 \pm 1.48</math> N = 448</p> | <p>for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Intervention: Yes<br/> 3] Outcomes: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Urgency episodes<br/>TOL ER: <math>-3.5 \pm 6.1</math><br/>N = 933<br/>FES: <math>-4.2 \pm 6.0</math> N = 915<br/>PLA: <math>-3.2 \pm 4.3</math> N = 453</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: 538/963 (56.0%)<br/>FES: 574/950 (60.0%)<br/>PLA: 241/472 (50.4%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>OAB-q - HRQOL total score - change score<br/>TOL ER: <math>19.5 \pm 29.6</math> N = 875<br/>FES: <math>22.9 \pm 28.9</math> N = 894<br/>PLA: <math>17.2 \pm 25.0</math> N = 435</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL ER: 267/973 (27.4%)<br/>FES: 388/960</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Results taken from clinicaltrials.gov (NCT00611026)</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>(40.4%)<br/>PLA: 91/478<br/>(19.0%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER: 130/973<br/>(13.4%)<br/>FES: 265/960<br/>(27.6%)<br/>PLA: 26/478<br/>(5.4%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>TOL ER: 88/973<br/>(9.0%)<br/>FES: 98/960<br/>(10.2%)<br/>PLA: 47/478<br/>(9.8%)</p> <p>Dropout for adverse event<br/>TOL ER: 28/973<br/>(4.7%)<br/>FES: 46/960<br/>(2.9%)<br/>PLA: 9/478 (1.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> |          |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Vardy,M.D., Mitcheson,H.D., Samuels,T.A., Wegenke,J.D., Forero-Schwanhaeuser,S., Marshall,T.S., He,W., Effects of solifenacin on overactive bladder symptoms, symptom bother and other patient-reported outcomes: results from VIBRANT - a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial, International Journal of Clinical Practice, 63, 1702-1714, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>129390</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy of solifenacin on symptom bother using the Overactive Bladder Questionnaire</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 768<br/>SOL = 386<br/>PLA = 382</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>SOL: 306/377 (81%)<br/>PLA: 314/374 (84%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 59 ± 13<br/>PLA: 60 ± 12</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 2.9 ± 2.7<br/>PLA: 2.8 ± 2.6</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 5.7 ± 3.7<br/>PLA: 5.7 ± 3.9</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Aged ≥ 18 years<br/>2] OAB symptoms for ≥ 3 months</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>5 mg solifenacin or placebo once daily</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Eligible patients were randomised to receive 5mg solifenacin or placebo once daily for 4 weeks. At 4 weeks patients could maintain 5mg dose or increase to 10mg for 4 weeks. At week 8 patients taking 10mg could maintain or decrease dose to 5mg, patients taking 5mg could increase to 10mg.</p> <p>At baseline, and weeks 4, 8 and 12 patients completed the OAB-q and 3-day bladder diaries. At baseline and 12 weeks patients completed the PBBC and additional health-related quality of life and satisfaction with treatment questionnaires. At each visit investigators conducted brief physical examinations and recorded vital signs. Treatment-emergent adverse events were monitored and recorded</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The primary efficacy variable was mean change on the OAB-q Symptom Bother scale from baseline to end of treatment. Assuming a</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Dropouts for any reason</u><br/>SOL: 15/386 (3.9%)<br/>PLA: 22/382 (5.8%)</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>SOL: 281/386 (72.8%)<br/>PLA: 197/382 (51.6%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - change from baseline<br/>SOL: -1.85 (No SD) N not reported<br/>PLA: -1.24 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL: -3.05 (No SD) N not reported<br/>PLA: -1.84 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - but baseline characteristics not reported for full study population - 17 patients with missing postbaseline OAB-q data were excluded from data set<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Astellas Pharma US Inc and GlaxoSmithKline</p> | <p>(≥ 8 micturitions and ≥ 1 urgency episode with or without incontinence per 24 h)</p> <p>3] Score ≥ 3 on Patient Perception of Bladder Condition (PBBC) questionnaire</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Significant stress or stress-predominant mixed incontinence</p> <p>2] ≥ 3 episodes of urinary tract infection (UTI) within past 3 months</p> <p>3] Evidence of UTI at baseline</p> <p>4] Evidence of chronic urologic inflammation/interstitial cystitis</p> <p>4] Urinary/gastric retention</p> |               | <p>standard deviation of 22.0 and that 80% of randomised patients would be evaluable, 381 randomised subjects per treatment group provided &gt; 99% power to detect a 10-point difference in between treatment groups using a two-sided test at a significance level of 0.05.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>All efficacy analyses were conducted on the full analysis set which consisted of patients who took ≥1 dose of study drug, had a baseline OAB-q assessment and ≥1 post baseline OAB-q assessment</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>SOL: 119/273 (43.6%)<br/>PLA: 80/272 (29.4%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - OAB-q - mean change from baseline<br/>SOL: 29.9 (No SD)<br/>N not reported<br/>PLA: 20.4 (No SD)<br/>N not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>SOL: 100/386 (26%)<br/>PLA: 50/382 (13%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>SOL: 51/386 (13.2%)<br/>PLA: 9/382 (2.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>SOL: 35/386 (9.1%)<br/>PLA: 48/382 (12.6%)</p> | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias</p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Use of antimuscarinics, antispasmodics, tricyclic</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
|   |  |  |   | <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>SOL: 12/386 (3%)<br/>PLA: 15/382 (4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>antidepressants and anti-Parkinson agents was prohibited, use of tetracyclic antidepressants, antihistamines and antiemetics was permitted to continue if patients had been taking drug on a long-term basis at a stable dose.</p> <p>Patients taking OAB medications were eligible after discontinuation and completion of a ≥14 day washout period.</p> <p>Additional data (continence status) from secondary publication: Vardy et al. Female Pelvic Medicine &amp; Reconstructive Surgery 2011; 17(1): 24-29</p> |
| Full citation   | Sample size  | Interventions  | Details   | Results  | Limitations   |
| <p>Yamaguchi,O., Nishizawa,O., Takeda,M., Yoshida,M., Choo,M.S., Gu, LeeJ, Tong-Long,LinA, Lin,H.H., Andrew,YipW, Isowa,H., Hiro,S., Efficacy, safety and tolerability of fesoterodine in asian patients with overactive bladder, LUTS: Lower Urinary</p> | <p>N = 951</p> <p>Fesoterodine 4mg QD (FES \$) = 320</p> <p>Fesoterodine 8mg QD (FES 8) = 313</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 318</p> | <p>The study, which consisted of a 2-week placebo run-in period followed by a 12-week double-blind treatment period, required a total of six clinic visits. In the placebo run-in period, subjects received one tablet of placebo in the morning. Once eligibility was</p> | <p>Efficacy variables were assessed with 3-day micturition diaries that subjects completed on 3 consecutive days during the 7 days prior to each visit. The primary efficacy endpoint was the change from baseline in the mean number</p> | <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p>                          | <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias A1 - Was there appropriate</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Tract Symptoms, 3, 43-50, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>129406</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To assess the efficacy, safety and tolerability of fesoterodine 4 and 8 mg QD compared with placebo at week 12 of treatment in Asian subjects with OAB.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Sponsored by Pfizer Japan</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>FES 4: 251/320 (78.9%)<br/>FES 8: 255/313 (81.5%)<br/>PLA: 251/318 (78.9%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES 4: 57.2 <math>\pm</math> 14.2<br/>FES 8: 58.8 <math>\pm</math> 13.4<br/>PLA: 56.7 <math>\pm</math> 13.5</p> <p>Number of incontinence episodes/week Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES 4: 2.2 <math>\pm</math> 1.8<br/>FES 8: 2.3 <math>\pm</math> 1.8<br/>PLA: 2.2 <math>\pm</math> 1.9</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] <math>\geq</math> 20 years of age<br/>2] a medical history of OAB symptoms or signs with urinary urgency and increased urinary frequency that lasted for <math>\geq</math> 6 months prior to enrollment and UUI that lasted for <math>\geq</math> 1 month prior to enrollment<br/>3] <math>\geq</math> 1 UUI episodes and <math>\geq</math> 8</p> | <p>established, subjects were randomized 1:1:1–12 weeks of double-blind treatment (QD in the morning) with fesoterodine 4 mg QD, fesoterodine 8 mg QD, or matching placebo.</p> | <p>of UUI episodes per 24 h at week 12 of treatment.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>None reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes - mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline<br/>FES 4: -1.61 <math>\pm</math> 1.76 N = 314<br/>FES 8: -1.50 <math>\pm</math> 1.71 N = 296<br/>PLA: -1.22 <math>\pm</math> 1.59 N = 301</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>FES 4: -2.16 <math>\pm</math> 2.91 N = 303<br/>FES 8: -2.16 <math>\pm</math> 3.07 N = 296<br/>PLA: -1.60 <math>\pm</math> 2.78 N = 301</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - incontinent at baseline only<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               | <p>micturitions per 24 h during a 3-day diary period of the placebo run-in phase</p> <p>4] at least moderate problems based on the Patient Perception of Bladder Condition (PPBC) measure</p> <p>5] a negative urine pregnancy test for women of child-bearing potential.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] neurological diseases influencing bladder function (e.g. stroke, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, spinal cord injury, spina bifida and autonomic neuropathy)</p> <p>2] lower urinary tract pathologies potentially responsible for urgency or incontinence (e.g. bladder stone, interstitial cystitis and urothelial tumors)</p> <p>3] clinically relevant bladder outlet obstruction (e.g. benign prostatic hyperplasia)</p> <p>4] pelvic organ prolapse</p> <p>5] predominant symptoms of stress urinary incontinence</p> <p>6] active urinary tract infection</p> <p>7] residual urine volume of &gt; 100 ml</p> <p>8] polyuria (&gt; 3000 ml/24 h)</p> <p>9] treatment with antimuscarinic drugs during the study</p> <p>10] clinically relevant arrhythmia,</p> |               |         | <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline<br/>FES 4: -1.97 <math>\pm</math> 1.84 N = 284<br/>FES 8: -1.86 <math>\pm</math> 2.0 N = 281<br/>PLA: -1.59 <math>\pm</math> 2.87 N = 284</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>FES 4: -2.89 <math>\pm</math> 2.83 N = 284<br/>FES 8: -3.05 <math>\pm</math> 3.46 N = 281<br/>PLA: -2.37 <math>\pm</math> 2.98 N = 284</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence</p> | <p>reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Outcome data taken from NCT00561951 (<a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a>)</p> <p>Data from FES 4 group used in reviews</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               | <p>unstable angina, other unstable cardiovascular conditions, or pacemaker</p> <p>11] corrected QT interval (Bazett's formula or Fridericia formula) of &gt; 500 ms.</p> |               |         | <p>episodes - incontinent at baseline only<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>OAB-q HRQOL used<br/>FES 4: 17.84 ± 17.88 N = 283<br/>FES 8: 17.29 ± 19.67 N = 283<br/>PLA: 12.88 ± 18.87 N = 285</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>FES 4: 138/320 (43.1%)<br/>FES 8: 185/313 (59.1%)<br/>PLA: 66/318 (20.8%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>FES 4: 93/320 (9.1%)<br/>FEs 8: 158/313 (50.5%)<br/>PLA: 31/318 (9.7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason</p> |          |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions                           | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
|  |  |   |  | <p>FES 4: 34/320 (10.6%)<br/> FES 8: 32/313 (10.2%)<br/> PLA: 33/318 (10.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> FES 4: 14/320 (4.4%)<br/> FES 8: 14/313 (4.5%)<br/> PLA: 11/318 (3.5%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> FES 4: 17.8 ± 33.4<br/> N not reported<br/> FES 8: 18.8 ± 31.3<br/> N not reported<br/> PLA: 10.4 ± 23.4<br/> N not reported</p> |  |
| Full citation  | Sample size  | Interventions                           | Details  | Results   | Limitations  |
| Weiss, Jeffrey P., Jumadilova, Zhanna, Johnson II, Theodore M., FitzGerald, Mary P., Carlsson, Martin, Martire, Diane L., Malhotra, Atul, Efficacy and | <p>N = 963</p> <p>FES = 476 (463 began treatment)<br/> PLA = 487 (474 began treatment)</p> | 4 mg fesoterodine or placebo once daily | After 2-week screening, subjects who met inclusion criteria began a 2-week single-blind placebo run-in period. After run-in period, subjects with ≤35% decrease in nocturnal urgency | <p><b>Week 4 results</b><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> Not reported</p>  | <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Safety of Flexible-Dose Fesoterodine in Men and Women with Overactive Bladder Symptoms, Including Nocturnal Urinary Urgency, The Journal of Urology, ePub ahead of print, -, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>214959</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To test the hypothesis that fesoterodine would be superior to placebo in the treatment of nocturnal urgency in OAB patients with nocturia</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>August 2009 - September 2011</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Sponsored by Pfizer Inc.</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>FES: 313/463 (67.6%)<br/>PLA: 312/474 (65.8%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES: 58.0 <math>\pm</math> 14.7<br/>PLA: 57.5 <math>\pm</math> 14.0</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES: 2.20 <math>\pm</math> 2.55<br/>PLA: 2.23 <math>\pm</math> 2.49</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>FES: 9.8 <math>\pm</math> 3.62<br/>PLA: 10.0 <math>\pm</math> 4.0</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean (range)<br/>FES: 7.5 (0.3 - 49.8)<br/>PLA: 8.0 (0.3 - 56.0)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Aged <math>\geq</math> 18 years<br/>2] Self-reported OAB symptoms including nocturnal urgency for <math>\geq</math> 3 months before screening<br/>3] Mean <math>\geq</math> 8 micturitions/24 h, <math>\geq</math> 3 urgency episodes/24 h, and <math>\geq</math> 2 but <math>\leq</math> 8 nocturnal urgency episodes/24 h on bladder diary at screening</p> |               | <p>episodes/24 h from screening to baseline, total urine volume <math>\leq</math> 3500 ml recorded on 1 of 3 baseline diary days and nocturnal volume voided <math>\leq</math> 50% of total 24-h urine volume voided recorded on 1 of 3 baseline diary days were randomized.</p> <p>Eligible subjects were randomized to fesoterodine 4mg or matching placebo once daily. At week 4, based on efficacy and tolerability, the investigator could increase fesoterodine dose to 8mg once daily or continue 4mg once daily for remaining 8 weeks of the study. No further dose adjustments were permitted after week 4.</p> <p>Subjects completed a 3-day bladder diary at screening (week -4), beginning placebo run-in (week -2), end of placebo run-in (baseline), and weeks 4 and 12. OAB-q completed at baseline and week 12</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Estimated sample size was 426 subjects per group to provide approximately 80% power to detect a clinically</p> | <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline<br/>FES: -1.44 <math>\pm</math> 2.42<br/>N = 463<br/>PLA: -1.28 <math>\pm</math> 2.02<br/>N = 474</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes - mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline</u><br/>FES: -<br/>3.53 <math>\pm</math> 3.98<br/>N = 463<br/>PLA: -2.81 <math>\pm</math> 3.81<br/>N = 474</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>OAB-q used*<br/>FES: 17.42 <math>\pm</math> 18.0</p> | <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - but baseline data only reported for those beginning treatment<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to</p> |

| Study details                                       | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p>Medical writing support funded by Pfizer Inc</p> | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] Clinically significant hepatic or renal disease</li> <li>2] Treatment with potent CYP3A4 inhibitors</li> <li>3] Intermittent or unstable use of tricyclic antidepressants, estrogens, diuretics, alpha-blockers or 5-alpha reductase inhibitors</li> <li>4] Pregnancy or nursing</li> <li>5] Recent history/known diagnosis of any sleep disorder</li> <li>6] Nocturia due to uncontrolled conditions other than OAB including chronic heart failure, diabetes mellitus, diabetes insipidus or polyuria</li> <li>7] History of acute urinary retention requiring catheterization or severe voiding difficulties</li> <li>8] Use of indwelling catheter or intermittent self-catheterization</li> <li>9] Predominant stress urinary incontinence</li> <li>10] Urinary tract infection or recurrent UTI (<math>\geq 3</math> times in past year)</li> <li>11] Initiation of electrostimulation, formal bladder training, or pelvic floor exercises within 4 weeks of screening</li> <li>12] Prior use of study medication</li> <li>13] Treatment with antimuscarinic OAB medication within 2 weeks of screening</li> </ol> |               | <p>meaningful difference of <math>\geq 0.25</math> episodes/24 H in mean change from baseline to week 12 in nocturnal urgency episodes between fesoterodine and placebo using a 2-sided t-test with alpha 5%. Allowing for drop-out rate of 8%, 928 randomized subjects (464 per group) were required. A blinded sample size re-estimation conducted when 341 subjects completed the study indicated that no increase in sample size was necessary.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Diary and OAB-q analyses were based on the full analysis set (i.e. all subjects who took <math>\geq 1</math> dose of study drug and had at least a baseline and a post-baseline efficacy assessment)</p> | <p>N = 393<br/>PLA: 14.39 <math>\pm</math> 20.4<br/>N = 416</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>FES: 188/476 (39%)<br/>PLA: 152/487 (31%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>FES: 98/476 (21%)<br/>PLA: 36/487 (7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>FES: 95/476 (20%)<br/>PLA: 87/487 (18%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>FES: 25/476 (5%)<br/>PLA: 11/487 (2%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Post-void residual volume - Mean change from baseline (95% CI)<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>13 participants in each group dropped out of the trial before starting treatment</p> <p>12 week data on OAB-q taken from NCT00911937 (<a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a>)</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Huang,Alison J., Hess,Rachel, Arya,Lily A., Richter,Holly E., Subak,Leslee L., Bradley,Catherine S., Rogers,Rebecca G., Myers,Deborah L., Johnson,Karen C., Gregory,W.Thomas, Kraus,Stephen R., Schembri,Michael, Brown,Jeanette S., Pharmacologic treatment for urgency-predominant urinary incontinence in women diagnosed using a simplified algorithm: a randomized trial, American Journal of Obstetrics and GynecologyAm J Obstet Gynecol, 206, 444-444, 2012 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 645<br>Fesoterodine = 322<br>Placebo =323<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>FES: 322/322 (100%)<br>PLA: 323/323 (100%)<br>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br>FES: 56.2 ± 14.7<br>PLA: 55.9 ± 14.2<br>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br>FES: 3.8 ± 2.9<br>PLA: 4.0 ± 3.0<br>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br>FES: 7.5 ±4.1<br>PLA: 7.8 ± 4.5<br>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br>Not reported<br>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br>12-weeks flexible dose (4-8mg) fesoterodine (Toviaz; Pfizer, Inc, New York, NY, USA) or identical placebo pill daily | <b>Details</b><br>Eligible women were randomised 1:1 to either fesoterodine or placebo.<br><br>Women were initially started on 4mg fesoterodine or an identical placebo pill daily. At 2-week telephone call and 4-week follow-up visit women were offered option of increasing their dose to 8mg fesoterodine or an identical placebo pill daily. At 8-week telephone call they were invited to readjust their dose to a maximum of 8 or minimum of 4 mg daily.<br><br>All clinical efficacy outcomes were measured at baseline, 4 and 12 weeks. Self-reported urgency episodes were documented by 3-day voiding diary. Measurement of PVR volume was performed by bladder ultrasound scanning or catheterization at 12 weeks or early termination.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br>Sample size of 636 | <b>Results</b><br><b>Week 4 results</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Week 12 results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Incontinence episodes - change from baseline (mean ± SD, N)<br>FES: - 2.9 ± 2.7 N = 303<br>PLA: -2.1 ± 2.9 N = 301<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>FES: -2.1 ± 3.8 N = 303<br>PLA: -1.4 ± 3.9 N = 301<br><br><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>FES: 79/322 (24.5%) | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - yes<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br>B Performance bias<br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br>C Attrition bias<br>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To examine the efficacy and safety of initiating pharmacologic therapy for urgency incontinence in women</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2009 - January 2010</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Pfizer Inc provided funding for the study and study medication but did not provide input into design of study, collection, analysis or interpretation of data, writing of report or decision to submit paper for publication</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] <math>\geq 18</math> years old<br/> 2] <math>\geq 7</math> incontinence episodes per week in past 3 months<br/> 3] Self-diagnosed with urgency-predominant incontinence on the 3 Incontinence Questionons (3IQ) questionnaire</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Anti-incontinence surgery in past 5 years<br/> 2] Other pelvic surgery in past 6 months<br/> 3] <math>&gt; 3</math> urinary tract infections in past year<br/> 4] Lower urinary tract or rectal fistula<br/> 5] Interstitial cystitis<br/> 6] Symptomatic pelvic organ prolapse<br/> 7] Urogenital cancer or radiation<br/> 8] Congenital abnormality leading to incontinence<br/> 9] Major neurologic disorder<br/> 10] Urinary or gastric retention<br/> 11] Uncontrolled narrow-angle glaucoma<br/> 12] Myasthenia gravis<br/> 13] Severe ulcerative colitis<br/> 14] Clinically significant hepatic or renal disease<br/> 15] Toxic megacolon<br/> 16] Potent CYP3A4 inhibitor treatment in the last 2 weeks<br/> 17] Pregnancy or nursing</p> |               | <p>participants was estimated to provide 90% power to detect a net reduction in urgency incontinence frequency with a 2 sample t test and the assumption of a 15% drop-out rate. The effect size was based on pooled data from 2 previous trials that reported an average effect size of 0.92 episodes per day and a standard deviation of 3.2 episodes per day.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Sensitivity analysis was performed to address potential bias - missing imputation analyses were performed on all participants with intent to treat</p> | <p>PLA: 34/323 (10.5%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used -<br/>Overactive Bladder Questionnaire<br/>Change from baseline (mean <math>\pm</math> SD)<br/>FES: <math>-17.1 \pm 17.6</math><br/>N = 303<br/>PLA: <math>-12.0 \pm 16.6</math><br/>N = 301</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u></p> <p>Any adverse effect<br/>FES: 187/322 (58.1%)<br/>PLA: 149/323 (46.1%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>FES: 29/322 (9.0%)<br/>PLA: 30/323 (9.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for</p> | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
|  |   |  |  | adverse effects<br>FES: 11/322 (3.4%)<br>PLA: 8/323 (2.5%)<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Post-void residual volume at end point (mean ± SD)<br>FES: 39.1 ± 48.0<br>N = 303<br>PLA: 31.2 ± 39.0<br>N = 301               |   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Oreskovic,S., But,I., Banovic,M., Goldstajn,M.S., The efficacy and safety of solifenacin in patients with overactive bladder syndrome, Collegium Antropologicum, 36, 243-248, 2012<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br>215468<br><br><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br>Croatia | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 171<br>Solifenacin (SOL) = 77<br>Placebo (PLA) = 80<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>SOL: 77/77 (100%)<br>PLA: 80/80 (100%)<br><br>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br>SOL: 56.77 ± 10.16<br>PLA: 57.03 ± 10.95<br><br>Incontinence episodes/day - | <b>Interventions</b><br>Following a single blind 2-week placebo run in period, patients were randomized to 4 weeks of solifenacin in 5 mg once daily doses or placebo. | <b>Details</b><br>Treatment efficacy was evaluated after one and four weeks treatment periods according to subjective assesment using data recorded in patient diaries in the one and four week periods preceding the scheduled clinical visits.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br>Not reported | <b>Results</b><br><b>Week 4</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>SOL: 0.96 ± 0.57<br>N = 77<br>PLA: 2.75 ± 0.43<br>N = 80<br><br>Urgency episodes | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy, tolerability and safety of solifenacin in patients with overactive bladder syndrome.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Range<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Patients who complained from symptoms of OAB for at least 6 months<br/>2] urge incontinence (at least but no more than 50 episodes per week), frequency of micturition (at least eight voids per 24 hours) and urgency (a strong desire to void at least once per day)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] contraindications for the use of antimuscarinic drugs (e.g. uncontrolled narrow-angle glaucoma, urinary or gastric retention)<br/>2] clinically significant stress urinary incontinence (more than one episode per week)<br/>3] clinically significant bladder outlet obstruction and /or a post-void residual volume more than</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>SOL: 5.77 ± 1.33<br/>N = 77<br/>PLA: 6.54 ± 0.50<br/>N = 80</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>IIQ used<br/>SOL: 36.25 ± 10.34 N = 77<br/>PLA: 46.86 ± 6.81<br/>N = 80</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Unclear<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  | <p>200 ml</p> <p>4] genitourinary condition that could cause urinary symptoms</p> <p>5] recent urogenital surgery</p> <p>6] hepatic disease.</p>  |  |   | <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Not reported</p>   | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Baseline data incomplete (not available for dropouts)</p>                   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Homma,Y., Paick,J.S., Lee,J.G., Kawabe,K., Japanese and Korean Tolterodine Study Group, Clinical efficacy and tolerability of extended-release tolterodine and immediate-release oxybutynin in Japanese and Korean patients with an overactive bladder: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial, BJU International, 92, 741-747,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 608</p> <p>Tolterodine ER (TOL ER) = 240<br/>Oxybutynin IR (OXY IR) = 246<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 122</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL ER: 162/240 (68%)<br/>OXY IR: 177/246 (73%)<br/>PLA: 69/122 (69%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL ER: 61.2 ± 11.8</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients randomized in a 2:2:1 ratio to treatment with tolterodine ER 4 mg capsules once daily (Detrol® capsule/Detrusitol, Pharmacia Corporation, USA), oxybutynin IR 3 mg tablets three times daily (Pollakis®), or placebo. Patients were randomized using the method of random permuted blocks. Because the two active drugs differed in appearance and were administered according</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Eligible patients were enrolled into a 1- or 2-week wash-out/run-in period during which baseline voiding data (incontinence episodes, urinary frequency, volume voided/void, incontinence pad usage) were recorded using voiding diaries.</p> <p>Voiding diaries were completed over 7 consecutive days during the run-in period (baseline) and the final week of treatment.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4 results</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment reported as 'much benefit' at endpoint<br/>TOL ER: 90/240 (37.5%)<br/>OXY IR: 100/246 (40.7%)<br/>PLA: 26/122 (21.3%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline -</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p>2003</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220246</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Japan and South Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare tolterodine ER and oxybutynin IR with placebo in Japanese and Korean patients with OAB</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by a grant from Pharmacia Corporation</p> | <p>OXY IR: 57.9 ± 12.5<br/>PLA: 58.4 ± 14.0</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL ER: 20.3 ± 20.6<br/>OXY IR: 21.8 ± 19.8<br/>PLA: 19.0 ± 15.5</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Men and women aged ≥ 20 years with symptoms of urinary urgency, urinary frequency (≥ 8 voids/24 h), urge incontinence (≥ 5 episodes/week) and symptoms of OAB for ≥6 months</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] demonstrable stress incontinence<br/>2] total daily urine volume of &gt;3 L<br/>3] average volume voided/void of &gt;200 ml<br/>4] significant hepatic or renal disease<br/>5] any contraindication to</p> | <p>to different daily schedules, blinding was by a variation on the double-dummy technique, so that matching placebos for both tolterodine ER 4 mg and oxybutynin IR 3 mg were provided. Patients were instructed to take one tolterodine ER 4 mg or placebo capsule in the morning plus one oxybutynin IR 3 mg or placebo tablet in the morning, at midday, and in the evening.</p> <p>No dose adjustment was permitted during the study</p> | <p>All incontinence episodes and voids during the 7-day periods were recorded. Volume voided/void and pad usage had to be recorded for at least two complete days.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Based on an assumed sd of 58% in a previous study, the aim was to enrol 600 patients (randomized 2:2:1), to detect a mean difference in efficacy of 20% between tolterodine ER and placebo (at 80% power and 5% significance level) and to show that tolterodine ER was not inferior to oxybutynin IR (at 80% power and 2.5% significance level).</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>The efficacy was analysed on an intent-to-treat basis for all randomized patients who received at least one dose of study drug, using the last-observation-carried-forward for any missing 12-week values. ANOVA was used to compare treatment groups, with factors for treatment, country and treatment–country interactions</p> | <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER: 80/240 (33.5%)<br/>OXY IR: 131/246 (53.3%)<br/>PLA: 12/122 (9.8%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any</p> | <p>Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   | <p>anticholinergic treatment, e.g. uncontrolled narrow-angled glaucoma, urinary retention or gastric retention</p> <p>6] symptomatic or recurrent UTI</p> <p>7] interstitial cystitis</p> <p>8] haematuria or BOO</p> <p>9] an indwelling catheter or intermittent self-catheterization</p> <p>10] electrostimulation or bladder training within 14 days before randomization or expected to commence during the study period</p> <p>11] Concomitant treatment with any other anticholinergic drug or an unstable dosage of any drug with anticholinergic side-effects, any other drug for OAB (except for oestrogen started &gt; 2 months before inclusion), potent CYP3A4 inhibitors, or any investigational drug, was not permitted during the study or in the 14 days before randomization</p> <p>12] Pregnant or nursing women and women of childbearing potential not using reliable contraception were also excluded</p> |  | <p>(removed from the model if <math>P &gt; 0.2</math>). Two-sided t-tests with significance levels of 5% and 95% CIs were calculated based on the least-squares means. If data were not normally distributed, i.e. skewed, a pre-planned nonparametric analysis with ANOVA based on the rank-transformation of the original variable was used.</p> | <p>reason</p> <p>TOL ER: 25/240 (10.4%)</p> <p>OXY IR: 57/246 (23.2%)</p> <p>PLA: 20/122 (16.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects</p> <p>TOL ER: 12/240 (10.4%)</p> <p>OXY IR: 42/246 (23.2%)</p> <p>PLA: 1/122 (16.4%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on Oxybutynin IR 3mg not used in reviews or network meta-analysis as it is lower than the recommended starting dose</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chapple,C.R., Rechberger,T., Al Shukri,S., Meffan,P., Everaert,K., Huang,M., Ridder,A., Study Group., Randomized, double-blind placebo- and tolterodine-</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1081</p> <p>Solifenacin 5mg (SOL 5) = 279</p> <p>Solifenacin 10mg (SOL 10) = 269</p> <p>Tolterodine IR (TOL IR) = 266</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 267</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Eligible patients after the run-in period were randomised equally to 12-week double-blind treatment with either tolterodine 2 mg twice daily, placebo, or solifenacin 5 or 10</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>At an initial screening visit (week 2) the patients provided a medical history, and had a physical examination, postvoid bladder ultrasonography,</p>   | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions         | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>controlled trial of the once-daily antimuscarinic agent solifenacin in patients with symptomatic overactive bladder, BJU International, 93, 303-310, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220250</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To assess the efficacy of solifenacin 5mg and 10mg once-daily compared with placebo in a large sample of patients with symptoms of OAB</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by a grant from Yamanouchi Pharmaceuticals Co. Ltd. Tokyo, Japan</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>SOL 5: 194/266 (72.6%)<br/>SOL 10: 188/264 (71.2%)<br/>TOL IR: 200/250 (80.0%)<br/>PLA: 193/253 (76.3%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>SOL 5: 58.1 <math>\pm</math> 13.4<br/>SOL 10: 57.2 <math>\pm</math> 13.4<br/>TOL IR: 56.9 <math>\pm</math> 1.8<br/>PLA: 57.8 <math>\pm</math> 13.7</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day: Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>SOL 5: 2.54 <math>\pm</math> 2.56<br/>SOL 10: 2.59 <math>\pm</math> 2.88<br/>TOL IR: 2.2 <math>\pm</math> 1.94<br/>PLA: 2.71 <math>\pm</math> 2.83</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day: Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>SOL 5: 5.77 <math>\pm</math> 4.89<br/>SOL 10: 5.82 <math>\pm</math> 4.45<br/>TOL IR: 5.45 <math>\pm</math> 3.87<br/>PLA: 5.30 <math>\pm</math> 3.92</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Men and women aged <math>\geq</math> 18</p> | <p>mg once daily.</p> | <p>blood and urine laboratory analyses (including urine culture), and an electrocardiogram (ECG). Eligible patients received placebo twice daily (morning and evening) over a 2-week run-in period; during the 3 days before the next visit (week 0), patients recorded in a voiding diary episodes of urgency and incontinence, the times of voiding, volumes voided/void, pad use, and episodes of sleep disturbance</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Based on a projected difference of 1.0 in the change from baseline in voiding frequency/24 h for solifenacin vs placebo, with a sd = 3, a significance level of <math>\alpha</math> = 0.05, two-sided, and a power of 90%, 190 evaluable patients per treatment arm were required. To obtain a total of 760 evaluable patients, assuming a discontinuation rate of 20% during the run-in and treatment periods, 1180 patients had to be enrolled.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline<br/>SOL 5: -1.42 <math>\pm</math> 1.82 N = 141<br/>SOL 10: -1.45 <math>\pm</math> 2.24 N = 158<br/>TOL IR: -1.14 <math>\pm</math> 2.15 N = 157<br/>PLA: -0.76 <math>\pm</math> 2.26 N = 153</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL 5: -2.85 <math>\pm</math> 3.74 N = 264<br/>SOL 10: -3.07 <math>\pm</math> 3.90 N = 261<br/>TOL IR: -2.05 <math>\pm</math> 3.58 N = 250<br/>PLA: -1.41 <math>\pm</math> 3.67 N = 248</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
|               | <p>years with symptoms of OAB (including urgency, urge incontinence, or frequency) for <math>\geq 3</math> months</p> <p>2] average frequency of <math>\geq 8</math> voids/24 h and have experienced at least three episodes of urgency and/or three episodes of incontinence during the 3-day voiding diary period</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] clinically significant BOO</p> <p>2] postvoid residual volume of <math>&gt;200</math> ml</p> <p>3] incontinence for which stress was determined to be the predominant factor</p> <p>4] presence of a neurological cause for detrusor muscle overactivity</p> <p>5] evidence of UTI or bladder stones</p> <p>6] previous pelvic irradiation</p> <p>7] previous or current malignant disease of the pelvic organs</p> <p>8] Any medical condition contraindicating the use of antimuscarinic medication (including narrow-angle glaucoma and urinary or gastric retention)</p> <p>9] nonpharmacological treatment for OAB including electrostimulation therapy or start of a bladder training programme during the 2 weeks before or during the study</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u></p> <p>Any adverse effect</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> <p>SOL 5: 39/279 (14.0%)</p> <p>SOL 10: 57/269 (21.2%)</p> <p>TOL IR: 49/266 (18.4%)</p> <p>PLA: 13/267 (4.9%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason</p> <p>SOL 5: 28/279 (11.5%)</p> <p>SOL 10: 20/269 (7.8%)</p> <p>TOL IR: 29/266 (12.0%)</p> <p>PLA: 32/267 (12.0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects</p> <p>SOL 5: 9/279 (3.2%)</p> <p>SOL 10: 7/269 (2.6%)</p> <p>TOL IR: 5/266 (1.9%)</p> <p>PLA: 10/267</p> | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes</p> <p>2] Interventions: Yes</p> <p>3] Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from Sol 10mg not used in review or network meta-analysis as this is more than the recommended starting dose</p> |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | <p>10] diabetic neuropathy,<br/>11] use of drugs intended to treat incontinence<br/>12] use of any drugs with cholinergic or anticholinergic side-effects<br/>13] participation in a clinical trial within 30 days before study entry<br/>14] Women of child-bearing potential who were pregnant or nursing, intending to become pregnant during the study, or who were not using reliable contraceptive methods, were ineligible</p>  |   |  | <p>(2.7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p>   |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chapple,C.R., Arano,P., Bosch,J.L., De Ridder,D., Kramer,A.E., Ridder,A.M., Solifenacin appears effective and well tolerated in patients with symptomatic idiopathic detrusor overactivity in a placebo- and tolterodine-controlled phase 2 dose-finding study.[erratum appears in BJU Int. 2004 May;93(7):1135], BJU International, 93, 71-77, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220251</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 225</p> <p>Solifenacin 2.5mg (SOL 2.5) = 41<br/>Solifenacin 5mg (SOL 5) = 37<br/>Solifenacin 10mg (SOL 10) = 35<br/>Solifenacin 20mg (SOL 20) = 37<br/>Tolterodine IR (TOL IR) = 37<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 38</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Solifenacin 2.5mg (SOL 2.5) = 41<br/>Solifenacin 5mg (SOL 5) = 37<br/>Solifenacin 10mg (SOL 10) = 35<br/>Solifenacin 20mg (SOL 20) = 37<br/>Tolterodine IR (TOL IR) = 37<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 38</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Eligible patients received placebo for 2 weeks as a run in and then were randomized to oral therapy with solifenacin once daily (2.5mg, 5mg, 10mg or 20mg), tolterodine IR capsules 2 mg twice daily, or placebo for 4 weeks.</p> <p>No dosage adjustment was allowed during the study</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>During the single-blind placebo run-in period all patients received two placebo capsules in the morning and one in the evening. Eligible patients were randomized to receive placebo or one of five active treatments: solifenacin 2.5, 5, 10, or 20 mg once daily, or immediate-release tolterodine 2 mg twice daily.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>With 40 patients per treatment group it was considered possible to detect</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 2.5: -0.66 N = 40<br/>SOL 5: -0.83 N = 37<br/>SOL 10: -0.79 N = 33<br/>SOL 20: -0.58 N =</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - identical packaging used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the dose-response relationship of solifenacin in patients with OAB.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Gender<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Age (years)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean<br/>SOL 2.5: 1.6 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 5: 1.5 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 10: 1.7 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 20: 1.0 (No SD reported)<br/>TOL IR: 1.5 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 1.7 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>SOL 2.5: 5.9 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 5: 5.8 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 10: 5.3 (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 20: 5.2 (No SD reported)<br/>TOL IR: 5.7 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 5.2 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>SOL 2.5 = 41/41 (100%)<br/>SOL 5 = 37/37 (100%)<br/>SOL 10 = 35/35 (100%)<br/>SOL 20 = 37/37 (100%)<br/>TOL IR = 37/37 (100%)<br/>PLA = 38/38 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Men and women aged 18–80 years were eligible to enter the study if they had idiopathic</p> |               | <p>a difference of 0.63 sds/24 h for changes between the solifenacin and placebo group, with 80% power at a significance level of <math>P &lt; 0.05</math>. Considering a sd of 2.9 voids/24 h, the detectable difference was 1.8 voids/24 h (with no adjustment for multiple comparisons).</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>34<br/>TOL IR: -0.41 N = 37<br/>PLA: -0.28 N = 36</p> <p>Urgency episodes - Mean (No SD reported)<br/>SOL 2.5: -1.07 N = 40<br/>SOL 5: -2.35 N = 37<br/>SOL 10: -2.46 N = 33<br/>SOL 20: -2.24 N = 34<br/>TOL IR: -1.62 N = 37<br/>PLA: -1.03 N = 36</p> <p><u>Continenence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Contiliffe QoL scale - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD endpoint<br/>SOL 2.5: 50.3 <math>\pm</math> 18.0 N = 39<br/>SOL 5: 48.5 <math>\pm</math> 15.3</p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               | <p>detrusor overactivity (defined in this study as phasic contractions of <math>\geq 10</math> cmH<sub>2</sub>O, as assessed by filling cystometry) within 6 months of study initiation</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1] neurogenic detrusor overactivity</li> <li>2] significant outlet obstruction</li> <li>3] urinary retention</li> <li>4] urodynamic stress incontinence</li> <li>5] bladder stones</li> <li>6] Urinary tract infection</li> <li>7] interstitial cystitis</li> <li>8] previous or current malignant disease of the pelvic organs</li> <li>9] previous pelvic radiation</li> <li>10] diabetic neuropathy</li> <li>11] concomitant anticholinergic medications</li> <li>12] had known or suspected hypersensitivity to anticholinergic medications or lactose.</li> <li>13] Women could not be pregnant or breast-feeding and had to use approved contraception methods throughout the study and for 1 month after completion.</li> </ol> |               |         | <p>N = 35<br/> SOL 10: 44.4 ± 15.0 N = 30<br/> SOL 20: 39.1 ± 12.8 N = 29<br/> TOL IR: 50.8 ± 19.4 N = 32<br/> PLA: 57.9 ± 21.7 N = 33</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/> Any adverse effect<br/> SOL 2.5: 6/41 (14.6%)<br/> SOL 5: 12/37 (32.4%)<br/> SOL 10: 12/35 (34.3%)<br/> SOL 20: 21/37 (56.8%)<br/> TOL IR: 12/37 (32.4%)<br/> PLA: 6/38 (15.8%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> SOL 2.5: 0/41 (0%)<br/> SOL 5: 5/37 (13.5%)<br/> SOL 10: 5/35 (14.3%)<br/> SOL 20: 14/37 (37.8%)<br/> TOL IR: 9/37 (24.3%)<br/> PLA: 0/38 (0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason</p> | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from SOL 2.5mg, SOL 10mg and SOL 20mg not used in review or network meta-analysis not used as these are not the recommended starting dose</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>SOL 2.5: 5/41 (12.2%)<br/> SOL 5: 3/37 (8.1%)<br/> SOL 10: 7/35 (20.0%)<br/> SOL 20: 7/37 (18.9%)<br/> TOL IR: 5/37 (13.5%)<br/> PLA: 6/38 (15.8%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> SOL 2.5: 1/41 (2.4%)<br/> SOL 5: 1/37 (2.7%)<br/> SOL 10: 3/35 (8.6%)<br/> SOL 20: 5/37 (13.5%)<br/> TOL IR: 1/37 (2.7%)<br/> PLA: 0/38 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> Not applicable</p> |          |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Steers,W., Corcos,J., Foote,J., Kralidis,G., An investigation of dose titration with darifenacin, an M3-selective receptor antagonist, BJU International, 95, 580-586, 2005</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220252</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To determine the efficacy, tolerability and safety of a flexible-dosing strategy with darifenacin, in which the dose could be adjusted from 7.5 to 15 mg once daily after 2 weeks of treatment if additional efficacy was required by both the patient and physician, and if the current dose was well tolerated</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 395</p> <p>Darifenacin (DAR) = 268</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 127</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)</p> <p>DAR: 227/268 (84.7%)</p> <p>PLA: 106/127 (83.5%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean</p> <p>DAR: 57.5 (No SD reported)</p> <p>PLA: 58.5 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Median</p> <p>DAR: 2.7 (No SD reported)</p> <p>PLA: 2.0 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Median</p> <p>DAR: 8.3 (No SD reported)</p> <p>PLA: 8.0 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] patients aged ≥ 18 years with symptoms of OAB for at least 6 months</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients with confirmed eligibility for study inclusion were then randomized (2 : 1) to 12 weeks of oral once-daily treatment with darifenacin controlled-release tablets 7.5 mg (269 patients) or matching placebo (129).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>After a pre-screening visit to assess eligibility, patients entered a 2-week washout phase (if required) before screening assessments, i.e. a physical examination, including a 12-lead electrocardiogram recording, measurement of vital signs and PVR, and clinical laboratory tests. Patients then entered a 2-week, single-blind, placebo run-in period, during which urinary symptoms were recorded over the final 7 days using an electronic daily diary (MiniDoc AB, Stockholm, Sweden). Blinding was maintained by a double-dummy design. Repeat clinic visits were after 2, 6 and 12 weeks of treatment, patients having completed daily diaries for 7 days before the 2-week and 12-week visits. Patients were permitted to double their dose of study medication after 2 weeks of treatment if additional efficacy was required by both the patient and physician, and if the current dose was well tolerated. Thereafter the dose could not be adjusted; compliance with treatment</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes - Median change from baseline</p> <p>DAR: -3.0 (No other data reported)</p> <p>PLA: -1.86 (No other data reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes</p> <p>DAR: -2.3 (No other data reported)</p> <p>PLA: -0.9 (No other data reported)</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes</p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline</p> <p>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias</p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias</p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout -</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Study was funded by Pfizer</p> | <p>2] capable of independent toileting<br/>3] urge incontinence (at least five episodes per week), voiding frequency (at least eight voids per day), and urgency (a strong desire to void at least once per day)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Patients with contraindications to anticholinergic therapy (e.g. uncontrolled narrow-angle glaucoma, urinary retention or gastric retention)<br/>2] clinically significant stress incontinence<br/>3] BOO and/or a postvoid residual urinary volume (PVR) of &gt; 200 ml<br/>4] pregnancy and lactation<br/>5] genitourinary conditions that could cause urinary symptoms<br/>6] fecal impaction or severe constipation (two or fewer bowel movements per week)<br/>7] urogenital surgery within the previous 6 months<br/>8] bladder biopsy in the previous 30 days<br/>9] patients with an indwelling catheter and those using intermittent self-catheterization<br/>10] presence of clinically significant disease<br/>11] patients who intended to start a bladder-training programme during the study</p> <p>Concomitant treatment with</p> |               | <p>was evaluated from returned tablet counts</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was determined using bootstrap simulation techniques based on efficacy data observed for the primary variable (number of incontinence episodes per week) from a previous placebo-controlled study of darifenacin. From the results of the simulation it was calculated that 312 patients were required (darifenacin 208, placebo 104) for a two-sided Wilcoxon rank-sum test to have 90% power to detect a between-group difference at the 5% significance level. Allowing for a 15% withdrawal rate, 372 patients were required to be randomized (darifenacin 248, placebo 124).</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>DAR: 10/269 (3.7%)<br/>PLA: 18/129 (14.2%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>DAR: 26/269 (9.7%)<br/>PLA: 12/129 (9.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>DAR: 18/269 (6.7%)<br/>PLA: 4/129 (3.1%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u></p> | <p>Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Of the 268 patients treated with darifenacin, 158 (59%) increased the dose to 15 mg after</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | anticholinergic or antispasmodic drugs (including drugs with significant anticholinergic effects, e.g. imipramine), opioids and other drugs known to cause significant constipation, hormone-replacement therapy (unless taken for > 2 months), and drugs known to be potent cytochrome P450 3A4 inhibitors (e.g. ketoconazole) was not permitted. Men receiving finasteride for BPH were required to have been on a stable dose for ≥6 months before study inclusion. Other medications considered necessary for the patient's welfare were permitted, provided the treatment regimen remained stable during the study. |  |  | Not reported   | 2 weeks of treatment, compared with 86 (68%) of the 127 who had a pseudo-dose increased in the placebo group (no significant difference). Average dose at endpoint = 11.9 mg   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Abrams,P., Freeman,R., Anderstrom,C., Mattiasson,A., Tolterodine, a new antimuscarinic agent: as effective but better tolerated than oxybutynin in patients with an overactive bladder, British Journal of UrologyBr.J.Urol., 81, 801-810, 1998</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220263</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 293</p> <p>Tolterodine immediate release 2mg (TOL IR) = 118<br/>Oxybutynin immediate release 5mg (OXY IR) = 118<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 57</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR: 91/118 (77.1%)<br/>OXY IR: 88/118 (74.6%)<br/>PLA: 43/57 (75.4%)</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patient were randomised to tolterodine immediate release (2mg twice daily), oxybutynin immediate release (5mg three time daily) and placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Efficacy was measure by a 6-point rating scale documenting problems and severity of problems at baseline and at 12 weeks</p> <p>Adverse effects were noted and severity recorded</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The number of patients required to detect a true difference between placebo</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>OXY IR: 58/118 (49%)<br/>TOL IR: 59/118 (50%)<br/>PLA: 27/57 (47%)</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - identical packaging used<br/>A3 - Were groups</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK, Ireland &amp; Sweden</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the efficacy and safety of tolterodine with that of oxybutynin in patients with overactive bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>July 1995 to July 1996</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Pharmacia &amp; Upjohn AB</p> | <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR: 19 - 80<br/>OXY IR: 21 - 80<br/>PLA: 26 - 78</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Range<br/>TOL IR: 0.1 - 24.0<br/>OXY IR: 0.1 - 24.0<br/>PLA: 0.1 - 23.5</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 18 years or older<br/>2] urodynamically proven bladder overactivity<br/>3] increased frequency of micturition (<math>\geq</math> micturition / 24 hours) and urge incontinence (<math>\geq</math> 1 incontinent episode / 24 hours) and/or urgency during a 2 week washout period</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> |               | <p>and active treatment of a reduction in 1.5 in the mean frequency of micturition / 24 hours using a significance level of 5% and a power of 80% was estimated to be 47 in the placebo group and 95 in each active treatment group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Reported but no details provided</p> | <p>reduction per day<br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD change from baseline<br/>OXY IR: <math>-1.7 \pm 3.1</math> N = 88<br/>TOL IR: <math>-1.3 \pm 3.2</math> N = 92<br/>PLA: <math>-0.9 \pm 1.5</math> N = 57</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>OXY IR: 114/118 (97%)<br/>TOL IR: 105/118 (89%)<br/>PLA: 46/57 (81%)</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> | <p>comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Unclear - no dropouts reported<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear</p> |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
|   |   |  |  | <p>OXY IR: 102/118 (86%)<br/> TOL IR: 59/118 (50%)<br/> PLA: 12/57 (21%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> OXY IR: 20/118 (17%)<br/> TOL IR:10/118 (8%)<br/> PLA: 7/57 (12%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/> Not reported</p> | <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/> Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/> None</p> |
| Full citation   | Sample size   | Interventions  | Details  | Results   | Limitations   |
| Jacquetin,B., Wyndaele,J., Tolterodine reduces the number of urge incontinence episodes in patients with an overactive bladder, European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology and Reproductive Biology Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol, | <p>N = 251</p> <p>Tolterodine immediate release 1mg (TOL IR 1) = 97<br/> Tolterodine immediate release 2mg (TOL IR 2) = 103<br/> Placebo (PLA) = 51</p> | Eligible patients were randomised to 4-week treatment with either placebo or tolterodine 1 or 2mg twice daily (bd) | <p>Eligible patients were randomised to tolterodine 1mg or 2mg twice daily or placebo. Dosage reduction was not permitted.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/> A power analysis (<math>\chi = 5\%</math>,</p> | <p><b>Week 4</b><br/> Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</p>   | <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/> A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes -</p>  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <p>98, 97-102, 2001</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220282</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Belgium, France</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare the efficacy and tolerability of tolterodine at fixed doses with placebo in patients with overactive bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Supported by Pharmacia Corporation</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR 1: 74/97 (76.3%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 84/103 (81.6%)<br/>PLA: 41/51 (80.4%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR 1: 18 - 85<br/>TOL IR 2: 21 - 88<br/>PLA: 19 - 89</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week - Range<br/>TOL IR 1: 0.1 - 24.0<br/>TOL IR 2: 0.1 - 24.0<br/>PLA: 0.1 - 8.4</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>TOL IR 1: 97/97 (100%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 103/103 (100%)<br/>PLA: 51/51 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 18 years and older<br/>2] urodynamically proven overactive bladder<br/>3] symptoms of urgency and/or urge incontinence (≥ 1 incontinence episode / 24 hours) with increased frequency of</p> |               | <p>80% power) indicated that 250 patients would be required</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL IR 1: -1.1 ± 2.2 N = 78<br/>TOL IR 2: -1.3 ± 1.8 N = 79<br/>PLA: -0.4 ± 1.9 n = 39</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL IR 1: 39/97 (40%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 55/103 (53%)<br/>PLA: 16/51 (31%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL IR 1: 20/97 (21%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 35/103</p> | <p>computerised randomisation<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   | <p>micturition (<math>\geq 8</math> micturitions / 24 hours) during a 2 week washout period</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] significant stress incontinence<br/> 2] hepatic or renal disease<br/> 3] symptomatic or recurrent urinary tract infection<br/> 4] interstitial cystitis<br/> 5] haematuria<br/> 6] clinical significant voiding difficulty<br/> 7] patients receiving bladder training, electrostimulation therapy or indwelling catheter or intermittent catheterisation<br/> 8] pregnant or nursing women<br/> 9] women of childbearing age not using reliable contraception</p> |  |  | <p>(34%)<br/> PLA: 3/51 (6%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> TOL IR 1: 3/97 (3%)<br/> TOL IR 2: 2/103 (2%)<br/> PLA: 1/51 (%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> Not applicable</p> | <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from TOL IR 2 arm used in review</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dorschner,W., Stolzenburg,J.U., Griebenow,R., Halaska,M., Schubert,G., Murtz,G., Frank,M., Wieners,F., Efficacy and cardiac safety of propiverine in elderly patients - a double-blind, placebo-</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 98</p> <p>Propiverine (PRO) = 49<br/> Placebo (PLA) = 49</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Following a week placebo run-in, patients were randomised to propiverine (15mg three times a day) or placebo (three times a day) for a 4 week period.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Efficacy was measured using a mictrition diary, uroflow, ultrasound and an urge score</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom</u></p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/> A1 - Was there</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p>controlled clinical study, European UrologyEur.Urol., 37, 702-708, 2000</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220285</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Germany</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To confirm the efficacy of propiverine in patients with detrusor instability</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Supported by Apogepha</p> | <p>TOL IR: 40/49 (81.6%)<br/>PLA: 37/49 (75.5%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>PRO: 68.4 ± 6.5<br/>PLA: 66.5 ± 6.0</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Range<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Aged &gt; 60 years<br/>2] frequency more than 7 episodes per day<br/>3] urinary incontinence more than 0 episodes per day<br/>4] micturition volume less than 300ml/micturition</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] acute urinary tract infection<br/>2] mechanical or functional bladder emptying disorders<br/>3] residual volume of more than</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean (No SD) change from baseline<br/>PRO IR: -0.6 (No SD) N not reported<br/>PLA: -0.1 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - reported as symptom free<br/>PRO IR: 18/43 (41.9%)<br/>PLA: 13/45 (28.9%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes - reported as symptom free<br/>PRO IR = 15/49 (30.6%)<br/>PLA: 5/49 (10.2%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect</p> | <p>appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Unclear - not reported which group the 9 dropouts were in<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - No<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 0% of the voided volume<br>4] renal insufficiency<br>5] concomitant medication interfering with drug studied |  |  | Not reported<br><br>Dry mouth<br>Not reported<br><br>Dropouts for any reason<br>Not reported<br><br>Dropouts for adverse effects<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Post-void residual volume<br>PRO IR: 7.2 ± 12.4 ml N = 49<br>PLA: 5.9 ± 8.0 ml N = 49<br><br><b>Week 12</b><br>Not reported | D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br><b>Indirectness</b><br><br>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br>1] Population: Yes<br>2] Interventions: Yes<br>3] Outcome: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b><br><br>A total of 107 were enrolled but 9 were excluded from efficacy analysis but not reported from which group. |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Haab,F., Stewart,L., Dwyer,P., Darifenacin, an M3 selective receptor antagonist, | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 561<br>Darifenacin 3.75mg (DAR 3,75) =   | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>After a week placebo run-in, patients were randomised using unequal allocation | <b>Details</b><br><br>Efficacy was evaluated at weeks, 6 and 1 using electronic patient diaries in | <b>Results</b><br><br><b>Week 4 results</b><br>Not reported  | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist:   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>is an effective and well-tolerated once-daily treatment for overactive bladder., European UrologyEur.Urol., 45, 420-429, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220287</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To evaluate the clinical efficacy of darifenacin over a broad range of OAB parameters as well as to assess its tolerability and safety profile</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Study funded by Pfizer Inc</p> | <p>53<br/>Darifenacin 7.5mg (DAR 7.5) = 229<br/>Darifenacin 15mg (DAR 15) = 115<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 164</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>DAR 3.75: 44/53 (83.0%)<br/>DAR 7.5: 194/229 (84/7%)<br/>DAR 15: 100/115 (87.0%)<br/>PLA: 138/164 (78.4%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>DAR 3.75: 56.7 (No SD reported)<br/>DAR 7.5: 57.7 (No SD reported)<br/>DAR 15: 56.6 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 56.5 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Median (95% CI)<br/>DAR 3.75: 9.6 (7.0 to 13.0)<br/>DAR 7.5: 9.3 (8.0 to 11.0)<br/>DAR 15: 8.0 (6.0 to 11.0)<br/>PLA: 11.0 (9.5 to 14.9)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>DAR 3.75: 7.5 (No CI reported)<br/>DAR 7.5: 7.7 (No CI reported)<br/>DAR 15: 8.0 (No CI reported)<br/>PLA: 8.30 (No CI reported)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>(1:4:2:3) to darifenacin 3.75mg, 7.5mg, 15mg or placebo using blocks of 10.</p> | <p>the 1-week period before each clinic visit</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was determined by a computer-generated simulation analysis using a bootstrap re-sampling technique, whereby data are used repeatedly to simulate the inference based on the primary comparison of 15mg and 7.5mg darifenacin versus placebo. Based on assumptions and calculation, 200 patients were required to complete the study in the 7.5mg group and 150 in the placebo group to detect a difference at 80% power.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Full analysis set used.</p> | <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Median (95% CI) change from baseline<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>DAR 3.75: -8.6 (No CI)<br/>DAR 7.5: -9.0 (No CI)<br/>DAR 15: -10.4 (No CI)<br/>PLA: -7.6 (No CI)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>DAR 3.75: -1.8 (No CI)<br/>DAR 7.5: -2.0 (No CI)<br/>DAR 15: -2.0 (No CI)<br/>PLA: -0.9 (No CI)</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life</p> | <p>Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - random blocks used<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urge incontinence (at least 5 but no more than 50 per week)<br/> 2] frequency of micturition (a mean of least 8 voids per 4 hours)<br/> 3] urgency (a strong desire to void at least once a day)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] contraindications of antimuscarinic drugs<br/> 2] clinically significant stress incontinence<br/> 3] clinically significant bladder outlet obstruction and/or a post-void residual volume &gt; 200ml<br/> 4] genitourinary conditions that could cause urinary symptoms<br/> 5] recent urogenital surgery or hepatic disease</p> |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/> Any adverse effect<br/> DAR 3.75: 24/53 (45.3%)<br/> DAR 7.5: 120/229 (52.4%)<br/> DAR 15: 61/115 (53%)<br/> PLA: 66/164 (40.2%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> DAR 3.75: 7/53 (13.2%)<br/> DAR 7.5: 43/229 (18.8%)<br/> DAR 15: 36/115 (31.3%)<br/> PLA: 14/164 (8.5%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> DAR 3.75: 4/53 (7.5%)<br/> DAR 7.5: 10/229 (4.4%)<br/> DAR 15: 8/115 (7.8%)<br/> PLA: 12/164 (7.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> DAR 3.75: 0/53 (0%)<br/> DAR 7.5: 3/229</p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
|  |   |  |  | (1.3%)<br>DAR 15: 3/115<br>(2.6%)<br>PLA: 2/164 (1.2%)<br><br>Psychological outcomes<br>Not reported<br><br>Clinical measures<br>- Post-void residual volume<br>Not reported  |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Drutz,H.P., Appell,R.A., Gleason,D., Klimberg,I., Radomski,S., Clinical efficacy and safety of tolterodine compared to oxybutynin and placebo in patients with overactive bladder, International Urogynecology Journal, 10, 283-289, 1999</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220304</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United states &amp; Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 277</p> <p>Tolterodine IR (TOL IR) = 109<br/>Oxybutynin IR (OXY IR) = 112<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 56</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR: 88/109 (80.7%)<br/>OXY IR: 81/112 (72.3%)<br/>PLA: 45/56 (80.4%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean<br/>TOL IR: 63.0<br/>OXY IR: 66.3<br/>PLA: 62.1</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day -</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients completed a 2 week placebo run in before randomisation to either tolterodine mg bid, oxybutynin 5mg tid or placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were seen at study entry, at baseline and after 2, 4, 8 and 12 weeks of treatment</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Preliminary micturition diary data suggested a standard deviation of three micturitions per 24 hours. In order to have an 80% chance of detecting a difference of 1.5 in reduction of micturition per 24 hours (x = 5%) using a 1:2:2 randomisation ratio. It was necessary to recruit 47 into the placebo group and 95 into the tolterodine and oxybutynin groups.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes - Mean ± SD change from baseline<br/>TOL IR: -1.7 ± 2.0<br/>N = 60<br/>OXY IR: -1.7 ± 1.7<br/>N = 39<br/>PLA: -1.0 ± 2.2 N</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the efficacy and safety of tolterodine 2mg bid, oxybutynin 5mg tid and placebo in patients with detrusor overactivity and symptoms of frequency and either urge incontinence and/or urgency</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Funded by Pharmacia &amp; Upjohn, AB</p> | <p>Range<br/>TOL IR: 7.7 - 22.0<br/>OXY IR: 7.1 - 31.4<br/>PLA: 6.6 - 21.9</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged 18 years or more<br/>2] postmenopausal, surgically sterile or using an adequate contraceptive method<br/>3] evidence of detrusor instability or subtracted cystometry<br/>4] urinary frequency (at least 8 times per day) and either urge incontinence or urinary urgency</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] clinically significant stress incontinence<br/>2] hepatic or renal disease<br/>3] recurrent urinary tract infection<br/>4] interstitial cystitis<br/>5] uninvestigated hematuria or hematuria secondary to malignant disease<br/>6] indwelling catheter or</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>= 33</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL IR: 23/103 (22.3%)<br/>OXY IR: 19/90 (21.1%)<br/>PLA: Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL IR: 85/109 (78.0%)<br/>OXY IR: 101/112 (90.2%)<br/>PLA: 42/56 (75.0%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL IR: 33/109 (30.3%)<br/>OXY IR: 77/112 (68.8%)<br/>PLA: 8/56 (14.3%)</p> | <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|  | <p>intermittent catheterisation</p> <p>7] treatemnt with an investigational drug in 2 months prior to study</p> <p>8] previous treatment with tolterodine</p> <p>9] electrostimulation therapy, antimuscarininc or bladder training with 14 days of entry to study</p> <p>10] clinically significant voiding difficulty</p> |   |   | <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>TOL IR: 12/109 (11.0%)<br/>OXY 35/112 (31.3%)<br/>PLA: 8/56 (14.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>TOL IR: 7/109 (6.4%)<br/>OXY IR: 23/112 (20.5%)<br/>PLA: 4/56 (7.1%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> <p>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Malone-Lee,J.G., Walsh,J.B., Maugourd,M.F., Tolterodine: a safe and effective treatment for older patients with overactive bladder., Journal of the American Geriatrics SocietyJ.Am.Geriatr.Soc., 49, 700-705, 2001</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 177</p> <p>Tolterodine IR 1mg bid (TOL IR 1) = 61</p> <p>Tolterodine IR 2mg bid (TOL IR 2) = 73</p> <p>Placebo (PLA) = 43</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients were randomised in a 3:3:2 ration to tolderodine IR img, tolterodine IR mg or placebo for a 4 week period</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Efficay was assessed by way of a week's micturition diary completed before the week 4 assessment.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample size of 160 patients</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate</p>                                 |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220325</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the clinical safety and efficacy of two doses of tolterodine versus placebo in older patients with overactive bladder presenting with urgency, frequency and/or urge incontinence</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Pharmacia &amp; Upjohn</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR 1: 38/61 (62.3%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 45/73 (61.6%)<br/>PLA: 32/43 (74.4%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR 1: 65 - 90<br/>TOL IR 2: 62 - 92<br/>PLA: 66 - 88</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL IR 1: 2.3 (No SD reported)<br/>OXY IR: 2.8 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 5.1 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] aged 65 or older with urgency, urinary frequency (8 or more micturitions per day) and/or urge incontinence (1 or more incontinence episodes per day)<br/>2] mobile and able to attend an outpatient clinic</p> |               | <p>was chosen to have at least 100 older patients on active treatment. All statistical tests were two-sided and had a significance level of 0.05</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes - Median change 95% CI from baseline<br/>TOL IR 1: -0.3 (-0.8 to -0.1) N not reported<br/>TOL IR 2: -0.7 (-1.3 to -0.2) N not reported<br/>PLA: 0.0 (-0.4 to -0.3) N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL IR 1: 43/61 (70.5%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 53/73 (47.9%)<br/>PLA: 27/43 (62.8%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL IR 1: 18/61 (29.5%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 35/73</p> | <p>randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - identical packaging used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - No - Mean number of incontinence episodes per day in placebo group was twice the other groups<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] significant stress incontinence<br/> 2] urinary outflow obstruction<br/> 3] urinary retention<br/> 4] symptomatic urinary infection<br/> 5] interstitial cystitis<br/> 6] unexplained hematuria<br/> 7] use of urinary catheterisation or electrostimulation<br/> 8] hepatic and renal disease with markers twice the upper limit of normal reference range<br/> 9] concomitant antimuscarinic medication<br/> 10] previous treatment iwth tolterodine<br/> 11] exposure to any other investigational drug in preceding 3 months</p> |  |   | <p>(47.9%)<br/> PLA: 4/43 (9.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> TOL IR 1: 8/61 (13.1%)<br/> TOL IR 2: 9/73 (12.3%)<br/> PLA: 4/43 (9.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> TOL IR 1: 4/61 (6.6%)<br/> TOL IR 2: 7/73 (9.6%)<br/> PLA: 1/43 (2.3%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> Not reported</p> | <p>defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dmochowski,R.R., Davila,G.W., Zinner,N.R., Gittelman,M.C., Saltzstein,D.R., Lyttle,S., Sanders,S.W., For The Transdermal Oxybutynin</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 520</p> <p>Oxybutynin transdermal 1.3mg (OXY TD 1.3) = 130<br/> Oxybutynin transdermal 2.8mg (OXY TD 2.8) = 133</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Following symptom stabilization or treatment withdrawal 520 adult patients were randomized to 12 weeks of double-blind daily treatment with 1.3, 2.6 or 3.9</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Evaluations included patient urinary diaries, incontinence specific quality of life and safety.</p> <p>Patients received basic</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p>  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Study Group., Efficacy and safety of transdermal oxybutynin in patients with urge and mixed urinary incontinence, Journal of Urology. J.Urol., 168, 580-586, 2002</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220334</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy and safety of a transdermal oxybutynin formulation in a general population of patients with moderate to severe overactive bladder.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported but all authors have interest in Watson</p> | <p>Oxybutynin transdermal 3.9mg (OXY TD 3.9) = 125<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 13</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>OXY 1.3: 120/130 (92.3%)<br/>OXY 2.8: 123/133 (92.5%)<br/>OXY 3.9: 114/125 (91.2%)<br/>PLA: 121/132 (91.7%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>OXY 1.3: 61.5 ± 11.3<br/>OXY 2.8: 61.9 ± 13.5<br/>OXY 3.9: 59.4 ± 14.5<br/>PLA: 62.7 ± 13.1</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week<br/>Unclear</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>OXY 1.3: 9.1 ± 10.3<br/>OXY 2.8: 8.9 ± 8.8<br/>OXY 3.9: 9.9 ± 9.8<br/>PLA: 9.1 ± 9.1</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 18 years or more with overactive bladder</p> | <p>mg. oxybutynin TDS or placebo administered twice weekly, followed by a 12-week open-label, dose titration period to assess efficacy and safety further.</p> | <p>information on bladder function, bladder control and fluid management and were instructed to maintain usual fluid intake.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was calculated based on data from a previous study. Assuming a common standard deviation of 17 episodes per week and 90 patients per treatment group, a difference of 10 episodes could be detected with 95% power. All statistical tests were conducted as 0.05</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) used.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>OXY TD 1.3mg: - 2.6 ± 2.8 N = 128<br/>OXY TD 2.8mg: - 2.4 ± 2.6 N = 131<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: - 3.1 ± 2.5 N = 123<br/>PLA: -2.7 ± 3.0 N = 130</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>OXY TD 1.3mg: 12/130 (10.0%)<br/>OXY TD 2.8mg: 7/133 (5.2%)<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 16/125 (12.8%)<br/>PLA: 10/132 (7.6%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> |

| Study details                                       | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| Pharmaceuticals                                     | <p>2] 10 or more urinary incontinence episodes over a 7-day diary with either pure urge or predominant urge<br/>3] 56 or more voids per week<br/>4] average recorded void volume of less than 350ml</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] incontinence due to chronic illness, anatomical weakness or concomitant medications<br/>2] lower urinary tract surgery in previous 8 months<br/>3] interstitial cystitis<br/>4] urethral syndrome<br/>5] painful bladder syndrome and overflow urinary incontinence<br/>6] alcohol/drug abuse in previous year<br/>7] known hypersensitivity to oxybutynin<br/>8] active skin disorder<br/>9] narrow angle glaucoma or shallow anterior chamber<br/>10] prostate specific antigen<br/>11] excessive caffeine consumption</p> |  |   | <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Dropouts for any reason<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Any adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>OXY TD 1.3mg: 6/120 (5.0%)<br/>OXY TD 2.8mg: 9/133 (6.8%)<br/>OXY TD 3.9mg: 12/125 (9.6%)<br/>PLA: 11/132 (8.3%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
| <b>Full citation</b>                                | <b>Sample size</b>  | <b>Interventions</b>                                   | <b>Details</b>  | <b>Results</b>   | <b>Limitations</b>  |
| Cardozo,L., Lisec,M., Millard,R., van Vierssen,Trip | N = 911   | Patients were allocated to once-daily solifenacin 5mg, | Efficacy was assessed by by 3-day micturition diaries for | <b>4 weeks</b><br>Not reported   | NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D:   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>O., Kuzmin,I., Drogendijk,T.E., Huang,M., Ridder,A.M., Randomized, double-blind placebo controlled trial of the once daily antimuscarinic agent solifenacin succinate in patients with overactive bladder, Journal of Urology.J.Urol., 172, 1919-1924, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220336</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To assess the efficacy of once daily solifenacin in patients with OAB</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Solifenacin 5mg (SOL 5) = 286<br/>Solifenacin 10mg (SOL 10) = 290<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 281</p> <p>*4 did not receive any drugs but no indication on which group they were randomised to</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b><br/>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>SOL 5: 237/286 (82.9%)<br/>SOL 10: 238/290 (82.1%)<br/>PLA: 227/281 (80.8%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>SOL 5: 19 - 85<br/>SOL 10: 18 - 83<br/>PLA: 18 - 8</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] 18 years of age or older with symptoms of OAB<br/>2] average micturition frequency of</p> | <p>solifenacin 10mg, or placebo for a 1 week period</p> | <p>3-day before each assessment at 4 week intervals. Primary outcome was change in the number of micturitions per 4 hours</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Based on the projected difference from baseline to endpoint of 1 micturition episode per 24 hours, with a standard deviation of 3, significance level of 0.05, -sided and a power of 90%, 190 evaluable patients per arm were required. Assuming a dropout rate of 20%, 894 patients were required</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used</p> | <p><b>12 weeks results</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Episodes of incontinence / day<br/>- Mean change scores (95% CI)<br/>SOL 5mg: -1.63 (No CI reported)<br/>SOL 10mg: -1.57 (No CI reported)<br/>PLA: -1.35 (No CI reported)</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>SOL 5mg: -2.94 (-1.44 to -0.28) N = 267<br/>SOL 10mg: -2.90 (-1.49 to -0.35) N = 283<br/>PLA: -1.98 (No CI reported)</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - LOCF used<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|--|--|
|               | <p>at least 8 per day<br/>3] at least 3 episodes of urgency and/or 3 episodes of urinary incontinence during 3 days</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] neurogenic bladder<br/>2] stress urinary incontinence<br/>3] Bladder outlet obstruction<br/>4] Post-void residual volume &gt;200ml<br/>5] urinary tract infection<br/>6] contraindication to antimuscarinic drugs,</p> |               |         | <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>SOL 5mg: 23/299 (87.7%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 71/307 (243.1%)<br/>PLA: 7/301 (2.3%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>SOL 5mg: 22/299 (7.4%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 24/307 (7.8%)<br/>PLA: 31/301 (10.3%)</p> <p>Dropout for adverse event<br/>SOL 5mg: 7/299 (2.3%)<br/>SOL 10mg: 12/307 (3.9%)<br/>PLA: 10/301 (3.3%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population: Yes<br/>2] Intervention: Yes<br/>3] Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Zinner,N., Gittelman,M., Harris,R., Susset,J., Kanelos,A., Auerbach,S., Trospium Study Group., Trospium chloride improves overactive bladder symptoms: a multicenter phase III trial, Journal of UrologyJ.Urol., 171, 2311-2315, 2004 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 523<br>Trospium (TRO) = 262<br>Placebo (PLA) = 261<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>TRO: 203/262 (77.5%)<br>PLA: 188/261 (71.3%)<br><br>Age (years) - Mean ± SE<br>TRO: 63 ± 0.8<br>PLA: 61.5 ± 0.8<br><br>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br>TRO: 3.9 (No SD reported)<br>PLA: 4.3 (No SD reported)<br><br>Urgency episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br>TRO: 11.29 (No SD reported)<br>PLA: 11.72 (No SD reported)<br><br>Detrusor overactivity<br>Not reported<br><br>Duration of OAB<br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br>Patients were randmised on a 1:1 basis to either trospium 0mg twice daily or matching placebo for 1 weeks | <b>Details</b><br>Patient treated with OAB drugs at screening underwent a 2-week washout. At baseline patient were given 7-day baseline urinary diary that included measurement of volume voided on days 6 and 7. 7-day diaries were completed prior to each study visit at weeks 1, 4 and 12.<br><br>Primary efficacy outcomes were change in the average number of voids per 24 hours and change in average number of urge incontinence episodes per 24 hours.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used | <b>Results</b><br><b>Week 4 results</b><br>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br>Not reported<br><br>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean ± SD<br>UUI episodes - change from baseline reported<br>TRO: -2.3 (No SD) N = 256<br>PLA: -1.8 (No SD) N = 256<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>TRO: -2.1 (No SD) N = 256<br>PLA: -1.0 (No SD) N = 256<br><br>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)<br>Not reported<br><br>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br>Not reported | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Not reported<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - unclear - not reported<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br>Level of bias: Medium<br><br>B Performance bias<br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br>C Attrition bias<br>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes |
| <b>Ref Id</b><br>220337   |  |   |  |   |  |
| <b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br>United States   |  |   |  |   |  |
| <b>Study type</b><br>Randomised controlled trial  |  |   |  |   |  |
| <b>Aim of the study</b><br>To examine the effect of trospium chloride at 20mg twice daily versus placebo in patients presenting with overactive bladder associated with urge incontinence   |  |   |  |   |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by Indevus Corporation</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 18 years of age or older<br/> 2] OAB symptoms for at least 6 months<br/> 3] urinary urgency, a minimum voiding frequency of 70 or more voids per week with at least 7 urge incontinence episodes per week</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress incontinence<br/> 2] insensate or overflow in nature<br/> 3] neurogenic bladder disorders<br/> 4] significant renal disease<br/> 5] uninvestigated hematuria<br/> 6] urinary tract infection at washout or more than twice in previous year<br/> 7] significant bladder outlet obstruction<br/> 8] current use of an anticholinergic drug or drug therapy for OAB in previous 21 days<br/> 9] bladder cancer<br/> 10] interstitial cystitis</p> |               |         | <p>Adverse effects<br/>Not reported at 4 weeks</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/>Patient satisfiopn with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean (No SD reported)<br/>UUI episodes - change from baseline reported<br/>TRO: -2.3 (No SD)<br/>N = 256<br/>PLA: -1.9 (No SD)<br/>N = 256</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>TRO: -2.3 (No SD)<br/>N = 256<br/>PLA: -1.1 (No SD)<br/>N = 256</p> <p>Continenence status<br/>(Zero episodes per</p> | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>day)<br/> TRO: 46/262<br/> (17.6%)<br/> PLA: 24/261<br/> (9.2%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/> (using Incontinence Impact Questionnaire)<br/> TRO: -54.0<br/> ± 85.8 N = 235<br/> PLA: -36.0 ± 86.0<br/> N = 236</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/> Any adverse effect<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> TRO: 57/262<br/> (21.8%)<br/> PLA: 17/261<br/> (6.5%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/> TRO: 43/262<br/> (16.4%)<br/> PLA: 43/261<br/> (16.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> TRO: 23/262<br/> (8.8%)</p> |          |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |  |   | PLA:<br>15/261 (5.7%)<br><br>Psychological outcomes<br>Not reported<br><br>Clinical measures<br>Not reported  |  |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Appell,R.A., Sand,P., Dmochowski,R., Anderson,R., Zinner,N., Lama,D., Roach,M., Miklos,J., Saltzstein,D., Boone,T., Staskin,D.R., Albrecht,D., Overactive Bladder: Judging Effective Control and Treatment Study Group., Prospective randomized controlled trial of extended-release oxybutynin chloride and tolterodine tartrate in the treatment of overactive bladder: results of the OBJECT Study., Mayo Clinic ProceedingsMayo Clin.Proc., 76, 358-363, 2001<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br>220347<br><br><b>Country/ies where the</b> | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 378<br><br>Oxybutynin extended release (OXY ER) = 185<br>Tolterodine immediate release (TOL IR) = 193<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>TOL IR: 163/193 (84.5%)<br>OXY ER: 152/185 (82.2%)<br><br>Age (years) - Range<br>TOL IR: 21 - 85<br>OXY ER: 26 - 87<br><br>Incontinence episodes/week - Mean $\pm$ SD<br>TOL IR: 28.0 $\pm$ 18.3<br>OXY ER: 28.4 $\pm$ 17.8<br><br>Urgency episodes/day<br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br>Patients were randomised to 10mg/day of extended release oxybutynin or 4mg/day (mg twice daily) of immediate release tolterodine | <b>Details</b><br>Primary efficacy outcome was the number of urge incontinence episodes at 1 weeks as determined by a 7-day urinary diary completed at baseline, weeks 2, 4, 8 and 12 weeks<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br>Not reported | <b>Results</b><br><b>4 weeks</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>12 weeks</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD endpoint</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>OXY ER: 1.1 $\pm$ 1.7<br>N = 160<br>TOL IR: 1.3 $\pm$ 1.9<br>N = 172<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status</u> | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - randomisation stratified for urge incontinence<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - yes - identical packaging used<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br>B Performance bias<br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---------|--|--|
| <p><b>study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the efficacy and tolerability of tolterodine and extended release oxybutynin in patients with overactive bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Funded by ALZA Corporation</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] OAB with at between 7 and 50 episodes of urge incontinence per weeks and 10 or more voids per 4 hours</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Incontinence related to urinary tract infection, prostatitis, interstitial cystitis, urinary tract obstruction, urethral diverticulum, bladder minor, bladder tumor, bladder stone or prostate cancer<br/>2] undergone pelvioc, vaginal, bladder or prostate surgery in previous 6 months or delivered a bay in previous 6 months<br/>3] post-void residual volume of more than 150ml or at risk of developing complete urinary retention<br/>4] clinically important medical problems<br/>5] hematuria or positive urine culture or narrow angle glaucome, obstructive uropathy, myasthenia gravis, pelvic organ prolapse to the hymenal ring, or gastrointestinal</p> |               |         | <p><u>(zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not measured</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>OXY ER: 52/185 (28.1%)<br/>TOL IR: 64/193 (33.2%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>OXY ER: 25/185 (13,5%)<br/>TOL IR: 22/193 (11.4%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>OXY ER: 14/185 (7.6%)<br/>TOL IR: 15/193 (7.8%)</p> <p><u>Psychological</u></p> | <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - yes<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear - not reported<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | conditions.  |  |   | <u>outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>- <u>Post-void residual volume</u><br>Not reported  | 1] Population: Yes<br>2] Interventions: Yes<br>3] Outcome: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b>   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Diokno,A.C., Appell,R.A., Sand,P.K., Dmochowski,R.R., Gburek,B.M., Klimberg,I.W., Kell,S.H., OPERA Study Group., Prospective, randomized, double-blind study of the efficacy and tolerability of the extended-release formulations of oxybutynin and tolterodine for overactive bladder: results of the OPERA trial., Mayo Clinic ProceedingsMayo Clin.Proc., 78, 687-695, 2003<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br><br>220348<br><br><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br><br>United States<br><br><b>Study type</b> | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 790<br><br>Oxybutynin extended release (OXY ER) = 291<br>Tolterodine extended release (TOL ER) = 399<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br>TOL ER:399/399 (100%)<br>OXY ER: 391/391 (100%)<br><br>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br>TOL ER: 60 (No SD reported)<br>OXY ER: 60 (No SD reported)<br><br>Incontinence episodes/day- Mean ± SD<br>TOL ER: 36.9 ± 14.1<br>OXY ER: 37.2 ± 15.2<br><br>Urgency episodes/day<br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>Patients were allocated on a 1:1 basis to take either extended release oxybutynin at 10mg/day or extended release tolterodine at 4mg/day orally at 8.00am for 12 weeks | <b>Details</b><br><br>Efficacy assessments were based on 7-day diaries at the baseline week abd at weeks 2, 4, 8 and 12<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br><br>Intention to treat analysis used but no details reported | <b>Results</b><br><br><b>Week 4</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Week 12</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>Not reported<br><br>Urgency episodes<br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br>Incontinence episodes<br>TOL ER: 60/399 (15.0%) | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br>A Selection bias<br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - overencapsulation used<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br>B Performance bias<br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|--|--|
| <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare extended release formulation of both tolterodine and oxybutynin</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>November 21, 2000 to October 18, 2001</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by ALZA Corporation</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] women with OAB, aged 18 or older<br/>2] document 21 to 60 urge urinary incontinence episodes per week<br/>3] an average of 10 or more voids per 24 hours</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] treatable urinary conditions that could cause incontinence<br/>2] 2 post-void residual volumes shown by ultrasonography to exceed 150ml<br/>3] pronounced risk of developing complete urinary retention<br/>4] clinically important medical problems,<br/>5] hematuria<br/>6] uncontrolled narrow angle glaucoma<br/>7] obstructive uropathy<br/>8] reduced gastrointestinal motility<br/>9] known hypersensitivity to study medications</p> |               |         | <p>OXY ER: 78/391 (19.9%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER: 89/399 (22.3%)<br/>OXY ER: 116/391 (29.7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>TOL ER: 42/399 (10.5%)<br/>OXY ER: 52/391 (13.3%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>TOL ER: 19/399 (4.8%)<br/>OXY ER: 20/391 (5.1%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
|  |  |   |  | <u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported  | Intervention: Yes<br>Outcome: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b>   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Van Kerrebroeck,P., Kreder,K., Jonas,U., Zinner,N., Wein,A., Tolterodine Study Group., Tolterodine once-daily: superior efficacy and tolerability in the treatment of the overactive bladder, Urology, 57, 414-421, 2001</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>220399</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>The Netherlands</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of the new ER formulation of tolterodine for</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1529</p> <p>Tolterodine ER (TOL ER) = 507<br/>Tolterodine IR (TOL IR) = 514<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 508</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR: 406/514 (79.4%)<br/>TOL ER: 417/507 (82.2%)<br/>PLA: 410/508 (80.7%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR: 22 - 92<br/>TOL ER: 20 - 89<br/>PLA: 22 - 93</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>TOL IR: 23.2 (No SD reported)<br/>TOL ER: 22.1 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 23.3 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Eligible patients were subsequently randomized (1:1:1), using the procedure of random permuted blocks, to oral therapy with tolterodine ER capsules 4 mg once daily, tolterodine IR tablets 2 mg twice daily, or placebo for 12 weeks.</p> <p>No dosage adjustment was allowed during the study.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>At an initial screening visit, a complete medical and drug history was taken, along with a full laboratory screen and a midstream specimen of urine for culture/urinalysis. Eligible patients were enrolled into a 1 to 2-week washout/run-in period, during which the number of incontinence episodes and frequency of micturition were recorded for 7 consecutive days using micturition diaries. The volume voided (in milliliters) for every micturition and the use of incontinence pads were recorded for at least 2 complete days.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment*</u><br/>Reported as 'improved'<br/>TOL ER: 336/507 (66.3%)<br/>TOL IR: 313/514 (60.9%)<br/>PLA: 218/508 (46.1%)</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day (Mean ± SD change from baseline)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>TOL ER: -1.7 ± 2.5<br/>N = 507<br/>TOL IR: -1.5 ± 2.4</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - numbered blocks used<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - double-dummy drug packaging used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| <p>once-daily treatment of over-active bladder</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Sponsored by Pharmacia Corporation</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Male and female patients, 18 years of age or older, with urinary frequency (eight or more micturitions every 24 hours), urge incontinence (five or more incontinence episodes per week), and symptoms of an overactive bladder for 6 months or longer were eligible for inclusion.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] demonstrable stress incontinence,<br/>2] total daily urine volume greater than 3 L<br/>3] any contraindications to antimuscarinic treatment<br/>4] significant hepatic or renal disease (biochemical markers twice the upper limit of the normal reference range)<br/>5] symptomatic or recurrent urinary tract infections<br/>6] interstitial cystitis<br/>7] hematuria or bladder outlet obstruction~<br/>8] current electrostimulation or</p> |               | <p>An analysis of efficacy was performed for all randomized patients on an intent-to-treat basis using the last observation carried forward to estimate the values for patients that dropped out of the study early.</p> | <p>N = 514<br/>PLA: <math>-1.0 \pm 2,2</math> N = 507</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL ER: 118/507 (23.3%)<br/>TOL IR: 156/514 (30.4%)<br/>PLA: 39/508 (7.7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>TOL ER: 56/507 (11.6%)<br/>TOL IR: 63/514</p> | <p>was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population: Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
|  | <p>bladder training therapy<br/>9] indwelling catheter or intermittent selfcatheterization.</p> <p>Pregnant or nursing women and women of childbearing potential not using reliable contraceptive methods were also excluded from enrollment.<br/>Other treatments for an overactive bladder such as anticholinergic drugs or drugs that inhibit cytochrome P450 3A4 isoenzymes were not allowed. An exception was made for those receiving estrogen treatment who had started therapy more than 2 months before randomization.<br/>Treatment with an investigational drug in the 2 months before study entry was also prohibited by the protocol.</p> |   |  | <p>(12.1%)<br/>PLA: 68/508<br/>(13.0%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>TOL ER: 27/507<br/>(5.3%)<br/>TOL IR: 28/514<br/>(5.4%)<br/>PLA: 5/508 (1.0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>- Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>2] Interventions: Yes<br/>3] Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on dropouts for any reason and improvement taken from this paper and "Chancellor et al., 2000" (see excluded studies table)</p> <p>Data on 'Patient satisfaction with treatment' taken from "Zinner et al., 2002" (see excluded studies table)</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Jonas,U., Hofner,K., Madersbacher,H., Holmdahl,T.H., Efficacy and safety of two doses of tolterodine versus placebo in patients with detrusor overactivity and symptoms of frequency, urge incontinence, and urgency: urodynamic evaluation. The International Study Group.[erratum appears in World J Urol</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 242</p> <p>Tolterodine IR 1mg (TOL IR 1) = 99<br/>Tolterodine IR 2mg (TOL IR 2) = 99<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 44</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Following a washout period, patients were randomised to tolterodine 1mg or mg bid or placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Efficacy was assessed at baseline, at weeks or at withdrawal.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate</p>   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods      | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|--------------|---|---|
| <p>1997;15(3):210], World Journal of UrologyWorld J.Urol., 15, 144-151, 1997</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220405</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Germany, Austria &amp; Sweden</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare the efficacy of tolterodine at 1 or 2 mg bid versus placebo and evaluate the safety over 4 weeks of treatment</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>TOL IR 1: 73/99 (74%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 76/99 (77%)<br/>PLA: 33/44 (75%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR 1: 21 - 81<br/>TOL IR 2: 20 - 83<br/>PLA: 23 - 9</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Range<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>TOL IR 1: 99/99 (100%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 99/99 (100%)<br/>PLA: 44/44 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] at least 18 years of age with detrusor overactivity<br/>2] evidence of frequency (8 or more micturitions per 24 hours) in combination with either urge incontinence (1 or more incontinence episodes per 4 hours), urinary urgency or both</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> |               | Not reported | <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL IR 1: 31/99 (31%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 32/99 (32%)<br/>PLA: 17/44 (39%)</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/>TOL IR 1: 8/99 (8%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 10/99 (10%)<br/>PLA: 1/44 (2%)</p> <p>Dropout for any reason<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects</p> | <p>concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
|  | <p>1] significant stress incontinence<br/> 2] hepatic disease<br/> 3] renal disease<br/> 4] condition contraindication anticholinergic therapy<br/> 5] recurrent urinary tract infections<br/> 6] interstitial cystitis<br/> 7] uninvestigated hematuria<br/> 8] clinically significant voiding difficulty with risk of urinary retention<br/> 9] patients on anticholinergic treatment, using an indwelling catheter or electrostimulation or bladder training within 14 days of study</p> |   |   | <p>TOL IR 1: 4/99 (4%)<br/> TOL IR 2: 3/99 (3%)<br/> PLA: 3/44 (6%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/> Not applicable</p> | <p>blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>79 (80%), 83 (84%) and 38 (86) were incontinent in the TOL IR 1, TOL IR 2 and PLA groups respectively</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Madersbacher,H., Halaska,M., Voigt,R., Alloussi,S., Hofner,K., A placebo-controlled, multicentre study comparing the tolerability and efficacy of propiverine and oxybutynin in patients with urgency and</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 366</p> <p>Propiverine immediate release (PRO IR) = 149<br/> Oxybutynin immediate release (OXY IR) = 145<br/> Placebo (PLA) = 72</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>15 mg propiverine (sugar-coated tablets, registered as Detrunorm®/Miconorm®, Apogepha Arzneimittel GmbH, Dresden, Germany) were administered three times daily</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>In a double-blind, randomized, prospective multicentre clinical trial, the treatment results of propiverine, oxybutynin and placebo were compared in a three-armed parallel-group design. After a 1-week</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4 results</b><br/> Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/> PRO IR: 104/149 (70.5%)<br/> OXY IR: 96/145 (66.2%)<br/> PLA: 43/72</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/> A1 - Was there</p>  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| <p>urge incontinence, BJU International, 84, 646-651, 1999</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220409</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Germany</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To assess evidence for the equal efficacy of propiverine and oxybutynin in patients with urgency and urge incontinence</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>PRO IR: 117/126 (92.9%)<br/>OXY IR: 113/118 (93.4%)<br/>PLA: 59/53 (93.7%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>PRO IR: 49.6 <math>\pm</math> 13.0<br/>OXY IR: 50.3 <math>\pm</math> 13.5<br/>PLA: 47.6 <math>\pm</math> 12.0</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>PRO IR: 9.5 (No SD reported)<br/>OXY IR: 1.4 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 11.3 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] history of urgency or urge incontinence<br/>2] a maximum cystometric bladder capacity of <math>\leq</math> 300 ml<br/>3] age <math>\geq</math> 18 years<br/>4] body weight <math>\geq</math> 45 kg</p> | <p>5 mg oxybutynin tablets (registered as Ditropan®/Dridase®) twice daily</p> <p>Placebo three times daily</p> | <p>'washout' period, treatments were administered for 4 weeks; 15 mg propiverine (sugar-coated tablets, registered as Detrunorm®/Mictonorm® , Apogepha Arzneimittel GmbH, Dresden, Germany) were administered three times daily (group 1), or 5 mg oxybutynin tablets (registered as Ditropan®/Dridase®) twice daily (group 2), or placebo three times daily (group 3). To ensure the double-blind condition, each of the patients received additional placebos (the double-dummy technique).</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>(59.7%)</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes - Mean change from baseline<br/>PRO IR: -3.1 (No SD) N not reported<br/>OXY IR: -3.0 (No SD) N not reported<br/>PLA: - 1.2 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>PRO IR: 95/149 (63.8%)<br/>OXY IR: 105/145 (71.7%)<br/>PLA: 30/72 (41.7%)</p> | <p>appropriate randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No significant difference between groups<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] detrusor hyperreflexia<br/> 2] postoperative (bladder) incontinence<br/> 3] infravesical obstruction<br/> 4] a postvoid residual urine (PVR) of &gt; 15% of the maximal cystometric bladder capacity<br/> 5] acute UTIs<br/> 6] angina pectoris<br/> 7] glaucoma<br/> 8] megacolon<br/> 9] clinically relevant cardiac, renal or hepatic dysfunctions<br/> 10] tachy/dysrhythmias<br/> 11] frequency or nocturia due to heart or renal insufficiency<br/> 12] overt cerebral sclerosis.<br/> The following concomitant medications were considered as exclusion criteria: other spasmolytics or anticholinergics, <math>\beta</math>-sympathomimetics, calcium antagonists, dopamine agonists, prolactin inhibitors, prostaglandin synthesis inhibitors, striated muscle relaxants, or medication for Parkinsonism.</p> |  |  | <p>Dry mouth<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> PRO IR: 19/149 (12.8%)<br/> OXY IR: 16/145 (11.0%)<br/> PLA: 7/72 (9.7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures - Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Not applicable</p> | <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Baseline data on all patients randomised not reported</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chapple,C.R., Martinez-Garcia,R., Selvaggi,L., Toozs-Hobson,P.,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 1177<br/> Solifenacin (5mg or 10mg) (SOL)</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients were randomised (stratified by centre) to receive either solifenacin 5</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>After 4 weeks of treatment, patients had the option of either continuing with their</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4 results</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist:</p>  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Warnack,W., Drogendijk,T., Wright,D.M., Bolodeoku,J., A comparison of the efficacy and tolerability of solifenacin succinate and extended release tolterodine at treating overactive bladder syndrome: Results of the STAR trial, European UrologyEur.Urol., 48, 464-470, 2005</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220410</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare the efficacy and tolerability of solifenacin and extended release tolterodine</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>May 2003 to October 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Supported by Yamanouchi Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd</p> | <p>= 578<br/>Tolterodine extended release (TOL ER) = 599</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>SOL: 493/578 (85.3%)<br/>TOL ER: 529/599 (88.2%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>SOL: 56.5 (No SD reported)<br/>TOL ER: 56.4 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Range<br/>SOL: 2.77 ± 2.65<br/>TOL ER: 2.55 ± 2.37</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>SOL: 6.01 ± 4.66<br/>TOL ER: 5.84 ± 4.12</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Men and women aged at least 18 years who had OAB symptoms (including urinary frequency, urgency or urge incontinence) for 3 months or more and being treated as outpatients</p> | <p>mg OD or tolterodine ER 4 mg OD as double-blind treatment</p> | <p>original dose or requesting a dose increase based on their satisfaction with treatment efficacy and tolerability, and discussions with the investigator.</p> <p>Patients completed the 3-day micturition diary prior to each scheduled visit at weeks 4, 8 and 12. For each episode of urinary symptoms, the patient recorded the date and time of each episode, whether or not they voided, the presence of urgency and/or incontinence, the volume voided (for at least 2 of the 3 days), whether or not the episode disturbed the patient's sleep, and the time of rising from, and retiring to, bed.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The sample size calculation and analytical strategy was based upon CPMP guidelines and enabled the primary efficacy analysis to be performed with a power of 80% as the between-treatment non-inferiority comparison of the change from baseline to endpoint in the mean number of micturitions per 24 hours by</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes - Mean (No SD) change from baseline<br/>SOL: -1.3 (No SD)<br/>N not reported<br/>TOL ER: -0.9 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL: -1.98 (No SD) N not reported<br/>TOL ER: -1.67 (No SD) N not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Incontinence episodes<br/>SOL: 225/593 (37.9%)<br/>TOL ER: 204/607 (33.6%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - remote randomisation<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - randomisation numbers served as packaging for interventions<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind and double-dummy<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|--|--|
|               | <p>2] an average of 8 micturitions per 24 hours<br/> 3] an average of 1 incontinence episode per 24 hours<br/> 4] an average of 1 urgency episode per 24 hours</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress incontinence or mixed incontinence where stress was predominant (mixed incontinence was allowed otherwise)<br/> 2] patients with a neurological cause of abnormal detrusor activity</p> |               | <p>using the Per Protocol Set (PPS) population.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/> Any adverse effect<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth<br/> SOL: 108/593 (18.2%)<br/> TOL ER: 91/607 (14.5%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> SOL: 18/593 (3.0%)<br/> TOL ER: 17/607 (2.8%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12 results</b><br/> <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/> Incontinence</p> | <p>data - Yes<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>52% of patients in SOL group requested a dose increase from 5mg to 10mg after 4 weeks - average dose at endpoint = 7.9mg</p> |



| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>episodes -<br/>Mean (No SD)<br/>change from<br/>baseline<br/>SOL: -1.6 (No SD)<br/>N not reported<br/>TOL ER: -1.1 (No<br/>SD) N not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>SOL: -2.85 (No<br/>SD) N not reported<br/>TOL ER: -<br/>2.42 (No SD) N<br/>not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>(zero episodes per<br/>day)<br/>Incontinence<br/>episodes<br/>SOL: 341/593<br/>(57.5%)<br/>TOL ER: 294/607<br/>(48.4%)</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-<br/>specific quality of<br/>life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Dry mouth</p> |          |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |   |   | <p>SOL: 174/593 (29.3%)<br/>TOL ER: 144/607 (23.7%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/>SOL: 34/593 (5.7%)<br/>TOL ER: 44/607 (7.2%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/>SOL: 20/593 (3.4%)<br/>TOL ER: 18/607 (3.0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Millard,R., Tuttle,J., Moore,K., Susset,J., Clarke,B., Dwyer,P., Davis,B.E., Clinical efficacy and safety of tolterodine compared to placebo in detrusor overactivity., Journal of UrologyJ.Urol., 161, 1551-</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 316</p> <p>Tolterodine immediate release 1mg (TOL IR 1) = 123<br/>Tolterodine immediate release 2mg (TOL IR 2) = 129<br/>Placebo (PLA) 64</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Patients were randomised to tolterodine immediate release 1mg twice daily, tolterodine immediate release mg twice daily or placebo</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The primary efficacy outcomes were the number of voids per 4 hours, mean volume per void and the number of incontinence episodes per 4 hours</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Week 4</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Week 12</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>TOL IR 1: 48/123 (37.4%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 67/129</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p>1555, 1999</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>220411</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To measure the efficacy of 2 doses of tolterodine versus placebo during a 12 week treatment period</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Supported by Pharmacia and Upjohn AB, Uppsala, Sweden</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>TOL IR 1: 96/123 (78%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 99/129 (77%)<br/>PLA: 42/64 (66%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>TOL IR 1: 24 - 89<br/>TOL IR 2: 24 - 83<br/>PLA: 25 - 84</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>TOL IR 1: 3.9 (No SD reported)<br/>TOL IR 2: 3.6 (No SD reported)<br/>PLA: 3.9 (No SD reported)</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>TOL IR 1: 123/123 (100%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 129/129 (100%)<br/>PLA: 64/64 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Aged 18 or older with OAB<br/>2] detrusor overactivity with average urinary frequency of 8 or more voids per 24 hours<br/>3] urge incontinence (an average of 1 or more incontinence episodes per 24 hours) and/or</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was chosen to provide an 80% chance of detecting a 15% decrease in the number of voids daily at 0.05 significance.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>(51.9%)<br/>PLA: 23/64 (35.9%)</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptoms reduction/day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>TOL IR 1: -1.7 <math>\pm</math> 2.8 N = 109<br/>TOL IR 2: -1.7 <math>\pm</math> 2.5 N = 117<br/>PLA: -1.3 <math>\pm</math> 2.5 N = 55</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)<br/>TOL IR 1: 12/108 (11.1%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 22/116 (18.9%)<br/>PLA: 6/55 (10.9%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects<br/>Any adverse effect<br/>TOL IR 1: 91/123 (74.0%)<br/>TOL IR 2: 94/129 (72.9%)</p> | <p>randomisation - Unclear - not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and</p> |

| Study details                               | Participants   | Interventions                                     | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
|   | urinary urgency<br><br><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br>1] demonstrable stress incontinence<br>2] clinically significant voiding difficulty<br>3] proved recurrent urinary tract infections<br>4] interstitial cystitis<br>5] uninvestigated hematuria<br>6] bladder cancer<br>7] on intermittent catheterisation or indwelling catheter<br>8] hepatic or renal disease<br>9] had undergone electrostimulation or bladder training or on antimuscarinic drugs within 14 days of study or during study<br>10] average total voided volume of greater than 3000ml per 24 hours |   |   | PLA: 50/64 (78.1%)<br><br>Dry mouth<br>TOL IR 1: 30/123 (24.4%)<br>TOL IR 2: 50/129 (38.8%)<br>PLA: 8/64 (12.5%)<br><br>Dropout for any reason<br>TOL IR 1: 7/123 (5.7%)<br>TOL IR 2: 15/129 (11.6%)<br>PLA: 3/64 (4.7%)<br><br>Dropouts for adverse effects<br>TOL IR 1: 2/123 (1.6%)<br>TOL IR 2: 8/129 (6.2%)<br>PLA: 0/64 (0%)<br><br>Psychological outcomes<br>Not reported<br><br>Clinical measures<br>Not reported | reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br>Level of bias: Low<br><br><b>Indirectness</b><br>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br>1] Population: Yes<br>2] Interventions: Yes<br>3] Outcome: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b> |
| <b>Full citation</b>                        | <b>Sample size</b>   | <b>Interventions</b>                              | <b>Details</b>  | <b>Results</b>  | <b>Limitations</b>  |
| Thuroff,J.W., Bunke,B., Ebner,A., Faber,P., | N = 169  | After a 1 week run-in period, patients were given | Efficacy was based on 3-day micturition charts, and self- | <b>Week 4 Patient satisfaction</b>  | NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D:   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>de,Geeter P., Hannappel,J., Heidler,H., Madersbacher,H., Melchior,H., Schafer,W., Randomized, double-blind, multicenter trial on treatment of frequency, urgency and incontinence related to detrusor hyperactivity: oxybutynin versus propantheline versus placebo, Journal of Urology, 145, 813-816, 1991</p> <p><b>Ref id</b><br/>220412</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Germany</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To determine the clinical efficacy and possible differences of treatment results between oxybutynin and propantheline in patients with urinary frequency, urgency and/or incontinence related to detrusor hyperactivity</p> | <p>Oxybutynin immediate release (OXY IR) = 63<br/>Propantheline (PRO) = 54<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 52</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>OXY IR: 59/63 (93.6%)<br/>PRO: 53/54 (98.1%)<br/>PLA: 50/52 (96.2%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Range<br/>OXY IR: 17 - 83<br/>PRO: 16 - 78<br/>PLA: 20 - 83</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/week<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] 15 years of age and older<br/>2] frequency, urgency and/or incontinence related to detrusor hyperactivity<br/>3] not be taking drugs affecting lower urinary tract function</p> | <p>Oxybutynin immediate release (5mg three times daily), propantheline (15mg three times daily) and placebo. Patients were instructed to take the tablets 30m mins before meals</p> | <p>report of urinary symptoms</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status (zero episodes per day)</u><br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/>Any adverse effect<br/>OXY IR: 40/63 (63.5%)<br/>PRO: 24/54 (44.4%)<br/>PLA: 17/52 (32.7%)<br/>Dry mouth</p> | <p>Methodology checklist:<br/>Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - computerised randomisation used<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - opaque packaging used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - No apparent differences between groups at baseline<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes - Study was double-blind<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Pharmacia Leo Therapeutics, Helsingborg, Sweden provided the pharmaceutical preparations</p> | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] pregnancy<br/> 2] congestive heart failure<br/> 3] severe renal / liver disease<br/> 4] myasthenia gravis<br/> 5] unable to swallow / uncooperative patient<br/> 6] hiatal hernic / reflux esophagitis<br/> 7] gastrointestinal tract obstruction<br/> 8] urnary tract obstruction<br/> 9] residual urine &gt; 50ml<br/> 10] untreated urinary tract infection<br/> 11] hyperreflexia without urge</p> |               |         | <p>OXY IR: 30/63 (47.6%)<br/> PRO: 17/54 (31.5%)<br/> PLA: 6/52 (11.5%)</p> <p>Dropouts for any reason<br/> OXY IR: 8/63 (6.3%)<br/> PRO: 6/54 (11.1%)<br/> PLA: 5/52 (9.6%)</p> <p>Dropouts for adverse effects<br/> OXY IR: 2/63 (3.2%)<br/> PRO: 3/54 (5.6%)<br/> PLA: 0/52 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/> - <u>Post-void residual volume</u><br/> Mean ± SE change at endpoint<br/> OXY IR: 27.0 ± 11.6 N = 59<br/> PRO: - 2.2 ± 2.0 N = 48<br/> PLA: -1.9 ± 1.6 N 46</p> <p><b>Week 12</b></p> | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/> 1] Population: Yes<br/> 2] Interventions: Yes<br/> 3] Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |

| <b>Study details</b> | <b>Participants</b> | <b>Interventions</b> | <b>Methods</b> | <b>Outcomes and Results</b> | <b>Comments</b> |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
|                      |                     |                      |                | Not applicable              |                 |

What is the effectiveness of Botulinum toxin A (200U) when compared to placebo

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dmochowski,R., Chapple,C., Nitti,V.W., Chancellor,M., Everaert,K., Thompson,C., Daniell,G., Zhou,J., Haag-Molkenteller,C., Efficacy and safety of onabotulinumtoxinA for idiopathic overactive bladder: a double-blind, placebo controlled, randomized, dose ranging trial, Journal of Urology, 184, 2416-2422, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100191</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA, Canada, Europe</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To assess the safety and efficacy of a range of</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 313</p> <p>BoNT-A 50U = 57<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 54<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 49<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 53<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 56<br/>Placebo = 44</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%) female)</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 53/57 (93.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 50/54 (92.6%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 47/49 (95.9%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 46/53 (86.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 52/56 (92.9%)<br/>Placebo = 40/44 (90.9%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 58.2 ± 15.1 years<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 60.8 ± 12.1 years<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 56.9 ± 13.3 years</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> <p>The BoNT-A concentration per ml in the 10ml dosing syringe was 5U/ml for 50U, 10U/ml for 100U, 15U/ml for 150U, 20U/ml for 200U and 30U/ml for 300U</p> <p>Placebo as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Anticholinergic medication was not permitted within 21 days of entry into the study or after treatment.</p> <p>Injections were administered via flexible or rigid cystoscope under local anesthesia (with or without sedation as per local practice).</p> <p>Before injection the bladder was instilled with 1% to 2% lidocaine (or similar agent) to achieve sufficient anesthesia. The bladder was drained, rinsed and then instilled with enough saline to achieve adequate visualization for the injections.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A formal power calculation was not done but a power of 61% to 92% to detect a between group difference of 4 to 6</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment (Week 12)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day -<br/>Assessed at Week 24<br/>Episodes of incontinence - weekly - Mean - no sd reported<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 7.8<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 4.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 5.6<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8.6<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 11.4<br/>Placebo: 15.3</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 24.9<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 29.8<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 41.0<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 38.7<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 41.3<br/>Placebo: 44.2</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 24)<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 30/56 (53.6%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 29/53 (54.7%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 21/49 (42.9%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 15/54 (27.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 16/57 (28.1%)<br/>Placebo: 6/44 (13.6%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Method was not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|---|
| <p>doses of a single treatment of intradetrusor onabotulinumtoxinA versus placebo in patients with idiopathic OAB and UUI whose symptoms were not adequately managed with anticholinergics"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>July 2005 to June 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>"Supported by Allergan, Inc"</p> | <p>BoNT-A 200U = 59.6 ± 14.9 years<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 58.7 ± 13.0 years<br/>Placebo = 58.7 ± 12.3 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 4.33 ± 2.7<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 3.97 ± 3.2<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 4.04 ± 3.8<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 3.44 ± 2.5<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 3.8 ± 3.0<br/>Placebo = 4.64 ± 2.9</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 44/57 (77.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 44/54 (81.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 34/49 (69.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 42/53 (79.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 40/56 (71.4%)<br/>Placebo = 34/44 (77.3%)</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 106.2 ± 92.2 months<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 99.1 ± 77.2 months<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 127.6 ± 107.4 months</p> |               | <p>weekly UUI episodes was the basis for the sample size of 42 patients per group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Missing values up to week 12 were replaced by the last observation adjusted by the ratio of means for the preceding and current visit for all non-missing values for all patients.</p> | <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12<br/>Scale used - I-QOL- No SD's reported<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 39.7<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 37.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 35.2<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 32.9<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 29.8<br/>Placebo: 17.9</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 9/55 (16.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 11/52 (21.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 10/50 (20.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8/55 (14.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 7/56 (12.5%)<br/>Placebo: 0/43 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>-2.87</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>-2.46</td> <td>2.47</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | -2.87 | 2.10 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | -2.46 | 2.47 | 44 | <p>comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Some baseline data taken from a secondary publication Rovner 2011 - see excluded studies</p> |
|   | Mean   | SD            | Total  |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | -2.87  | 2.10          | 53   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | -2.46  | 2.47          | 44   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|------|----|---------|-------|------|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|---|----|--|
|               | <p>BoNT-A 200U = 107.3 ± 107.2 months<br/> BoNT-A 300U = 114.3 ± 112.1 months<br/> Placebo = 130.8 ± 112.9 months</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] symptoms of OAB with UUI for at least 6 months immediately prior to screening<br/> 2] ≥ 8 UUI episodes/week with no more than 1 incontinence-free day/week<br/> 3] urinary frequency (defined as an average ≥ 8 micturitions/day)<br/> 4] to have not been adequately managed with ≥ 1 anticholinergic drug (defined as an inadequate response to or intolerable side effects after ≥ 1 month of therapy on an optimized dose) in the investigators opinion</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress-predominant urinary incontinence<br/> 2] used clean intermittent catheterization (CIC)<br/> 3] history or evidence of pelvic or urologic abnormalities<br/> 4] disease affecting bladder</p> |               |         | <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>-4.34</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>-2.54</td> <td>4.10</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>29</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>6</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>11</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | -4.34 | 3.49 | 53 | Control | -2.54 | 4.10 | 44 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 29 | 53 | Control | 6 | 44 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 11 | 53 | Control | 0 | 44 | <p>table.</p> <p>Addition supplementary data on 24 week continence status taken from <a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a> (NCT00168454) and from supplementary information from the trialist (as suggested in text)</p> <p>Means and standard deviations were divided by 7 from weekly totals for meta-analysis.</p> |
|               | Mean  | SD            | Total   |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | -4.34   | 3.49          | 53      |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | -2.54   | 4.10          | 44      |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 29  | 53            |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 6   | 44            |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 11  | 53            |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 0   | 44            |         |   |          |      |    |       |              |       |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | function<br>5] $\geq 2$ UTIs within 6 months<br>6] 24-hr total urine volume voided > 3,000 ml or post-void residual (PVR) urine volume > 200 ml at screening   |  |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Flynn,M.K., Amundsen,C.L., Pervich,M., Liu,F., Webster,G.D., Outcome of a randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled trial of botulinum A toxin for refractory overactive bladder, Journal of Urology, 181, 2608-2615, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100214</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 28</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 11<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 10<br/>Placebo = 7</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 11/11 (100%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 10/10 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 7/0 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 76.2 <math>\pm</math> 10.7 years<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 61.7 <math>\pm</math> 13.0 years<br/>Placebo = 74.1 <math>\pm</math> 11.0 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity -n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A was reconstituted in 3 cc saline according to manufacturers instructions and approximately 0.2cc study solution was injected.</p> <p>Placebo was 3cc saline.</p> <p>The detrusor was injected in parallel lines approximately 1 cm apart along the posterior bladder wall, staying superior to the trigone and medial to the ureteral orifices, beginning 1 cm above the interureteral ridge. Three to five injections per line were performed with approximately 1 cm between injections.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The bladder was filled with 40cc 2% lidocaine and 1% viscous lidocaine administered to the urethra for 20 mins. A 14Fr operating sheath with 12 degree cystoscope and a 22 gauge injection needle was inserted into the bladder which was filled with enough saline to smoth the bladder mucosa (approxinnately 100cc)</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"Based on values and standard deviations from our earlier study, an a priori power analysis indicated that we needed 7 subjects per group for a 90% power and a significance of 0.05 to detect a 40% improvement in IE per day at 6 weeks. We assumed</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment (Week 12)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - endpoint at 9 months<br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 6.6 <math>\pm</math> 3.12<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 3.52 <math>\pm</math> 3.0<br/>Placebo: 8.7 <math>\pm</math> 3.76</p> <p>Episodes of frequency<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 0/11 (0%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 1/10 (10.0%)<br/>Placebo: 0/7 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|----|----------------|------|------|---|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>May 2005 - end date not given as study was ongoing at time of publication</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"Supported by the National Institutes of Health National Institute of Aging grant #R21 AG25490-01"</p> | <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] &gt; 2 incontinence episodes per day occurring with urge on a 3-day bladder diary<br/>2] 24 hour pad weight &gt; 100gm<br/>3] failed at least 1 anti-cholinergic medicine and behavioral modifications<br/>4] negative urine culture</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] cough leak point pressure &lt; 100cm H<sub>2</sub>O<br/>2] known neurological condition<br/>3] gross fecal incontinence<br/>4] absent detrusor contraction on pressure flow</p> |               | <p>a 10% dropout rate"</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"Analysis was performed on an intent to treat basis"</p> <p>Method not reported</p> | <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>6.60</td> <td>3.12</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>8.70</td> <td>3.76</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 6.60 | 3.12 | 11 | <b>Control</b> | 8.70 | 3.76 | 7 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 1 | 11 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 7 | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - No - study duration was 6 weeks<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Additional data on mean</p> |
|  | Mean   | SD            | Total   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 6.60   | 3.12          | 11  |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 8.70   | 3.76          | 7   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
|  | Events   | Total         |   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 1  | 11            |   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 0  | 7             |   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |   |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |  |   |   | age and gender incontinence episodes at endpoint taken from <a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a> (NCT00178191)   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Sahai,A., Khan,M.S., Dasgupta,P., Efficacy of botulinum toxin-A for treating idiopathic detrusor overactivity: results from a single center, randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled trial, Journal of Urology, 177, 2231-2236, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100421</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 34</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 16</p> <p>Placebo = 18</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%) female)</u></p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 9/16 (56.3%)</p> <p>Placebo = 10/18 (55.6%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean</u></p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 49.8 years</p> <p>SD not reported</p> <p>Placebo = 50.8 years SD not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 4.98 ± 2.56*</p> <p>Placebo = 3.91 ± 1.91*</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u></p> <p>BoNT-A = 16/16 (100%)</p> <p>Placebo = 18/18 (100%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A 200U was reconstituted in 20 ml 9% normal saline and involved 20 injections of 10U/ml per injection site into the bladder wall sparing the trigone</p> <p>Placebo as 20ml 9% normal saline</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were cleaned and draped, and 20ml 2% lidocaine gel was applied intraurethrally. BoNT-A or placebo was administered with a flexible injection needle via a flexible cystoscope.</p> <p>Patients were observed for 30 minutes and then discharged home with a 3-day prescription of 250mg oral ciprofloxacin twice daily.</p> <p>Patients taking anticholinergics, despite poor treatment efficacy, were asked to continue unless they believed it unnecessary and to inform the investigators when this happened. Those not taking anticholinergics were advised not to restart.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom/day - endpoint at 12 weeks - no sd reported</p> <p>Incontinence episodes - 3 days</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 1.48</p> <p>Placebo: 3.20</p> <p>Urgency episodes - 3 days</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 3.50</p> <p>Placebo: 6.39</p> <p>Continence status</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 8/16 (50.0%)</p> <p>Placebo: 0/16 (0%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - change to week 12</p> <p>Scale used = IIQ-7 - No SD's reported</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: -10.38 (16)</p> <p>Placebo: 0.61 (18)</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment</p> <p>Post-void residual volume (&gt; 150ml) requiring CISC</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 6/18 (33.3%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias</p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias</p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
|---|--|---------------|--|--|----------|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|----|---------|------|------|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|----|---------|------|------|----|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>May 2004 to February 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"Supported by a grant from the British Urological Foundation"</p> <p>"All botulinum toxin-A was provided free of charge by Allergan, Ltd"</p> <p>Secondary publication<br/>"All authors are investigators for Allergan Ltd"</p> | <p>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Data calculated by NCC-WCH</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Age 18 - 80 years<br/>2] symptoms of OAB<br/>3] proven detrusor overactivity on urodynamics<br/>4] failed trial of anticholinergic therapy<br/>5] able and willing to perform CISC</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] OAB secondary to neurological disease<br/>2] evidence of bladder flow obstruction<br/>3] anticoagulant therapy (eg heparin or warfarin)<br/>4] pregnancy or planned pregnancy with a year<br/>5] painful bladder syndrome or institial cystitis<br/>6] indwelling catheter<br/>7] increased post-void residual &gt; 300 ml<br/>8] previous urological use of botuliinum toxin<br/>9] previous bladder surgery</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The study was designed to have 90% power to detect a mean difference of 50 ml in MCC between BoNT-A and placebo assuming that the standard deviation is 42ml using a two-sided type I error of 5%. Thus, at least 32 patients (16 in each group) were required to complete the trial.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>An independent statistician performed the analysis on a per protocol basis. Missing values were imputed based on mean values at specific points.</p> | <p>Placebo: 0/18 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical outcomes<br/>Post-void residual volume (reported as baseline to week 12 change in ml)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: -7.13 (16)<br/>Placebo: -0 (18)</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>0.49</td> <td>2.56</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1.07</td> <td>1.91</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1.17</td> <td>4.48</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>2.13</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> |          | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 0.49 | 2.56 | 16 | Control | 1.07 | 1.91 | 18 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 1.17 | 4.48 | 16 | Control | 2.13 | 1.74 | 18 | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - No - 12 weeks<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Baseline incontinence episodes - SD data not</p> |
|   | Mean   | SD            | Total  |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
| Experimental  | 0.49   | 2.56          | 16   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
| Control   | 1.07   | 1.91          | 18   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
|   | Mean   | SD            | Total  |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
| Experimental  | 1.17   | 4.48          | 16   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |
| Control   | 2.13   | 1.74          | 18   |  |          |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|----|---------|-------|------|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|---|
|   | (eg cystoplasty)<br>10] other bladder pathology<br>(eg transitional cell carcinoma. current UTI)<br>11] neuromuscular transmission disorder (eg myasthenia gravis, Eaton-Lambert syndrome) |   |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>8</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>7.94</td> <td>7.44</td> <td>16</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>15.39</td> <td>8.06</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 8 | 16 | Control | 0 | 18 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 7.94 | 7.44 | 16 | Control | 15.39 | 8.06 | 18 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 18 | Control | 0 | 18 | <p>provided but calculated from SEM provided</p> <p>Standard deviations at endpoint not given so baseline standard deviations used.</p> |
|   | Events   | Total   |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 8  | 16  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control   | 0  | 18  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|   | Mean   | SD  | Total   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 7.94   | 7.44  | 16  |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control   | 15.39  | 8.06  | 18  |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|   | Events   | Total   |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 6  | 18  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control   | 0  | 18  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Brubaker,L., Richter,H.E., Visco,A., Mahajan,S., Nygaard,I., Braun,T.M., Barber,M.D., Menefee,S., Schaffer,J., Weber,A.M.,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 43</p> <p>BoNT-A 200 U = 28</p> <p>Placebo = 15</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A 200U was dissolved in 6 ml saline and divided into 2 syringes each containing 3ml</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Syringes were prepared by study pharmacists and they appeared identical to the injecting physician. All physicians administering</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 6/28 (23.1%)</p> <p>Placebo: 4/15 (26.7%)</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |       |      |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|-------|----|---|
| <p>Wei,J., Pelvic Floor,Disorders Network, Refractory idiopathic urge urinary incontinence and botulinum A injection, Journal of Urology, 180, 217-222, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>101247</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>'To compare the effect of 200U intradetrusor BoNT-A vs placebo on improvement in urge incontinence symptoms in neurologically normal women with DOI refractory to at least 2 first line treatments.'</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 28/28 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 15/15 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 64.7 ± 14.5 years<br/>Placebo = 69.2 ± 13.5 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 7.15 ± 7.59<br/>Placebo = 6.33 ± 2.67</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 28/28 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 15/15 (100%)</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Females at least 21 years of age<br/>2] Six or more urge incontinence episodes on a 3-day bladder diary.<br/>3] Demonstrate DOI on urodynamic testing within the last year.<br/>4] Refractory DOI symptom</p> | <p>Placebo - 6 ml saline in two 3ml syringes</p> <p>Injections were administered into 15 to 20 detrusor muscle sites (in 3 rows) on posterior bladder wall avoiding the trigone and ureteral orifice. 0.1 ml indigo carmine was added to the total volumes as a marker for detrusor injection sites.</p> | <p>injections were experienced with cystoscopic injection techniques and they performed the procedure in standardized fashion, as instructed using an injection technique video.</p> <p>All subjects received an antibiotic before the injection and for 3 days thereafter. Subjects unable to void after injection were taught intermittent self-catheterization.</p> <p>Subjects with inadequate symptom improvement (PGI-I 4 or greater) who requested a second injection were eligible to receive an open label injection of 200 U BoNT-A at least 8 weeks but no more than 52 weeks after the first injection. All subjects were to be followed for 12 months after the first injection but not less than 1 month following the second injection or to study withdrawal up to a maximum of 13 months.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> | <p>symptom reduction per day<br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of frequency<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes per day)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life (endpoint at 1 month)<br/>Scale used = UDI<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 67.7 ± 55.4 (28)<br/>Placebo: 97.4 ± 58.3 (15)</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment - Increased PVR requiring intermittent catheterisation<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 12/28 (43%)<br/>Placebo: 0/15 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>67.70</td> <td>55.40</td> <td>28</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 67.70 | 55.40 | 28 | <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - No<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - No - More dropped out in BoNT-A 200U group<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - No<br/>Duration of study was 52 weeks but assessments were at 1 month not the planned 6 months</p> |
|  | Mean   | SD   | Total  |  |          |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |   |
| Experimental   | 67.70  | 55.40  | 28   |  |          |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |   |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments       |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|----------------|-------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|---|----|--|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>'Botox was provided to the National Institutes of Health for this study by Allergan, Inc., Irvine, California under Investigational New Drug BB 12,780.</p> <p>Supported by Grants 2U01 HD41249, 2U10 HD41250, 2U10 HD41261, 2U10 HD41267, 1U10 HD54136, 1U10 HD54214, 1U10 HD54215 and 1U10 HD54241 from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.'</p> | <p>control, defined as patients with inadequate symptom control after at least two first-line therapies for DOI. First-line therapies include: pharmacotherapy, supervised behavioral therapy, supervised physical therapy, supervised biofeedback, and electrical stimulation (transvaginal or implanted neuromodulation). First-line pharmacotherapy must include at least two trials of DOI medication for a minimum of 1 month each unless the drug is not tolerated.</p> <p>5] Neurologically normal on exam, defined as normal knee reflexes, perineal sensation, and no gross neurologic abnormalities believed to affect urinary function</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Untreated urinary retention, defined as post-void residual greater than 150 ml after a measured void of greater than 150 mL within the last 3 months (including exclusion of patients using intermittent straight catheterization)</p> <p>2] Surgically altered detrusor muscle, such as</p> |               | <p>Sample size was calculated to test efficacy rates of 30% for placebo and 50% for BoNT-A after approximately 6 months of follow-up. A dichotomous outcome (success/failure) was assumed with 2:1 randomization. A sample size of 210 subjects provided 80% power to test the hypothesis using a 2-tailed 5% level of significance. This sample size also permitted the testing of an effect size of 0.2 in the continuous measures of quality of life.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>No allowance was made for subjects lost to follow-up.</p> | <table border="1" data-bbox="1400 272 1749 344"> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>97.40</td> <td>58.30</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1400 456 1704 679"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>12</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Control</b> | 97.40 | 58.30 | 15 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 12 | 28 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 15 | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear - This was not reported<br/> Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/> 1] Population - Yes<br/> 2] Intervention - No - participants could get a second injection after 8 weeks<br/> 3] Outcome - No - Need for self-catherisation was not reported clearly<br/> Indirectness: Serious</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Study terminated early due to higher than anticipated rate of increased post-void residual in subjects who received botulinum toxin A injection</p> |
| <b>Control</b>  | 97.40   | 58.30         | 15  |  |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |
|   | Events  | Total         |   |  |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 12  | 28            |   |  |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 0   | 15            |   |  |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|----------------------|--|
|               | augmentation cystoplasty<br>3] Known allergy to Botox<br>4] Prior treatment with intra-<br>detrusor Botox in the last<br>year<br>5] Symptomatic urinary tract<br>infection<br>6] Currently pregnant or<br>lactating patients or patients<br>planning pregnancy within<br>the next year<br>7] Sexually active<br>premenopausal women with<br>a uterus not on a medically<br>approved form of<br>contraception for at least 3<br>months prior to study<br>participation;<br>8] Cystoscopic findings that<br>preclude injection, in the<br>opinion of the investigator<br>9] Current or prior bladder<br>malignancy<br>10] Patients with known<br>neurological diseases<br>involving impaired<br>neurotransmission<br>11] Patients who are on<br>ambulatory anticoagulant<br>therapy, including aspirin,<br>who are unable to<br>discontinue this treatment for<br>24 hours prior to the bladder<br>injection<br>12] Suspected or previously<br>diagnosed interstitial cystitis<br>or chronic pelvic pain<br>syndrome<br>13] Women with hematuria<br>who have not undergone a |               |         |                      | Further injections were<br>not given.<br><br>Required sample size not<br>reached |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | <p>clinically appropriate evaluation</p> <p>14] Women taking aminoglycosides at the time of injection</p> <p>15] Blood creatinine level greater than twice the upper limit of normal</p>  |   |   |   |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Tincello,D.G., Kenyon,S., Abrams,K.R., Mayne,C., Toozs-Hobson,P., Taylor,D., Slack,M., Botulinum toxin a versus placebo for refractory detrusor overactivity in women: a randomised blinded placebo-controlled trial of 240 women (the RELAX study), European Urology, 62, 507-514, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>216211</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 240</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 122</p> <p>Placebo = 118</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 122/122 (100%)</p> <p>Placebo = 118/118 (100%)</p> <p>Age - Mean (range)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 60.7 (50.8 - 67.8)</p> <p>Placebo = 58.2 (51.5 - 69.2)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes / day - Median (Interquartile range)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 6.2 (3.7 - 8.3)</p> <p>Placebo = 6.2 (3.0 - 8.7)</p> <p>Urgency episodes / day - Median (Interquartile range)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 8.0 (5.7 -</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Women received 200U of BoNT-A or placebo (vacuum dried 0.9% sodium chloride) diluted in 20ml of normal saline (10U/ml) injected into 20 sites, sparing the trigone</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Antibiotic prophylaxis was not required but 2 centres administered intraoperative antibiotics</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>To detect a difference in outcome of 2.29 voids per 24 hours at the 5% statistical significance level, a minimum sample of 220 patients was required. To allow for 10% dropout rate 240 women were recruited.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Intention to treat analysis reported but no further information provided</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment - endpoint at 6 months</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - endpoint at 6 months*</p> <p>Episodes of incontinence - Mean <math>\pm</math> sd (N)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 3.1 <math>\pm</math> 4.0 (116)</p> <p>Placebo: 5.7 <math>\pm</math> 4.8 (111)</p> <p>Episodes of frequency</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 4.4 <math>\pm</math> 3.7 (116)</p> <p>Placebo: 6.8 <math>\pm</math> 4.5 (111)</p> <p>Continence status - no leaks at 6 months*</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 31/122 (17.2%)</p> <p>Placebo: 12/118 (10.2%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - endpoint at 6 months*</p> <p>Scale used - I-QOL</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias</p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - prepackaged drug packs</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes - no significant differences</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias</p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Unclear - study was double-blind but no other details reported</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|--|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|-----|----------------|------|------|-----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|-----|----------------|------|------|-----|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To examine efficacy and safety of BoNT-A for refractory IDO in women"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>July 2006 to November 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"Wellbeing of Women &amp; Moulton Charitable Trust. Drugs were provided by Allergan but the company had no further involvement"</p> | <p>10.3)<br/>Placebo = 7.7 (6.0 - 9.7)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)*<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 122/122 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 118/118 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] refractory IDO after 8 weeks of treatment with any anticholinergic and any of the following responses on Patient Global Impression fo Improvement 'a little better' or 'worse', verbal report of unacceptable improvement, treatment stopped for side effects, patients previous treatment with no benefit<br/>2] &gt; 8 voids &amp; ≥ 2 urgency episodes per day</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urodynamic stress incontinence<br/>2] neurologic disease<br/>3] voiding dysfunction<br/>4] contraindications to onabotulinumtoxinA</p> |               |         | <p>BoNT-A 200U: 53.0 ± 31.1 (116)<br/>Placebo: 33.5 ± 22.6 (111)</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment*<br/>Intermittent catheterisation<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 18/122 (14.7%)<br/>Placebo: 4/118 (3.4%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>3.10</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>5.70</td> <td>4.80</td> <td>111</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>4.40</td> <td>3.70</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>6.80</td> <td>4.50</td> <td>111</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 3.10 | 4.00 | 116 | <b>Control</b> | 5.70 | 4.80 | 111 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 4.40 | 3.70 | 116 | <b>Control</b> | 6.80 | 4.50 | 111 | <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear - study was double-blind but no other details reported<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes 6/122 and 5/118<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Unclear - Not reported<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear - - not reported<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes</p> |
|   | Mean  | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 3.10  | 4.00          | 116     |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 5.70  | 4.80          | 111     |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
|   | Mean  | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 4.40  | 3.70          | 116     |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 6.80  | 4.50          | 111     |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |     |                |      |      |     |   |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|--------|-------|-----|---------|--------|-------|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|---|-----|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p data-bbox="1391 272 1771 304"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1391 328 1704 552"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>31</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>12</td> <td>112</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1391 608 1771 639"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1391 663 1749 887"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>-53.00</td> <td>31.10</td> <td>116</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>-33.50</td> <td>22.60</td> <td>111</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1391 943 1771 975"><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1391 999 1704 1222"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>18</td> <td>122</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>4</td> <td>118</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 31 | 116 | Control | 12 | 112 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | -53.00 | 31.10 | 116 | Control | -33.50 | 22.60 | 111 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 18 | 122 | Control | 4 | 118 | <p data-bbox="1771 272 2051 360">2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p data-bbox="1771 416 2051 448"><b>Other information</b></p> <p data-bbox="1771 472 2051 576">* 6 month outcome data taken from conference abstract in excluded studies table</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Experimental  | 31           | 116           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Control       | 12           | 112           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
|               | Mean         | SD            | Total   |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Experimental  | -53.00       | 31.10         | 116     |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Control       | -33.50       | 22.60         | 111     |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Experimental  | 18           | 122           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |
| Control       | 4            | 118           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |     |         |        |       |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |   |

What is the effectiveness of Botulinum toxin A (200U) when compared to Botulinum toxin A (100U)

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dmochowski,R., Chapple,C., Nitti,V.W., Chancellor,M., Everaert,K., Thompson,C., Daniell,G., Zhou,J., Haag-Molkeneller,C., Efficacy and safety of onabotulinumtoxinA for idiopathic overactive bladder: a double-blind, placebo controlled, randomized, dose ranging trial, Journal of Urology, 184, 2416-2422, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100191</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA, Canada, Europe</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To assess the safety and efficacy of a range of doses of a single treatment of intradetrusor</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 313</p> <p>BoNT-A 50U = 57<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 54<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 49<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 53<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 56<br/>Placebo = 44</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 53/57 (93.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 50/54 (92.6%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 47/49 (95.9%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 46/53 (86.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 52/56 (92.9%)<br/>Placebo = 40/44 (90.9%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 58.2 ± 15.1 years<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 60.8 ± 12.1 years<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 56.9 ± 13.3 years<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 59.6 ±</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> <p>The BoNT-A concentration per ml in the10ml dosing syringe was 5U/ml for 50U, 10U/ml for 100U, 15U/ml for 150U, 20U/ml for 200U and 30U/ml for 300U</p> <p>Placebo as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Anticholinergic medication was not permitted within 21 days of entry into the study or after treatment.</p> <p>Injections were administered via flexible or rigid cystoscope under local anesthesia (with or without sedation as per local practice.</p> <p>Before injection the bladder was instilled with 1% to 2% lidocaine (or similar agent) to achieve sufficient anesthesia. The bladder was drained, rinsed and then instilled with enough saline to achieve adequate visualization for the injections.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A formal power calculation was not done but a power of 61% to 92% to detect a between group difference of 4 to 6 weekly UUI episodes was the basis for the sample size of 42 patients per group.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment (Week 12)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day -<br/>Assessed at Week 24<br/>Episodes of incontinence - weekly - Mean - no sd reported<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 7.8<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 4.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 5.6<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8.6<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 11.4<br/>Placebo: 15.3</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 24.9<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 29.8<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 41.0<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 38.7<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 41.3<br/>Placebo: 44.2</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 24)<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 30/56 (53.6%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 29/53 (54.7%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 21/49 (42.9%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 15/54 (27.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 16/57 (28.1%)<br/>Placebo: 6/44 (13.6%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Method was not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|---|
| <p>onabotulinumtoxinA versus placebo in patients with idiopathic OAB and UUI whose symptoms were not adequately managed with anticholinergics"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>July 2005 to June 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"Supported by Allergan, Inc"</p> | <p>14.9 years<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 58.7 ± 13.0 years<br/>Placebo = 58.7 ± 12.3 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 4.33 ± 2.7<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 3.97 ± 3.2<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 4.04 ± 3.8<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 3.44 ± 2.5<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 3.8 ± 3.0<br/>Placebo = 4.64 ± 2.9</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 44/57 (77.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 44/54 (81.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 34/49 (69.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 42/53 (79.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 40/56 (71.4%)<br/>Placebo = 34/44 (77.3%)</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB -</u></p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Missing values up to week 12 were replaced by the last observation adjusted by the ratio of means for the preceding and current visit for all non-missing values for all patients.</p> | <p>Scale used - I-QOL- No SD's reported<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 39.7<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 37.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 35.2<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 32.9<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 29.8<br/>Placebo: 17.9</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 9/55 (16.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 11/52 (21.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 10/50 (20.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8/55 (14.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 7/56 (12.5%)<br/>Placebo: 0/43 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>-2.87</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>-2.74</td> <td>2.67</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | -2.87 | 2.10 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | -2.74 | 2.67 | 54 | <p>data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of:<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Some baseline data taken from a secondary publication Rovner 2011 - see excluded studies table.</p> <p>Addition supplementary data on 24 week</p> |
|  | Mean   | SD            | Total   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | -2.87  | 2.10          | 53  |   |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | -2.74  | 2.67          | 54  |   |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |   |

| Study details       | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
|---------------------|--|---------------|---------|--|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|---|----|---|
|                     | <p><u>Mean ± SD</u><br/> BoNT-A 50U = 106.2 ± 92.2 months<br/> BoNT-A 100U = 99.1 ± 77.2 months<br/> BoNT-A 150U = 127.6 ± 107.4 months<br/> BoNT-A 200U = 107.3 ± 107.2 months<br/> BoNT-A 300U = 114.3 ± 112.1 months<br/> Placebo = 130.8 ± 112.9 months</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] symptoms of OAB with UUI for at least 6 months immediately prior to screening<br/> 2] ≥ 8 UUI episodes/week with no more than 1 incontinence-free day/week<br/> 3] urinary frequency (defined as an average ≥ 8 micturitions/day)<br/> 4] to have not been adequately managed with ≥ 1 anticholinergic drug (defined as an inadequate response to or intolerable side effects after ≥ 1 month of therapy on an optimized dose) in the investigators opinion</p> |               |         | <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>-4.34</td> <td>3.49</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>-4.46</td> <td>3.81</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>29</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>15</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>11</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | -4.34 | 3.49 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | -4.46 | 3.81 | 54 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 29 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | 15 | 54 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 11 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 54 | <p>continence status taken from <a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a> (NCT00168454) and from supplementary information from the trialist (as suggested in text)</p> <p>Means and standard deviations were divided by 7 from weekly totals for meta-analysis.</p> |
|                     | Mean   | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | -4.34  | 3.49          | 53      |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | -4.46  | 3.81          | 54      |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
|                     | Events   | Total         |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 29   | 53            |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 15   | 54            |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
|                     | Events   | Total         |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 11   | 53            |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 0  | 54            |         |  |          |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |   |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress-predominant urinary incontinence<br/> 2] used clean intermittent catheterization (CIC)<br/> 3] history or evidence of pelvic or urologic abnormalities<br/> 4] disease affecting bladder function<br/> 5] <math>\geq 2</math> UTI's within 6 months<br/> 6] 24-hr total urine volume voided &gt; 3,000 ml or post-void residual (PVR) urine volume &gt; 200 ml at screening</p> |   |   |   |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Altaweel,W., Mokhtar,A., Rabah,D.M., Prospective randomized trial of 100u vs 200u botox in the treatment of idiopathic overactive bladder, Urology Annals, 3, 66-70, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>176921</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 22</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Age - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean (No SD reported)</u></p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Each BTX-A 100u was diluted with 10 ml normal saline. Intradetrusor injection of BTX-A was performed in the posterior and lateral walls of the urinary bladder, with an equivalent dose (1cc/injection) given at each site, using a rigid cystoscopic injection instrument 22F and a 23-gauge injection needle. The injection needle was inserted and injected</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>After treatment, a 14F urethral Foley catheter was inserted, and oral antibiotics were prescribed for the next five days. Patients were discharged the same day after the procedure catheter free unless developed retention. The patient's voiding condition was followed up at the outpatient clinic two weeks later with residual volume measurement and then after one, three, six</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Mean (No SD reported)<br/> Change from baseline for Incontinence episodes<br/> BoNT-A 200U = -1.2<br/> BoNT-A 100U = -1.0</p> <p>Change from baseline for Urgency episodes<br/> BoNT-A 200U = -6.7<br/> BoNT-A 100U = -7.9</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/> A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - No - Alternation used<br/> A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/> A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline -</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|--|--|---|---|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|
| <p>Saudi Arabia</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the clinical outcome of two different doses of BTX-A in patients with idiopathic over active bladder"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Jan 1 2008 to Mar 30 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>No funding sources reported</p> | <p>BoNT-A 200U = 3.8<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 4.2</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean (No SD reported)</u><br/>BoNT-A 200U = 9.6<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 11.2</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] refractory idiopathic overactive bladder defined as failure of symptom control despite use of antimuscarinic treatment using toleterodine 4 mg/day or oxybutanine 15 mg/day during the previous three months.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] post void residual (PVR) urine volume of more than 150 ml<br/>2] neurogenic bladder</p> | <p>directly into the detrusor muscle. After treatment, a 14F urethral Foley catheter was inserted, and oral antibiotics were prescribed for the next five days. Patients were discharged the same day after the procedure catheter free unless developed retention.</p> | <p>and nine months follow-up by voiding diary. If the PVR volume exceeded 200 ml at the follow-up visits, clean intermittent self-catheterization was recommended for evacuation of the bladder at least four times daily. An indwelling Foley catheter was placed for one week if transient urinary retention developed. The use of anticholinergic agents was discontinued one week before BTX-A injection. The use of urodynamic parameters assessed included maximum cystometric capacity (MCC), maximal voiding detrusor pressure, and maximal flow rate during voiding and PVR urine volume. Follow-up urodynamic studies were performed at three months after treatment. Antibiotics were given for urinary tract infection until the urinalysis results became negative. Data on adverse events including acute urinary retention, difficult urination, urinary tract infection and gross hematuria after BTX-A treatment were collected during follow-up examinations.</p> | <p>Continenence status (Zero episodes per day) at 9 months<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 3/11 (27.3%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 1/11 (9.1%)</p> <p>Incontinence specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment -<br/>Need for catheterisation at 200cc indication<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 2/11 (18.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 100 U = 1/11 (9.1%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures - Mean ± SD<br/>Post-void residual volume at 3 months<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 78 ± 34<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 62 ± 49</p> <p><b>Continenence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>3</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 3 | 11 | <b>Control</b> | 1 | 11 | <p>Yes<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes - No dropouts reported<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> |
|  | Events   | Total   |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 3  | 11  |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 1  | 11  |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|-------|----|---------|-------|-------|----|--|
|               | 3] bladder outlet obstruction<br>4] urinary tract infection |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>None reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <table border="1" data-bbox="1391 272 1697 496"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post void residual volume</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1391 608 1742 823"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>78.00</td> <td>34.00</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>62.00</td> <td>49.00</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 2 | 11 | Control | 1 | 11 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 78.00 | 34.00 | 11 | Control | 62.00 | 49.00 | 11 | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Unclear if population included women<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: Serious</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>NA</p> |
|               | Events  | Total         |  |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
| Experimental  | 2   | 11            |  |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
| Control       | 1   | 11            |  |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
|               | Mean  | SD            | Total  |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
| Experimental  | 78.00   | 34.00         | 11   |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |
| Control       | 62.00   | 49.00         | 11   |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |

## Urinary incontinence (update)

What is the effectiveness of Botulinum toxin A (100U) when compared to placebo

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dmochowski,R., Chapple,C., Nitti,V.W., Chancellor,M., Everaert,K., Thompson,C., Daniell,G., Zhou,J., Haag-Molkenteller,C., Efficacy and safety of onabotulinumtoxinA for idiopathic overactive bladder: a double-blind, placebo controlled, randomized, dose ranging trial, Journal of Urology, 184, 2416-2422, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100191</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA, Canada, Europe</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To assess the safety and</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 313</p> <p>BoNT-A 50U = 57</p> <p>BoNT-A 100U = 54</p> <p>BoNT-A 150U = 49</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 53</p> <p>BoNT-A 300U = 56</p> <p>Placebo = 44</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>BoNT-A 50U = 53/57 (93.0%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 100U = 50/54 (92.6%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 150U = 47/49 (95.9%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U = 46/53 (86.8%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 300U = 52/56 (92.9%)</p> <p>Placebo = 40/44 (90.9%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>BoNT-A 50U = 58.2 ± 15.1 years</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>BoNT-A as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> <p>The BoNT-A concentration per ml in the10ml dosing syringe was 5U/ml for 50U, 10U/ml for 100U, 15U/ml for 150U, 20U/ml for 200U and 30U/ml for 300U</p> <p>Placebo as 20 intradetrusor injections of 0.5 ml, avoiding the trigone and dome</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Anticholinergic medication was not permitted within 21 days of entry into the study or after treatment.</p> <p>Injections were administered via flexible or rigid cystoscope under local anesthesia (with or without sedation as per local practice.</p> <p>Before injection the bladder was instilled with 1% to 2% lidocaine (or similar agent) to achieve sufficient anesthesia. The bladder was drained, rinsed and then instilled with enough saline to achieve adequate visualization for the injections.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment (Week 12)</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Assessed at Week 24</p> <p>Episodes of incontinence - weekly - Mean - no sd reported</p> <p>BoNT-A 300U: 7.8</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 4.1</p> <p>BoNT-A 150U: 5.6</p> <p>BoNT-A 100U: 8.6</p> <p>BoNT-A 50U: 11.4</p> <p>Placebo: 15.3</p> <p>Episodes of urgency</p> <p>BoNT-A 300U: 24.9</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 29.8</p> <p>BoNT-A 150U: 41.0</p> <p>BoNT-A 100U: 38.7</p> <p>BoNT-A 50U: 41.3</p> <p>Placebo: 44.2</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 24)</p> <p>BoNT-A 300U: 30/56 (53.6%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 200U: 29/53 (54.7%)</p> <p>BoNT-A 150U: 21/49 (42.9%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Method was not reported</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |  |  |  |  |   |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|----------|------|----|-------|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>efficacy of a range of doses of a single treatment of intradetrusor onabotulinumtoxinA versus placebo in patients with idiopathic OAB and UUI whose symptoms were not adequately managed with anticholinergics"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>July 2005 to June 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>"Supported by Allergan, Inc"</p> | <p>BoNT-A 100U = 60.8 ± 12.1 years<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 56.9 ± 13.3 years<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 59.6 ± 14.9 years<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 58.7 ± 13.0 years<br/>Placebo = 58.7 ± 12.3 years</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 4.33 ± 2.7<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 3.97 ± 3.2<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 4.04 ± 3.8<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 3.44 ± 2.5<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 3.8 ± 3.0<br/>Placebo = 4.64 ± 2.9</p> <p><u>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 44/57 (77.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 44/54 (81.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 34/49 (69.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 42/53 (79.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 40/56</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A formal power calculation was not done but a power of 61% to 92% to detect a between group difference of 4 to 6 weekly UUI episodes was the basis for the sample size of 42 patients per group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Missing values up to week 12 were replaced by the last observation adjusted by the ratio of means for the preceding and current visit for all non-missing values for all patients.</p> | <p>BoNT-A 100U: 15/54 (27.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 16/57 (28.1%)<br/>Placebo: 6/44 (13.6%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12<br/>Scale used - I-QOL- No SD's reported<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 39.7<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 37.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 35.2<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 32.9<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 29.8<br/>Placebo: 17.9</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>BoNT-A 300U: 9/55 (16.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 200U: 11/52 (21.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 10/50 (20.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8/55 (14.5%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 7/56 (12.5%)<br/>Placebo: 0/43 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total |  |  |  |  | <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Some baseline data</p> |
|  | Mean  | SD            | Total   |  |          |      |    |       |  |  |  |  |   |
|  |   |               |   |  |          |      |    |       |  |  |  |  |   |

| Study details       | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments            |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
|---------------------|--|---------------|---------|---|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|---|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|---|
|                     | <p>(71.4%)<br/>Placebo = 34/44<br/>(77.3%)</p> <p><u>Duration of OAB -<br/>Mean ± SD</u><br/>BoNT-A 50U = 106.2 ± 92.2 months<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 99.1 ± 77.2 months<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 127.6 ± 107.4 months<br/>BoNT-A 200U = 107.3 ± 107.2 months<br/>BoNT-A 300U = 114.3 ± 112.1 months<br/>Placebo = 130.8 ± 112.9 months</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] symptoms of OAB with UUI for at least 6 months immediately prior to screening<br/>2] ≥ 8 UUI episodes/week with no more than 1 incontinence-free day/week<br/>3] urinary frequency (defined as an average ≥ 8 micturitions/day)<br/>4] to have not been adequately managed with ≥ 1 anticholinergic drug (defined as an inadequate response to or intolerable side</p> |               |         | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>-2.74</td> <td>2.67</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>-2.46</td> <td>2.47</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>-4.46</td> <td>3.81</td> <td>53</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>-2.54</td> <td>4.10</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>15</td> <td>54</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Experimental</b> | -2.74 | 2.67 | 54 | <b>Control</b> | -2.46 | 2.47 | 44 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | -4.46 | 3.81 | 53 | <b>Control</b> | -2.54 | 4.10 | 44 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 15 | 54 | <b>Control</b> | 6 | 44 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 6 | 54 | <p>taken from a secondary publication Rovner 2011 - see excluded studies table.</p> <p>Addition supplementary data on 24 week continence status taken from <a href="http://www.clinicaltrials.gov">www.clinicaltrials.gov</a> (NCT00168454) and from supplementary information from the triallist (as suggested in text)</p> <p>Means and standard deviations were divided by 7 from weekly totals for meta-analysis.</p> |
| <b>Experimental</b> | -2.74  | 2.67          | 54      |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | -2.46  | 2.47          | 44      |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
|                     | Mean   | SD            | Total   |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | -4.46  | 3.81          | 53      |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | -2.54  | 4.10          | 44      |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
|                     | Events   | Total         |         |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 15   | 54            |         |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 6  | 44            |         |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
|                     | Events   | Total         |         |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 6  | 54            |         |   |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |   |    |  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|----|--|
|  | <p>effects after <math>\geq 1</math> month of therapy on an optimized dose) in the investigator's opinion</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] stress-predominant urinary incontinence<br/> 2] used clean intermittent catheterization (CIC)<br/> 3] history or evidence of pelvic or urologic abnormalities<br/> 4] disease affecting bladder function<br/> 5] <math>\geq 2</math> UTI's within 6 months<br/> 6] 24-hr total urine volume voided <math>&gt; 3,000</math> ml or post-void residual (PVR) urine volume <math>&gt; 200</math> ml at screening</p> |  |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </table>  | Control  | 0 | 44 |  |
| Control  | 0   | 44   |  |   |  |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Jabs,C., Carleton,E., Efficacy of botulinum toxin a intradetrusor injections for nonneurogenic urinary urge incontinence - A randomized double-blind control trial, Neurourology and Urodynamics, 29, 1228-1229, 2010</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 20</p> <p>Botulinum toxin A (BoNT-A) = 11<br/> Placebo (PLA) = 9</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (%)</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Botulinum toxin A (100U) or saline placebo intradetrusor injection via cystoscopy</p> <p>Number of injections not specified</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Women were recruited from clinical practice of traillist. An operating room nurse mixed the solutions (details not provided). Both patient and surgeon were blinded for 6 months.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Assessed at Week 24<br/> Incontinence episodes - weekly - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/> BoNT-A 100U: 2.0 <math>\pm</math> 3.0 N = 11</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/> A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes -</p> |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |   |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|----|----------------|------|------|---|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>128924</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To determine the efficacy of intradetrusor injection of botullinum toxin A on non-neurogenic urinary urge incontinence</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p>female)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 11/11 (100%)<br/>PLA = 9/9 (100%)</p> <p>Age<br/>Not reported by group but overall mean age was 64.5 (range 48 to 84)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 6.1 <math>\pm</math> 5.9<br/>Placebo = 5.2 <math>\pm</math> 2.3</p> <p>Urgency episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] &gt; 28 years of age<br/>2] confirmed diagnosis of idiopathic urge incontinence refractory to anticholinergic treatment</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Placebo: 5.3 <math>\pm</math> 5.0 N = 9</p> <p>Urgency episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 24)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 6/11 (54.5%)<br/>Placebo: Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>2.00</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>11</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>5.30</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 2.00 | 3.00 | 11 | <b>Control</b> | 5.30 | 5.00 | 9 | <p>Random number table used</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Yes - envelopes used</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - No- Placebo group reported fewer incontinence episodes at baseline</p> <p>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p>B Performance bias</p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias</p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias</p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to</p> |
|  | Mean   | SD            | Total   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 2.00   | 3.00          | 11  |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 5.30   | 5.00          | 9   |   |          |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |   |   |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
|  | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>   |   |   |  | <p>assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Dowson,C., Sahai,A., Watkins,J., Dasgupta,P., Khan,M.S., The safety and efficacy of botulinum toxin-A in the management of bladder oversensitivity: a randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial, International Journal of Clinical Practice, 65, 698-704, 2011</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 23</p> <p>Botulinum toxin A (BoNT-A 100U) = 10<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 13</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)*<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 8/10 (80.0%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Prior to the injection, a urine sample was taken to exclude infection (and pregnancy if appropriate) and all received an oral dose of ciprofloxacin 500mg<br/>Lignocaine gel was applied to the urethra prior to cystoscopy.</p> <p>Intradetrusor, trignone spearing injections of either BoNT-A 100U or saline were performed with a flexible cystoscopic technique using a 4mm Olympus needle. Ten sites</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Study procedures were performed by a single surgeon.<br/>Urodynamics were performed in accordance with the ICS guidelines.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment (Week 12)<br/>BoNT-A: 2/10 (20.0%)<br/>PLA: 0/13 (0%)</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Incontinence episodes - change score - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>BoNT-A 100U: -0.1 (No SD)<br/>PLA: 0.9 (No SD)</p> <p>Urgency episodes - change</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Yes - independent statistician used<br/>A2 - Was there adequate</p>  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|---|--|---|---|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>129097</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>November 2007 to November 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>"All authors are investigators for Allergan"</p> | <p>PLA = 7/11 (63.6%)</p> <p>Age - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 49.6 <math>\pm</math> 19 years<br/>PLA = 46.7 <math>\pm</math> 17 years</p> <p>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 1.2 (No SD)<br/>PLA = 2 (No SD)</p> <p>Urgency episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 12.4 (No SD)<br/>PLA = 10.8 (No SD)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>* completers only</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Aged between 18 and 79 years<br/>2] diagnosis of bladder oversensitivity<br/>3] failed conservative and pharmacological treatment including at least 1 anticholinergic</p> | <p>along the base, posterior and lateral walls of the bladder were injected with 1ml of solution of BoNT-A 100U in saline solution or normal saline.</p> <p>All were given a three day course of ciprofloxacin 500mg twice daily.</p> | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>score<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 0.1 (No SD)<br/>PLA: 1.0 (No SD)</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 24)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12<br/>Scale used - UDI-6<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 8.2 (No SD)<br/>Placebo: 8.6 (No SD)</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 3/10 (30.0%)<br/>PLA: 0/13 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 2 | 10 | Control | 0 | 13 | <p>concealment - YEs<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable methods used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear</p> |
|   | Events   | Total   |   |  |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 2  | 10  |   |  |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control   | 0  | 13  |   |  |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods                         | Outcomes and Results  | Comments                            |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|----|----------------|------|------|----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|------|----|----------------|-------|------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|---|
|  | <p>medication</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] current or planned pregnancy<br/> 2] breast feeding<br/> 3] painful bladder syndrome<br/> 4] pre-existing neurological condition<br/> 5] evidence of bladder outflow obstruction<br/> 6] indwelling catheter<br/> 7] previous bladder surgery<br/> 8] previous urological use of botulinum toxin A<br/> 9] continued anticoagulation with heparin or warfarin</p> |   |                                 | <p><b>Incontinence episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>1.10</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>2.90</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Urgency episodes</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>12.50</td> <td>5.90</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>11.80</td> <td>5.90</td> <td>11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>3</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |                                     | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 1.10 | 2.20 | 10 | <b>Control</b> | 2.90 | 2.20 | 11 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 12.50 | 5.90 | 10 | <b>Control</b> | 11.80 | 5.90 | 11 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 3 | 10 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 13 | <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/> 1] Population - Yes<br/> 2] Intervention - Yes<br/> 3] Outcome - No - outcomes reported at 12 weeks<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |
|  | Mean   | SD  | Total                           |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>                                    | 1.10   | 2.20  | 10                              |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 2.90   | 2.20  | 11                              |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|  | Mean   | SD  | Total                           |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>                                    | 12.50  | 5.90  | 10                              |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 11.80  | 5.90  | 11                              |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|  | Events   | Total   |                                 |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>                                    | 3  | 10  |                                 |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 0  | 13  |                                 |   |                                     |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Full citation</b>                                   | <b>Sample size</b>   | <b>Interventions</b>  | <b>Details</b>                  | <b>Results</b>  | <b>Limitations</b>                  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| Denys,P., Le,Normand L., Ghout,I., Costa,P., Chartier- | N = 107  | OnabotulinumtoxinA was used in the following doses; 50U, 100U | All women were trained and were | Patient satisfaction with treatment   | NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |      |    |                |       |      |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Kastler,E., Grise,P., Hermieu,J.F., Amarenco,G., Karsenty,G., Saussine,C., Barbot,F., VESITOX study group, Efficacy and safety of low doses of onabotulinumtoxinA for the treatment of refractory idiopathic overactive bladder: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled dose-ranging study, European Urology, 61, 520-529, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>194803</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the efficacy and tolerability of a single intradetrusor injection procedure of low-doses of onabotulinumtoxinA in patients with idiopathic OAB refractory to anticholinergics and in patients who discontinued anticholinergics</p> | <p>Botulinum toxin A (BoNT-A 50u) = 23<br/>Botulinum toxin A (BoNT-A 100u) = 23<br/>Botulinum toxin A (BoNT-A 150u) = 30<br/>Placebo (PLA) = 31</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>BoNT-A 50U = 20/21 (95.2%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 18/22 (81.8%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 22/27 (81.5%)<br/>Placebo = 27/29 (93.1%)</p> <p>Age - Mean <math>\pm</math> SE<br/>BoNT-A 50U = 62.3 <math>\pm</math> 12.8 years<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 62.5 <math>\pm</math> 17.5 years<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 60.3 <math>\pm</math> 12.8 years<br/>Placebo = 61.7 <math>\pm</math> 14.0 years</p> <p>Incontinence episodes / day - Mean <math>\pm</math> SE<br/>BoNT-A 50U = 3.9 <math>\pm</math> 2.4<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 5.9 <math>\pm</math> 6.3<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 3.9 <math>\pm</math> 2.7</p> | <p>and 150U</p> <p>Saline was used as placebo</p> <p>A single injection procedure (15 injections) was used targeting the bladder sparing the trigone, given under cystoscopic guidance after the bladder was distended using approximately 100ml of normal saline solution. Either local or general anaesthetic was used.</p> <p>OnabotulinimtoxinA was reconstituted using 15 ml of normal saline solution.</p> | <p>willing to perform clean intermittent catheterisation for prophylactic use and were able to complete a bladder diary.</p> <p>In case of anticholinergic use, a stable regimen was maintained during the study period.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>A sample calculation of 38 patients per group was based on a 50% reduction in primary outcome criteria after BoNT-A injection, a 20% reduction in the placebo group, an <math>\alpha</math>-risk of 5%, with a power of 80% resulting in a total of 160 patients. An interim analysis was planned at mid-inclusion.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Last observation carried forward (LOCF) was used</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day - Assessed at Week 24<br/>Incontinence episodes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status (zero episodes at week 20)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 12/30 (40.0%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 10/23 (43.4%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 3/31 (9.7%)<br/>Placebo: 2/31 (6.5%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Endpoint week 12<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Post-void residual-related catheterisation (CIC or indwelling)<br/>BoNT-A 150U: 4/30 (13.3%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U: 1/23 (4.1%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U: 3/31 (9.7%)<br/>Placebo: 1/31 (3.2%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> | <p>Methodology checklist:<br/>Randomised controlled trials</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation - Unclear - Method was not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment - Unclear - Not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Unclear</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care - Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded - Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups - Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout - Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data - Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length - Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>October 2005 to March 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Sponsored by the "Assistance Publique - Hopitaux de Paris" and funded by the French Ministry of Health</p> | <p>Placebo = 5.9 ± 4.6</p> <p>Urgency episodes / day - Mean ± SE<br/>BoNT-A 50U = 6.8 ± 5.3<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 8.7 ± 6.1<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 9.3 ± 4.6<br/>Placebo = 7.9 ± 3.5</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>BoNT-A 50U = 21/21 (100%)<br/>BoNT-A 100U = 22/22 (100%)<br/>BoNT-A 150U = 27/27 (100%)<br/>Placebo = 29/29 (100%)</p> <p>Duration of OAB - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>some centres withdrawn from study after protocol violations</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] three or more urgency episodes per day with or without urinary urge incontinence</p> |               |         | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>9</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>2</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 9 | 23 | Control | 2 | 31 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 1 | 23 | Control | 1 | 31 | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely - Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome - Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to intervention - Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors - Unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the protocol in terms of;<br/>1] Population - Yes<br/>2] Intervention - Yes<br/>3] Outcome - No -some outcomes not reported at timepoints of interest<br/>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/>Sample size required by calculation not met</p> |
|   | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 9   | 23            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 2   | 31            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|   | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 1   | 23            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 1   | 31            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|----------------------|----------|
|               | <p>2] eight or more voidings per day<br/> 3] proved detrusor overactivity<br/> 4] were refractory to, had contraindication to, or discontinued anticholinergics because of adverse events</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] symptomatic UTI<br/> 2] urinary flow rate &lt; 15 ml/s<br/> 3] post-void residual &gt; 150ml<br/> 4] predominant stress urinary incontinence<br/> 5] a 24 hour urinary production &gt; 3 l<br/> 6] an allergy or contraindication to study medication<br/> 7] an ongoing anticoagulant or antineoplastic treatment<br/> 8] has used BoNT-A in previous 3 months</p> |               |         |                      |          |

Sacral nerve stimulation versus no active treatment

No studies identified

SNS vs PTNS for OAB

No studies identified



What is the comparative effectiveness of surgical approaches for mid-urethral procedures in women undergoing their primary surgical tape procedure?

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Andonian,S., Chen,T., St-Denis,B., Corcos,J., Randomized clinical trial comparing suprapubic arch sling (SPARC) and tension-free vaginal tape (TVT): one-year results, European Urology, 47, 537-541, 2005</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100532</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To test the safety and efficacy of the suprapubic arch sling in a randomised clinical trial with a minimum follow-up of 1 year</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 84</p> <p>Top-down procedure = 41<br/>Bottom-up procedure = 43</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>84/84 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (95% CI)</u><br/>Top-down procedure = 62.6 (59.4 to 65.9)<br/>Bottom-up procedure = 60.4 (56.5 to 64.2)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>SPARC procedures were performed as described by Niknejad et al 2002 using SPARC sets manufactured by American Medical Systems Inc (Minnetonka, MN, USA)</p> <p>TVT procedures were performed as described by Ulmsten et al 1996 using TVT sets manufactured by Gynecare (Ethicon, Inc., Sommerville, NJ, USA)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Anterior and posterior colporrhaphy and vaginal hysterectomy were performed simultaneously in symptomatic women with pelvic organ prolapse.</p> <p>A 16F Foley catheter was left in situ until complete patient recovery from anaesthesia. Patients were invited to urinate before leaving the hospital, and a bladder scan ensured that post-void residual was &lt; 150 ml. In cases of higher residual volumes, an indwelling catheter was re-inserted and the patient was followed at the clinic within 48 hours for a voiding trial and measurement of post-void residual.</p> <p>Anaesthesia was performed as follows:<br/><b>SPARC</b><br/>Local = 1/41 (2.4%)<br/>Spinal = 34/41 (83%)<br/>General = 6/41 (15%)</p> <p><b>TVT</b><br/>Local = 2/43 (4.7%)<br/>Spinal = 31/43 (72%)</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>"1-hour pad test of ≤ 2 g was considered as an objective cure" - n/N (%)<br/>SPARC = 34/41 (83%)<br/>TVT = 40/42 (95%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ) - Mean, 95% CI (N)<br/>SPARC = 49.9, 38.0 to 69.8 (41)<br/>TVT = 45.3, 36.1 to 54.5 (42)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation*<br/>SPARC = 10/41 (24%)<br/>TVT = 10/43 (23%)</p> <p>Patients with &gt; 250ml blood loss<br/>SPARC = 4/41 (10%)<br/>TVT = 3/43 (7%)</p> <p>Complete retention<br/>SPARC = 2/41 (4.9%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |   |
|--|---|---------------|--|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 2001 to December 2002</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamic stress incontinence with or without pelvic organ prolapse</p> <p>Women with previous failed anti-incontinence surgeries or bulking agent treatments were eligible for the study.</p> <p>Women with mixed urinary incontinence were not excluded as far as their cystometrogram showed normal capacity, compliance and no uninhibited contractions</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Obstructive, unstable bladder function<br/>2] Neurogenic bladder<br/>3] Urinary tract infection was a temporary exclusion criteria</p> |               | <p>General = 10/43 (23%)</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Since the primary endpoint of the trial was objective cure rate, defined by 1-hour pad test of <math>\leq 2</math> g, success rate of 90% for TVT was used. It was decided that 30% difference in success rate between the two procedures would be clinically significant. To detect a 30% difference, with an alpha value of 0.05 and power of 80%, at least 38 subjects in each group was required. This number was increased to 42 per group to account for 10% dropout during follow-up.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT = 4/43 (9.3%)</p> <p>Infected pelvic haematoma<br/>SPARC = 1/41 (2.4%)<br/>TVT = 0/43 (0%)</p> <p>Fever requiring broad-spectrum antibiotics<br/>SPARC = 1/41 (2.4%)<br/>TVT = 0/43 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Tape erosion*<br/>SPARC = 1/41 (2.4%)<br/>TVT = 0/43 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used for meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>40</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>34</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 40 | 43 | Control | 34 | 41 | <p>length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - pad test performed by nurse blinded to treatment allocation<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Percentage of study population with MUI not reported. Percentage of women who had previous failed anti-incontinence surgeries (and the details of those procedures) not reported.</p> <p>Intervention: Percentage of study population undergoing concomitant surgery not reported.</p> <p>Outcome: continence status measured by 1-h pad test.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Study included in 2006 guideline.</p> <p>At 12 month follow-up one</p> |
|  | Events  | Total         |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |   |
| Experimental   | 40  | 43            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |   |
| Control  | 34  | 41            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|
|   |   |   |  | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>10</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>10</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>41</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 10 | 43 | <b>Control</b> | 10 | 41 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 0 | 43 | <b>Control</b> | 1 | 41 | <p>woman in the TVT group died of myocardial infarction, unrelated to surgery.</p> <p>The one tape erosion, in SPARC group, required partial tape removal.</p> <p>Complete retention: SPARC = 2/41, TVT = 4/43. Two women with complete retention in each group required re-operation to loosen the tape after 3 days. The remaining two cases of complete retention (both in the TVT group) resumed spontaneous complete voiding within 48 hours of the operation.</p> <p>Standard deviation for quality of life data calculated by NCC-WCH using 95% CI.</p> |
|   | Events  | Total   |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 10  | 43  |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 10  | 41  |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|   | Events  | Total   |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 0   | 43  |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 1   | 41  |  |   |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Andonian,S., St-Denis,B., Lemieux,M.C., Corcos,J., Prospective clinical trial comparing Obtape and DUPS to TVT: one-year safety and efficacy results, European Urology, 52, 245-251, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100533</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 158</p> <p>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 78</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 80</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>158/158 (100%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT (Gynecare, Sommerville, NJ, USA) procedure was carried out as described by Ulmsten (1996), with the exception of type of anaesthesia.</p> <p>TOT (Obtape, Mentor Corp,</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Anterior and posterior colporrhaphy and vaginal hysterectomy were performed simultaneously when indicated in symptomatic women with pelvic organ prolapse.</p> <p>A 16F Foley catheter was left in situ until complete patient recovery from anaesthesia.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u></p> <p>Scale used – Cured = 1-h pad test ≤ 2g, failed = 1-h pad test &gt; 2g</p> <p><b>Cured</b></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: TVT patients were</p> |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"The aim of the present prospective, randomised, controlled, clinical trial was to compare Obtape and DUPS to the original TVT procedure."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2003 – May 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (range)</u><br/>TOT = 56.2 (21.7 – 85.7)<br/>TVT = 61.1 (35.4 – 94.6)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-SF) - Score (95% CI)<br/>TOT = 14.7 (13.4 to 16.0)<br/>TVT = 14.4 (13.0 to 15.8)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] SUI with or without pelvic organ prolapse<br/>2] Previous failed anti-</p> | <p>Santa Barbara, CA, USA) was performed according to the technique described by Delorme (2001)</p> | <p>Patients were invited to urinate before leaving the hospital, and a bladder scan ensured that postvoid residual (PVR) was &lt;150 ml. In cases of higher residual volumes or inability to void, an indwelling urethral catheter was reinserted and the patients followed at the clinic within 48h for a voiding trial and PVR measurement. If they were unable to void 48h later, they were taught clean intermittent catheterisation (CIC) if they were physically capable, or an indwelling Foley catheter was reinserted and a repeat voiding trial conducted at a later time. If these measures failed, urethrolisis was performed.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"Since the primary end point of the trial was an objective cure rate, as defined by the 1-h pad test of ≤ 2 g, the success rate of 90% for TVT was used. It was decided that a 20% difference in the success rate between TVT versus Obtape and between TVT versus DUPS would be clinically significant. Therefore, to detect a 20%</p> | <p>TOT = 64/77 (83%)<br/>TVT = 69/80 (86%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TOT = 10/77 (13%)<br/>TVT = 8/80 (10%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-SF) - Mean (95% CI)<br/>TOT = 5.2 (3.3 to 7.1)<br/>TVT = 3.7 (2.7 to 4.7)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TOT = 0/77 (0%)<br/>TVT = 11/80 (13.8%)</p> <p>&gt; 250 ml blood loss<br/>TOT = 2/77 (2.6%)<br/>TVT = 3/80 (3.8%)</p> <p>Complete retention*<br/>TOT = 6/77 (7.8%)<br/>TVT = 6/80 (7.5%)</p> <p>Haematoma<br/>TOT = 2/77 (2.6%)<br/>TVT = 9/80 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Urinary tract infection<br/>TOT = 1/77 (1.3%)<br/>TVT = 0/80 (0%)</p> <p>Mesh erosion</p> | <p>older than TOT patients (<math>P &lt; 0.01</math>).<br/>Level of bias: high - statistically significant different between the ages of TVT and TOT patients</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: not applicable<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: not applicable<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
|               | <p>incontinence surgeries or bulking agent treatments</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Obstruction<br/>2] Unstable bladder function<br/>3] Neurogenic bladder<br/>4] Urinary tract infection was a temporary exclusion criteria</p> |               | <p>difference, with an alpha value of 0.05 and power of 80%, at least 72 subjects were required in each group. This number was increased to 79 per group to account for 10% dropout during the follow-up period."</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TOT = 2/77 (2.6%)<br/>TVT = 0/80 (0%)</p> <p>De novo urgency<br/>TOT = 6/77 (8%)<br/>TVT = 5/80 (6%)</p> <p>Persistent urgency*<br/>TOT = 18/77 (23%)<br/>TVT = 16/80 (20%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used for meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continenence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 938 1630 1161"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>69</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>64</td> <td>78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1270 1630 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 69 | 80 | Control | 64 | 78 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Women with MUI were not excluded from the study but the number of included women with MUI was not reported</p> <p>Intervention: 17% of participants underwent concomitant surgery</p> <p>Outcome: Pad test results reported for continence status</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>This was a three-arm trial comparing TVT, Obtape (transobturator outside in; TOT) and DUPS (undertaken according to the description of Rodriguez and Raz, 2001). Randomisation stopped accruing after 32 patients in each arm due to the high number of vaginal erosions in the DUPS group, DUPS was discontinued and patients were randomised to either TVT or TOT. Only results from TVT and TOT arms have been extracted here.</p> <p>Women with mixed urinary incontinence were not excluded as long as their cystometrogram showed normal capacity, compliance</p> |
|               | Events  | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 69  | 80            |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 64  | 78            |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               |   |               |   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|---|
|   |  |   |  | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 272 1630 411"> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>77</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 472 1675 496"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 523 1630 743"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>16</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>18</td> <td>77</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Experimental</b>  | 6 | 80 | <b>Control</b> | 6 | 77 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 16 | 80 | <b>Control</b> | 18 | 77 | <p data-bbox="1709 272 2042 357">and no uninhibited contractions. [Number of women with MUI in each group not reported]</p> <p data-bbox="1709 387 2042 496">Concomitant prolapse surgery was performed in 8/77 (10%) in the TOT group and 18/80 (22%) in the TVT group.</p> <p data-bbox="1709 526 2042 719">One patient in the TOT group was found to have a urethral diverticulum, which was repaired, but the TOT procedure was cancelled, leaving 77 patients in the TOT group for the final analysis.</p> <p data-bbox="1709 750 2042 995">One patient in the TOT group required urethrolisis. The two patients in the TOT group with vaginal mesh erosion required resection of the mesh and closure of the vaginal wound. Two patients in the TOT group required repeat anti-incontinence surgery with TVT.</p> |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 6  | 80  |  |  |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 6  | 77  |  |  |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
|   | Events   | Total   |  |  |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 16   | 80  |  |  |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 18   | 77  |  |  |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <p data-bbox="192 1062 331 1086"><b>Full citation</b></p> <p data-bbox="192 1118 479 1342">Aniuliene,R., Tension-free vaginal tape versus tension-free vaginal tape obturator (inside-outside) in the surgical treatment of female stress urinary incontinence, Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania), 45,</p> | <p data-bbox="497 1062 636 1086"><b>Sample size</b></p> <p data-bbox="497 1118 757 1286">N = 264<br/>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 150<br/>TVT (bottom up tension-free vaginal tape) = 114</p> <p data-bbox="497 1342 674 1366"><b>Characteristics</b></p> | <p data-bbox="790 1062 943 1086"><b>Interventions</b></p> <p data-bbox="790 1118 994 1342">Surgical procedures (TVT and TVT-O) were performed by the same surgeon using the standardised Gynecare protocol.</p> | <p data-bbox="1008 1062 1093 1086"><b>Details</b></p> <p data-bbox="1008 1118 1299 1366">Cystoscopy and cough test were routinely performed only in the TVT group.<br/><br/>Antibiotic prophylaxis was applied for all patients during surgery.<br/><br/>Foley catheter was left for</p> | <p data-bbox="1326 1062 1413 1086"><b>Results</b></p> <p data-bbox="1326 1118 1686 1174"><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1326 1204 1637 1286"><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1326 1316 1664 1366"><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Results were</p>   | <p data-bbox="1709 1062 1839 1086"><b>Limitations</b></p> <p data-bbox="1709 1118 1989 1230">NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p data-bbox="1709 1260 2007 1366"><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear - no mention of randomisation in</p> |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| <p>639-643, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100543</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Lithuania</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare prospectively the TVT procedure with the TVT-O procedure regarding the effectiveness, safety and simplicity."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>264/264 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 49 ± 9.5<br/>TVT = 51 ± 10.1</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 7.5 ± 2.4<br/>TVT = 6.5 ± 3.1</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women with stress urinary incontinence<br/>2] Patient's agreement to buy a TVT or TVT-O set (there is no compensation from territorial patients funds in Lithuania)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urogenital prolapse greater than stage II<br/>2] Urinary retention<br/>3] Overactive bladder</p> |               | <p>12 hours in the TVT group and for 6 hours in the TVT-O group after operation.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>estimated according to the following criteria: <b>excellent</b> - no signs of SUI, imperative urination or dysuria; <b>good</b> - no signs of SUI, very mild imperative urination, no dysuria; <b>moderate</b> - no signs of SUI, imperative urination with minimal leakage, very mild dysuria; <b>bad</b> - SUI, imperative urination, a woman uses inlays."</p> <p><b>Excellent</b><br/>TVT-O = 117/150 (78%)<br/>TVT = 97/114 (85.1%)</p> <p><b>Good</b><br/>TVT-O = 25/150 (16.7%)<br/>TVT = 11/114 (9.7%)</p> <p><b>Moderate</b><br/>TVT-O = 5/150 (3.3%)<br/>TVT = 3/114 (2.6%)</p> <p><b>Bad</b><br/>TVT-O = 3/150 (2%)<br/>TVT = 3/114 (2.6%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Suprapubic haematoma<br/>TVT-O = 0/150 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/114 (0.9%)</p> <p>Wound bleeding in vagina<br/>TVT-O = 3/150 (2%)<br/>TVT = 2/114 (1.8%)</p> | <p>methods, although author does stated 'prospective randomised study' in abstract<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: unclear<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: no - how 'signs of SUI' 'imperative urination' and 'dysuria' (variables that form composite measure of continence status) were measured is not described<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: unclear</p> |

| Study details | Participants      | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |  |
|---------------|-------------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|--|
|               | 4] Mental disease |               |         | <p>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT-O = 0/150 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/114 (0.9%)</p> <p>Urinary retention*<br/>TVT-O = 5/150 (3/3%)<br/>TVT = 18/114 (15.8%)</p> <p>Symptoms of irritated bladder<br/>TVT-O = 5/150 (3/3%)<br/>TVT = 6/114 (5.3%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Urinary tract infection*<br/>TVT-O = 1/150 (0.7%)<br/>TVT = 5/114 (4.4%)</p> <p>Fever &gt;38°C<br/>TVT-O = 1/150 (0.7%)<br/>TVT = 0/114 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used for meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1214 1630 1364"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>97</td> <td>114</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 97 | 114 | <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: high</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: 18/150 (12%) in TVT-O group and 16/114 (14%) had undergone previous incontinence surgery (procedures not described)</p> <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: How 'signs of SUI' 'imperative urination' and 'dysuria' (variables that form composite measure of continence status) were measured is not described.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>All procedures performed by a single surgeon.</p> |
|               | Events            | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |  |
| Experimental  | 97                | 114           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |  |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|-----|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|---|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|-----|--|
|  |   |   |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>117</td> <td>150</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>18</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>5</td> <td>150</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>5</td> <td>114</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>150</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Control   | 117 | 150 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 18 | 114 | Control | 5 | 150 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 5 | 114 | Control | 1 | 150 |  |
| Control  | 117   | 150   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental   | 18  | 114   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control  | 5   | 150   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental   | 5   | 114   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control  | 1   | 150   |  |  |   |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Barry,C., Lim,Y.N., Muller,R., Hitchins,S., Corstiaans,A., Foote,A., Greenland,H., Frazer,M., Rane,A., A multi-centre, randomised clinical control trial comparing the retropubic (RP) approach versus the transobturator approach (TO) for tension-free, suburethral sling</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 187</p> <p>TVT = 107</p> <p>TOT = 80</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>187/187 (100%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT (Gynecare, Johnson &amp; Johnson) was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996 except the choice of anaesthesia was left to the surgeon.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were seen pre-operatively and at 3 months post-operatively. Data collected included patient demographics, operative details, intra- and post-operative complications and pre- and post-operative symptomatology using BFLUTS, incontinence impact using IIQ-7, 3-day</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - Stratified randomization in blocks of 20<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear - Not</p> |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>treatment of urodynamic stress incontinence: the TORP study, International Urogynecology Journal, 19, 171-178, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100557</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the safety and efficacy of of the Monarc transobturator sling to those of TVT in the treatment of SUI</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>July 2004 to October 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 53.6 ± 12.1<br/>TOT = 54.2 ± 11.4</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence -n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] failed conservative management for symptomatic stress incontinence<br/>2] required prophylactic incontinence surgery for prolapse repair for occult stress incontinence (no pre-operative subjective complaint of urinary stress incontinence leakage but found to have SUI)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] significant voiding dysfunction (maximum</p> | <p>TOT (Monarc, American Medical Systems) was performed as described by Naidu 2005 by to standardize sling tension, surgeons were requested to perform either a cough test or simulated cough (Crede manoeuvre) with 300mL of water in bladder intra-operatively in patients undergoing sling surgery alone, unless intra-operative bladder injury occurred, whereby catheter would then be left in overnight.</p> | <p>bladder diary and pad usage, clinical examination (POP-Q, ICS), and urodynamic tests.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Using a one-sided <math>\alpha</math> level of 5% and a power of 80%, it was estimated that at least 100 women in each arm would be required to detect a reduction in bladder injury from 6.4 to 0% as significant. Allowing for a loss to follow-up of 15%, it was proposed that 230 patients be recruited to the study</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury<br/>TVT = 7/105 (6.7%)<br/>TOT = 0/79 (0%)</p> <p>Urethral perforation<br/>TVT = 0/105 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/79 (1.3%)</p> <p>Bowel injury<br/>TVT = 0/105 (0%)<br/>TOT = 0/79 (0%)</p> <p>Major haemorrhage<br/>TVT = 0/105 (0%)<br/>TOT = 0/79 (0%)</p> <p>Nerve entrapment<br/>TVT = 0/105 (0%)<br/>TOT = 1/79 (1.3%)</p> <p>Retropubic haematoma<br/>TVT = 1/105 (1.0%)<br/>TOT = 0/79 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> | <p>reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: No - very unequal numbers in groups<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: Unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: Unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear - not reported<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: Unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: low</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|----|--|
|   | urine flow rate < 10th percentile according to Liverpool nomogram<br>2] post-void residual volume >50 mL<br>3] known allergy to polypropylene<br>4] immunosuppressant therapy<br>5] past history of neurological disease, urogenital malignancy, fistula or pelvic radiotherapy   |  |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>7</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>79</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 7 | 105 | Control | 0 | 79 | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>           Population: Yes<br/>           Intervention: Yes<br/>           Outcome: Yes<br/>           Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Sample size does not meet power calculation - logistical reasons given as duration of recruitment period</p> <p>Loss to follow-up rates were high at 20% to 25%</p> |
|   | Events  | Total  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 7   | 105  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 0   | 79   |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Basu,M., Duckett,J., A randomised trial of a retropubic tension-free vaginal tape versus a mini-sling for stress incontinence, BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 117, 730-735, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100560</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 71<br/>           TVT = 33<br/>           Miniarc = 38</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>           71/71 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>           TVT = 48.2 ± 9.4<br/>           Miniarc = 49.7 ± 10.7</p> <p><u>Incontinence</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1995</p> <p>Miniarc was passed through the obturator muscle via a 1cm incision 1cm below the external urethral meatus. The tape was anchored in place via self-fixating tips at either end. Saline cystoscopy was</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants were given the choice of general or spinal anaesthesia. An indwelling catheter was left in overnight if spinal anaesthesia was used. Patients were discharged home on the day after surgery if they were voiding adequately with a post-void residual of &lt; 100ml.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was based on presumed subjective cure</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>           Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of symptom reduction per day</u><br/>           Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>           Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>           Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/> <b>Peri-operative</b><br/>           Bladder injury<br/>           TVT = 0/38 (0%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>           A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - Computer generated<br/>           A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear - opaque envelopes used<br/>           A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes<br/>           Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>           B1 - Did groups get same level</p> |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions                    | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|--|---|----------------------------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>study was carried out</b></p> <p>United Kingdom</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the efficacy of the mini-sling against a conventional retropubic TVT, in terms of resolution of SUI and urodynamic stress incontinence"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2008 to February 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Funded by a grant from American Medical Systems</p> | <p><u>episodes/day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT: 19/33(57.6%)<br/>Miniarc: 19/38 (50.0%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] SUI symptoms<br/>2] objective evidence of urodynamic stress incontinence<br/>3] failed conservative management</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] history of previous continence surgery<br/>2] evidence of voiding dysfunction<br/>3] known bladder pathology<br/>4] prolapse of pelvic organ prolapse quantification scheme stage 2 or above<br/>5] recurrent urinary tract infections<br/>6] those planning to conceive</p> | <p>carried out in all cases.</p> | <p>rate of 75% for the miniarc and 95% for TVT. It was calculated that 64 patients would be needed to detect a difference of 20% in cure rates with a 90% power and a <math>\alpha</math> of 0.05. Assuming a drop-out rate of 10%, the study aimed to recruit 70 patients.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Miniarc = 0/33 (0%)</p> <p>Urethral perforation<br/>TVT = 0/38 (0%)<br/>Miniarc = 1/33 (3.0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>38</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 0 | 38 | <b>Control</b> | 1 | 33 | <p>of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: Yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |
|  | Events  | Total                            |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 0   | 38                               |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 1   | 33                               |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
|  |  |   |   |   | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and category used for meta-analysis</p>  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Abdel-Fattah,M., Ramsay,I., Pringle,S., Hardwick,C., Ali,H., Young,D., Mostafa,A., Randomised prospective single-blinded study comparing 'inside-out' versus 'outside-in' transobturator tapes in the management of urodynamic stress incontinence: 1-year outcomes from the E-TOT study, BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 117, 870-878, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100562</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 341</p> <p>TVT-O = 170</p> <p>TOT = 171</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (%) female)</u><br/>341/341 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 51.5 (SD not reported)<br/>TOT = 52.1 (SD not reported)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O™ (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ, USA) was performed as originally described by de Leval (2003).</p> <p>TOT-ARIS® (Coloplast Corp, Minneapolis, MN, USA) was performed as originally described by Delorme (2001).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Intra-operative cough stress test and cystoscopy were not performed in either study arm (in line with a number of studies reporting low rates of lower urinary tract injuries with transobturator tapes and the recommendation for the omission of intra-operative cystoscopy).</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"A sample-size calculation showed that with 80% power and assuming a 90% success rate (both objective and patient-reported) for TVT-O, 140 women were needed in each arm to detect a 10% difference in the success rate between the two procedures. With an anticipated drop-out rate of 20% over 3 years we aimed to recruit 168 women to each arm."</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – Patient Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I). "Patient-reported success rate defined as 'Very much improved' or 'Much improved'"<br/>TVT-O = 121/149 (81.2%)<br/>TOT = 111/143 (77.6%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Definition Cure = "negative standard 1-h pad test"<br/>TVT-O = 114/121 (94.2%)<br/>TOT = 96/109 (88.1%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (KHQ) - Median difference (range not reported) in incontinence impact domain score<br/>TVT-O = 66.67<br/>TOT = 66.67<br/>[Authors report individual KHQ domains separately, only</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes - although for ethical considerations women were informed of the intervention if they wished, but were instructed not to disclose this information to clinician at follow up<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: not applicable<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the two surgical approaches of transobturator tape insertion in the management of female USI: the 'inside-out' route (using the TVT-O™ tape) and the 'outside-in' route (using the ARIS® tape)."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 2005 to April 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>The study was funded by a grant from Henry Smith Charity. Refs: 20050062 &amp; 20050933.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence</u> - n/N (%)<br/>TVT-O = 40/170 (23.5%)<br/>TVT = 43/171 (25.1%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Diagnosed with urodynamic stress incontinence (USI) from preoperative urodynamics or with mixed incontinence<br/>2] Previous incontinence surgery<br/>3] Failed or declined pelvic floor muscle training</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Unwilling to participate in randomisation process<br/>2] Predominant overactive bladder symptoms<br/>3] Specific co-morbidities such as known neurological conditions (e.g. multiple sclerosis), diabetes, pelvic organ prolapse (≥ stage 2 POP-Q)<br/>4] Concomitant surgery at time of transobturator tape insertion</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>incontinence impact was extracted in to evidence table]</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Vaginal angle perforations<br/>TVT-O = 3/170 (1.76%)<br/>TOT = 17/171 (10%)</p> <p>Bladder injury<br/>TVT-O = 1/170 (0.6%)<br/>TOT = 1/171 (0.6%)</p> <p>Urethral injury<br/>TVT-O = 0/170 (0%)<br/>TOT = 1/171 (0.6%)</p> <p>EBL &gt; 200 ml*<br/>TVT-O = 15/170 (8.8%)<br/>TOT = 11/171 (6.4%)<br/>[EBL not defined]</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Vaginal erosion<br/>TVT-O = 3/170 (1.76%)<br/>TOT = 5/171 (2.9%)</p> <p>Tape release<br/>TVT-O = 1/170 (0.6%)<br/>TOT = 0/171 (0%)</p> <p>Hip pain ≥ 7<br/>TVT-O = 34/170 (22.7%)<br/>TOT = 26/171 (17.7%)</p> <p>Groin pain ≥ 7<br/>TVT-O = 27/170 (18%)<br/>TOT = 19/171 (11%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - postoperative assessment at 1 year performed by clinician blinded to intervention<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes Included women with MUI (83/341, 24.3%; TVT-O = 40/170, 23.6%; TOT = 43/171, 24.6%) and women with previous incontinence surgery - details not reported (46/341, 13.5%; TVT-O = 28/170, 16.5%; TOT = 18/171, 10.5%).</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|-----|-----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used for meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 635 1630 852"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>111</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>121</td> <td>170</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 963 1630 1181"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>96</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>114</td> <td>170</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1292 1630 1377"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 111 | 171 | Control | 121 | 170 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 96 | 171 | Control | 114 | 170 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: Yes - continence status measured by pad test</p> <p>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>299/341 women (88%) completed 12-month follow-up (TVT-O = 152/170, 89%; TOT = 147/171, 86%).</p> <p>230/299 women followed up at 12 months underwent a standard 1-h pad test. 69 women requested to avoid further hospital trips but participated in the completion of postoperative questionnaire. 292/299 women completed the postoperative PGI-I questionnaire.</p> <p>The authors report two other measures of patient satisfaction (success on a patient satisfaction scale where success = <math>\geq 8/10</math> and success on International Consultation of Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-SF) where success = 'never leaked' or 'leak a few drops once or less/week'. All three reported measures of patient satisfaction showed lower cure rates than</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| Experimental  | 111          | 171           |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| Control       | 121          | 170           |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| Experimental  | 96           | 171           |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| Control       | 114          | 170           |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|               |              |               |         |   |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |     |     |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|----|-----|----------------|----|-----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|-----|----------------|----|-----|---|
|  |  |  |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>11</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>15</td> <td>170</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>26</td> <td>171</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>34</td> <td>170</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | <b>Experimental</b>   | 11 | 171 | <b>Control</b> | 15 | 170 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 26 | 171 | <b>Control</b> | 34 | 170 | the objective cure rate assessed by 1-h pad test. |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 11   | 171  |  |  |   |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 15   | 170  |  |  |   |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
|  | Events   | Total  |  |  |   |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 26   | 171  |  |  |   |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
| <b>Control</b>   | 34   | 170  |  |  |   |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>But,I., Faganelj,M., Complications and short-term results of two different transobturator techniques for surgical treatment of women with urinary incontinence: a randomized study, International Urogynecology Journal, 19, 857-861, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100571</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Slovenia</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 120<br/>TOT = 60<br/>TVT-O = 60</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>120/120 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (No SD reported)</u><br/>TOT = 51.6<br/>TVT-O = 53.6</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT was performed as described by Delorme 2001</p> <p>TVT-O was performed as described by de Leval 2003</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Both procedures were carried out by a single surgeon. Before the end of the procedure the bladder was filled with 250ml of saline and the cough stress test was performed to allow for minimum tape adjustments if needed. After surgery, water was left in the bladder and patient were encouraged to empty their bladder spontaneously 1 hour after the procedure. On the evening (usually after the third voiding) the post-void residual was measured using a catheter.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment Peri-operative</u><br/>Vaginal wall perforation<br/>TOT = 3/60 (5.0%)<br/>TVT-O = 0/60 (0%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes - computer generated<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded:</p> |    |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |   |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To analyse differences in peri-operative complications and pain in a group of patients who were being treated for stress and mixed urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2005 to June 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p><u>Duration of SUI - Mean (No SD reported)</u><br/>TOT: 7.9<br/>TVT-O: 6.4</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported by group but a total of 89/120 (74.2%) had mixed UI</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] stress UI or mixed UI with stress as predominant symptom</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Urge incontinence or mixed UI with predominant urge incontinence</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Vaginal mucosa tears<br/>TOT: 6/60 (10.0%)<br/>TVT-O: 1/60 (1.7%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 6 | 60 | <b>Control</b> | 1 | 60 | <p>unclear - not reported<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: Unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |
|   | Events   | Total         |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 6  | 60            |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 1  | 60            |   |   |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
|   |   |  |  |  | <b>Other information</b>  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Karateke,A., Haliloglu,B., Cam,C., Sakalli,M., Comparison of TVT and TVT-O in patients with stress urinary incontinence: short-term cure rates and factors influencing the outcome. A prospective randomised study, Australian and New Zealand Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 49, 99-105, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100648</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Turkey</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"This prospective randomised trial was designed to compare the</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 164</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 81<br/>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 83</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>164/164 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 49.31 ± 5.00<br/>TVT-O = 49.08 ± 4.93</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O was performed according to the original technique by de Leval (2003) except for mid-urethral transverse incision instead of vertical one.</p> <p>TVT was performed according to the original technique by Ulmsten (1995).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Metzenbaum scissors were placed between tape and urethra prior to removal of plastic covers.</p> <p>Cough test was not used in both groups.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was routinely performed only in the TVT group. Although diagnostic cystoscopy was not used, the signs suggesting bladder perforation (such as leakage through surgical abdominal or vaginal cuts) were recorded in TVT-O group.</p> <p>When bladder injury occurred, an indwelling catheter was placed on 72h. If postoperative post-void residual volume was &gt; 100 ml, the patient carried out intermittent self-catheterisation at home until a post-void residual volume of &lt; 80 ml on two consecutive measurements was obtained.</p> <p>Spinal and general anaesthesia was used</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Patients were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the surgical outcome, with the three possible choices being very satisfied, satisfied or not satisfied."<br/><b>Very satisfied</b><br/>TVT = 68/81 (84.0%)<br/>TVT-O = 69/83 (83.1%)</p> <p><b>Satisfied</b><br/>TVT = 8/81 (9.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 7/83 (8.4%)</p> <p><b>Not satisfied</b><br/>TVT = 5/81 (6.2%)<br/>TVT-O = 7/83 (8.4%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Cure of SUI was defined as no leakage of urine during cough stress test (performed at maximum cystometric capacity after the filling line was removed) at</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes - pre-determined computer-generated randomisation code.<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes - all patients received intervention to which they were randomised<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p>use of TVT and TVT-O for surgical treatment of SUI in terms of cure rates, complications and factors influencing cure rate."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2004 to March 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ-7)<br/>TVT = 13.83 ± 3.88<br/>TVT-O = 13.83 ± 3.88</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Patients suffering from urinary incontinence with urodynamically proven SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urogenital prolapse greater than stage 1<br/>2] Detrusor overactivity<br/>3] Symptoms of overactive bladder<br/>4] Urinary retention (peak flow rate &lt; 15 ml/s)<br/>5] Previous anti-incontinence surgery including anterior colporrhaphy<br/>6] Neurological bladder</p> |               | <p>according to the patient and anaesthesiologist's preference.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Preliminary power analysis indicated that a sample size of 152 patients (76 for TVT group and 76 for TVT-O group) provided a statistical power (1-β) of at least 80% at α = 0.05 for the detection of 16% differences of cure rates between the two groups. To compensate for dropouts (estimated 10%), study aimed to recruit 84 patients per group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>urodynamic testing."<br/><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT = 72/81 (88.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 72/83 (86.7%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT = 9/81 (11.1%)*<br/>TVT-O = 11/83 (13.3%)*</p> <p>*failed data calculated from reported cure rates</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ-7)<br/>TVT = 6.94 ± 3.40 (81)<br/>TVT-O = 6.88 ± 3.38 (83)</p> <p>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory (UDI-6) [reported as UDI 1-2 scores, UDI 3-4 scores, UDI 5-6 scores]<br/>UDI 1-2<br/>TVT = 1.60 ± 0.93 (81)<br/>TVT-O = 1.54 ± 0.91 (83)</p> <p>UDI 3-4<br/>TVT = 0.89 ± 0.87 (81)<br/>TVT-O = 1.00 ± 1.06 (83)</p> <p>UDI 5-6<br/>TVT = 0.93 ± 1.19 (81)<br/>TVT-O = 0.76 ± 1.11 (83)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation</p> | <p>for missing data: yes - 83/84 in TVT-O and 81/83 in TVT group were assessed at 12 months.<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>IIQ-7 scores used in meta-analysis of incontinence-specific quality of life</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>TVT = 3/81 (3.7%)<br/>TVT-O = 0/83 (0%)</p> <p>Haematoma<br/>TVT = 4/81 (4.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/83 (2.4%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Fever<br/>TVT = 4/81 (4.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 1/83 (1.2%)</p> <p>Tape erosion<br/>TVT = 4/81 (4.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/83 (2.4%)</p> <p>Voiding difficulty<br/>TVT = 8/81 (9.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 6/83 (7.2%)</p> <p>De novo detrusor overactivity - 12 months<br/>TVT = 12/81 (14.8%)<br/>TVT-O = 10/83 (12.0%)</p> <p>De novo urge incontinence - 12 months<br/>TVT = 6/81 (7.4%)<br/>TVT-O = 5/83 (6.0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> |          |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|---|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|----|---------|------|------|----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
|               |              |               |         | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 272 1630 496"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>68</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>69</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 552 1532 576"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 604 1630 828"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>72</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>7</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 884 1532 908"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 936 1666 1160"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6.94</td> <td>3.40</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>6.88</td> <td>3.38</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 1216 1666 1240"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1268 1630 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 68 | 81 | Control | 69 | 83 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 72 | 81 | Control | 7 | 83 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 6.94 | 3.40 | 81 | Control | 6.88 | 3.38 | 83 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 68           | 81            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 69           | 83            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 72           | 81            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 7            | 83            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Mean         | SD            | Total   |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 6.94         | 3.40          | 81      |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 6.88         | 3.38          | 83      |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               |              |               |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|
|  |   |  |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>4</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>12</td> <td>81</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>10</td> <td>83</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | <b>Experimental</b>  | 4 | 81 | <b>Control</b> | 2 | 83 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 12 | 81 | <b>Control</b> | 10 | 83 |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 4   | 81   |  |   |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 2   | 83   |  |   |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |   |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 12  | 81   |  |   |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 10  | 83   |  |   |  |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Krofta,L., Feyereisl,J., Otcenasek,M., Velebil,P., Kasikova,E., Krcmar,M., TVT and TVT-O for surgical treatment of primary stress urinary incontinence: prospective randomized trial, International Urogynecology Journal, 21, 141-148, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100662</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Czech Republic</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 300</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 151<br/>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 149</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>300/300 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 57.82 ± 10.35<br/>TVT = 57.19 ± 10.65</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O procedure (Gynecare® TVT Obturator System, Ethicon, USA) was performed according to the original technique described by de Leval (2003).</p> <p>TVT procedure (Gynecare® TVT Ethicon, USA) was performed according to the technique described by Ulmsten (1996)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The TVT-O procedure was performed under spinal or local anaesthesia supplemented by intravenous analgosedation. Hydrodissection was performed routinely only in case of local anaesthesia. The Gynecare Winged Guide was regularly used but the cough test and cystoscopy were not. To avoid excess tension during the plastic sheath removal, Babcock forceps were used to grasp the tape in the middle and create a small, 5mm-long tape loop.</p> <p>The TVT procedure was</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Patients were also asked to rate their overall satisfaction after the operation with three possible choices: very satisfied, satisfied, or not satisfied."<br/><b>Very satisfied</b><br/>TVT-O = 120/151 (79.5%)<br/>TVT = 120/149 (80.5%)</p> <p><b>Satisfied</b><br/>TVT-O = 25/151 (16.6%)<br/>TVT = 21/149 (14.1%)</p> <p><b>Not satisfied</b><br/>TVT-O = 2/151 (1.3%)<br/>TVT = 0/149 (0%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: no<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded:</p> |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"The current randomised, non-blinded study was undertaken to prospectively compare the TVT procedure with TVT-O, concerning the effectiveness and safety."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2005 to December 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p><math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - VAS<br/>TVT - O = 7.91 <math>\pm</math> 1.82 (151)<br/>TVT = 7.86 <math>\pm</math> 1.61 (149)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF)<br/>TVT-O = 13.76 <math>\pm</math> 4.78 (151)<br/>TVT = 13.28 <math>\pm</math> 15.83 (149)</p> <p>Scale used - CONTILIFE<br/>Daily activities<br/>TVT-O = 22.38 <math>\pm</math> 5.96<br/>TVT = 19.82 <math>\pm</math> 5.29</p> <p>Effort activities<br/>TVT-O = 16.22 <math>\pm</math> 2.62<br/>TVT = 17.62 <math>\pm</math> 3.48</p> <p>Self-image<br/>TVT-O = 18.39 <math>\pm</math> 5.51<br/>TVT = 17.56 <math>\pm</math> 4.82</p> <p>Emotional impact<br/>TVT-O = 24.95 <math>\pm</math> 6.52</p> |               | <p>performed under local anaesthesia supplemented by intravenous analgesedation. Cystoscopy was routinely performed and a cough test was performed with the patient coughing repeatedly with a bladder volume of 300 ml.</p> <p>In both groups, for all patients, a bladder catheter (16-French Foley) was kept in place for 24h. After catheter removal, patients were instructed to urinate 3 times before a bladder scan was performed to measure postvoid residual volume (PVR). When the PVR was &gt; 100 ml or there was complete retention, a Foley catheter was inserted for 24h. Patients were discharged when PVR &lt; 100 ml.</p> <p>All subjects received intravenous prophylactic antibiotic treatment with 2g cefazoline, administered at the beginning of surgery.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>A preliminary power calculation indicated that a sample size of 172 women (86 in each group) would</p> | <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "<b>Objective cure</b>: a negative cough stress test with 300 ml of saline solution in the bladder during multichannel urodynamic examination and 1-h pad test weight &lt; 1g. <b>Objective improvement</b> defined as negative cough stress test and 1-h pad test weight &lt; 5g. <b>Objective failure</b> defined as positive cough stress test and urine leakage of &gt; 5g on 1-h pad test."<br/><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 130/151 (86.1%)<br/>TVT = 127/149 (85.2%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-O = 14/151 (9.3%)<br/>TVT = 12/149 (8.1%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-O = 3/151 (2%)<br/>TVT = 2/149 (1.3%)</p> <p>Scale used - "<b>Subjective cure</b> was defined by no leakage of urine after surgery. <b>Subjective improvement</b>: if assessment of frequency of urine leakage after surgery was lower than before. <b>Subjective failure</b> occurred if the</p> | <p>no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes - 147/151 (97.4%) in TVT-O and 141/149 (94.6%) were assessed at 12 months<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Population: No<br/>Intervention: No<br/>Outcome: Cough test plus pad test to measure continence status</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---|---|
|               | <p>TVT = 22.74 ± 6.56</p> <p>Sexuality<br/>TVT-O = 8.62 ± 4.62<br/>TVT = 8.90 ± 4.06</p> <p>Well-being<br/>TVT-O = 3.46 ± 0.93<br/>TVT = 3.47 ± 0.93</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamically proven primary SUI including a positive stress test<br/>2] Conservative therapy unsuccessful</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Predominant urge incontinence<br/>2] Urodynamic detrusor instability<br/>3] Preoperative use of anti-cholinergic medication<br/>4] Previously failed anti-incontinence surgery<br/>5] Previous prolapse or radical pelvic surgery or radiotherapy<br/>6] Postvoid residual volume &gt; 100 ml<br/>7] Diagnosis of stage II, III or IV pelvic organ prolapse according to the International Continence</p> |               | <p>lend a statistical power (1-β) of at least 80% at α = 0.05 for the detection of 15% differences of cure rates between the TVT and TVT-O group. Anticipating the drop out at the level of 10% of patients in each arm, we planned to include at least 190 patients.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>urine leakage frequency before and after the surgery was identical or worse."</p> <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 112/151 (74.2%)<br/>TVT = 111/149 (74.5%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-O = 31/151 (20.5%)<br/>TVT = 27/149 (18.1%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-O = 4/151 (2.6%)<br/>TVT = 3/149 (2%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Visual Analog Scale (VAS) - 0 = no symptoms, 10 = maximum symptoms<br/>TVT-O = 2.16 ± 1.88 (147)<br/>TVT = 2.14 ± 1.45 (141)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF)<br/>TVT-O = 3.5 ± 3.47 (147)<br/>TVT = 3.00 ± 4.92 (141)</p> <p>Scale used - CONTILIFE<br/>Daily activities<br/>TVT-O = 10.62 ± 4.21<br/>TVT = 10.32 ± 5.14</p> <p>Effort activities<br/>TVT-O = 10.52 ± 2.19<br/>TVT = 9.64 ± 3.25</p> <p>Self-image<br/>TVT-O = 10.31 ± 4.21<br/>TVT = 9.07 ± 3.52</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Percentages calculated by NCC-WCH. For meta-analysis of patient satisfaction, "very satisfied" and "satisfied" were pooled. ICIQ scores were used in meta-analysis of incontinence-specific quality of life.</p> <p>There is a statistically significant correlation between VAS scores and subjective evaluation (<math>r = 0.666</math>; <math>p &lt; 0.001</math>).</p> <p>All four cases of tape erosion were diagnosed during first 4 months after the procedure.</p> <p>Two patients in the TVT-O group were not satisfied with the procedure due to de novo urgency symptoms.</p> |



| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               | Society pelvic organ prolapse quantification system<br>8] Concomitant operations |               |         | <p>Emotional impact<br/>           TVT-O = 11.91 ± 6.29<br/>           TVT = 10.39 ± 4.97</p> <p>Sexuality<br/>           TVT-O = 5.07 ± 1.97<br/>           TVT = 5.57 ± 1.37</p> <p>Well-being<br/>           TVT-O = 1.91 ± 1.12<br/>           TVT = 1.48 ± 0.83</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/> <b>Peri-operative</b><br/>           Bladder perforation<br/>           TVT-O = 0/151 (0%)<br/>           TVT = 1/149 (0.7%)</p> <p>Severe urinary retention<br/>           TVT-O = 1/151 (0.6%)<br/>           TVT = 1/149 (0.7%)</p> <p>Retropubic haematoma<br/>           TVT-O = 0/151 (0%)<br/>           TVT = 1/149 (0.7%)</p> <p>Suprapubic discomfort<br/>           TVT-O = 0/151 (0%)*<br/>           TVT = 6/149 (4.5%)</p> <p>Inner thigh discomfort<br/>           TVT-O = 8/151 (5.4%)<br/>           TVT = 0/149 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>           Tape erosion<br/>           TVT-O = 2/151 (%)<br/>           TVT = 2/149 (%)</p> |          |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|--|
|                     |              |               |         | <p>De novo urgency*</p> <p>TVT-O = 20/151 (%)</p> <p>TVT = 9/149 (%)</p> <p>Anticholinergic use postoperatively</p> <p>TVT-O = 15/151 (%)</p> <p>TVT = 7/149 (%)</p> <p>Urinary tract infection</p> <p>TVT-O = 8/151 (5.4%)</p> <p>TVT = 5/149 (3.4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Postoperative retention of urine (24h) - PVR &gt; 100 ml</p> <p>TVT-O = 10/151 (6.6%)</p> <p>TVT = 4/149 (2.7%)</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1075 1630 1297"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>120</td> <td>149</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>120</td> <td>151</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 120 | 149 | <b>Control</b> | 120 | 151 |  |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 120          | 149           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 120          | 151           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|-----|-----|---------|-----|-----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|-----|---------|------|------|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|-----|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p data-bbox="1323 276 1532 300"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 328 1630 549"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>127</td> <td>149</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>130</td> <td>151</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 608 1532 632"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 660 1666 880"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>4.92</td> <td>141</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.47</td> <td>147</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 940 1666 963"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 992 1630 1212"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>149</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>151</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 1272 1673 1295"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 127 | 149 | Control | 130 | 151 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 3.00 | 4.92 | 141 | Control | 3.50 | 3.47 | 147 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 149 | Control | 0 | 151 |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 127          | 149           |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 130          | 151           |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Mean         | SD            | Total   |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 3.00         | 4.92          | 141     |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 3.50         | 3.47          | 147     |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 6            | 149           |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 0            | 151           |         |  |          |        |       |              |     |     |         |     |     |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |     |         |      |      |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|----|-----|--|
|  |   |  |  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>9</td> <td>149</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>20</td> <td>151</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 9 | 149 | Control | 20 | 151 |  |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |  |   |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental   | 9   | 149  |  |  |   |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| Control  | 20  | 151  |  |  |   |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Laurikainen,E., Valpas,A., Kivela,A., Kalliola,T., Rinne,K., Takala,T., Nilsson,C.G., Retropubic compared with transobturator tape placement in treatment of urinary incontinence: a randomized controlled trial, Obstetrics and Gynecology, 109, 4-11, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100672</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Finland</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the TVT</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 267</p> <p>TVT = 136</p> <p>TVT-O = 131</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>267/267 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 53 ± 10</p> <p>TVT-O = 54 ± 10</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 7 ± 6</p> <p>TVT-O = 10 ± 7</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten and TVT-O as described by de Leval and in both case Gynecare (Ethicon, Johnso &amp; Johnson) wass used.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Women were positioned on the operating table according to the procedure. For TVT the angle of the thighs in the stirrups was to be 70° while for TVT-O it was to be between 90° and 110°. Both procedures were performed under local anaesthesia, using 75-135ml prilocaine plus adrenalalin diluted to 0.25%. Light intravenous sedation was used to enable the patient to perform the intraoperative cough stress test.</p> <p>The cough stress test was performed with a bladder volume of 300ml, with the goal of adjusting the tape to allow a drop of urine to escape from the outer meatus of the urethra on strong coughing.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was performed twice during the TVT</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months*</u></p> <p>Scale used - objective cure rate = negative stress test</p> <p>TVT = 128/136 (94.1%)</p> <p>TVT-O = 122/131 (93.1%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used = UDI-6 (score at 12 months)</p> <p>TVT: 7 ± 2</p> <p>TVT-O: 7 ± 2</p> <p>Scale used = IIQ-7 (score at 12 months)</p> <p>TVT: 7 ± 1</p> <p>TVT-O: 7 ± 1</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder injury</p> <p>TVT: 1/136 (0.7%)</p> <p>TVT-O: 0/131 (0%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes - computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: Unclear</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes</p> |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p>procedure with the TVT-O, using the same tape for both, in terms of cure rate, peri-operative complications.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2004 to November 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] history of stress urinary incontinence<br/> 2] indication for surgical treatment of stress incontinence<br/> 3] positive cough stress test<br/> 4] Detrusor Instability Score (DIS) 7 or less</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] previous incontinence surgery<br/> 2] postvoid residual urine volume &gt; 100mL<br/> 3] lower urinary tract anomaly<br/> 4] current urinary tract infection or more than 3 UTI episodes in past year<br/> 5] urogenital prolapse of more than 2nd degree (Baden-Walker)<br/> 6] BMI &gt; 35<br/> 7] previous radiation treatment of the pelvis<br/> 8] active malignancy<br/> 9] anticoagulant therapy<br/> 10] hemophilia<br/> 11] neurogenic disease which can be associated with bladder disorders<br/> 12] anticholinergic</p> |               | <p>procedure (one each passing of the needle) and once during the TVT-O procedure.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size calculation was based on a 95% success rate with TVT and that a 10% difference in either success rate or complication rate would be clinically relevant. With 70% power to show a 10% difference, the sample size should be 160 patients, 130 in each arm.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Vaginal perforation<br/> TVT: 2/136 (1.5%)<br/> TVT-O: 3/131 (2.3%)</p> <p>Groin pain<br/> TVT: 2/136 (1.5%)<br/> TVT-O: 21/131 (16%)</p> <p>Urinary tract infection<br/> TVT: 11/136 (8%)<br/> TVT-O: 17/131 (13%)</p> <p>Hematoma<br/> TVT: 1/136 (0.7%)<br/> TVT-O: 0/131 (0%)</p> <p>Wound infection<br/> TVT: 1/136 (0.7%)<br/> TVT-O: 0/131 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b></p> <p>Urinary tract infection*<br/> TVT: 19/134 (14.2%)<br/> TVT-O: 22/131 (16.8%)</p> <p>De novo urgency<br/> TVT: 2/134 (1.5%)<br/> TVT-O: 3/131 (2.3%)</p> <p>Retention symptoms<br/> TVT: 1/134 (0.7%)<br/> TVT-O: 2/131 (1.5%)</p> <p>Tape erosion<br/> TVT: 0/134 (0%)<br/> TVT-O: 1/131 (0.8%)</p> <p>Pain<br/> TVT: 0/134 (0)</p> | <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/> Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - pad test performed by nurse blinded to treatment allocation<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/> Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcomes: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on 12 months outcomes taken from a secondary publication 'Rinne et al., 2008' in excluded studies table</p> |

| Study details       | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
|---------------------|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|--|----------------|------|------|--|--|
|                     | medication<br>13] duloxetine medication<br>14] inability to understand the purpose of the trial<br>15] patient immobile |               |         | <p>TVT-O: 1/131 (0.8%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures at 12 months</u><br/>Post-void residual volume (ml) - Median (interquartile range)<br/>TVT-O = 00.00 (00.00 – 10.25)<br/>TVT = 10.00 (00.00 – 50.00)</p> <p>*Data on most common adverse effects for both peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 799 1630 1019"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>128</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>122</td> <td>131</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1131 1666 1351"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>7.00</td> <td>1.00</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>7.00</td> <td>1.00</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 128 | 136 | <b>Control</b> | 122 | 131 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 7.00 | 1.00 |  | <b>Control</b> | 7.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
|                     | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 128   | 136           |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 122   | 131           |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
|                     | Mean  | SD            | Total   |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 7.00  | 1.00          |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 7.00  | 1.00          |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |  |                |      |      |  |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--------|-------|---------------------|---|-----|----------------|----|-----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|-----|----------------|----|-----|--|
|  |  |   |  | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>21</td> <td>131</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>19</td> <td>136</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>22</td> <td>131</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 2 | 136 | <b>Control</b> | 21 | 131 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 19 | 136 | <b>Control</b> | 22 | 131 |  |
|  | Events   | Total   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 2  | 136   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 21   | 131   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
|  | Events   | Total   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>  | 19   | 136   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>   | 22   | 131   |  |  |   |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Liapis,A., Bakas,P., Giner,M., Creatsas,G., Tension-free vaginal tape versus tension-free vaginal tape obturator in women with stress urinary incontinence, Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation, 62, 160-164, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100677</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 89</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 43<br/>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 46</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>89/89 (100%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O was performed using the Gynecare TVT Winged Guide and the correct TVT Helical Presser.</p> <p>TVT was performed according to the technique described by Ulmsten (1996)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p><u>TVT-O</u><br/>"The patient is placed in gynecological position with thighs in hyperflexion. A 16-Fr Foley catheter is inserted into the bladder. The points where the needles will exit at the skin level are identified by tracing a horizontal line at the level of the urethral meatus. The exit points are located 2 cm above this line and 2 cm outside the thigh folds. A skin incision is</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Subjective cure, improvement and failure were assessed with the use of a simple questionnaire"</p> <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 33/43 (76.7%)<br/>TVT = 34/46 (73.9%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-O = 7/43 (16.2%)<br/>TVT = 10/46 (21.7%)</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear - "All patients were randomly assigned to an operation from the outpatient department of the hospital"<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear</p> |        |       |                     |   |     |                |    |     |  |        |       |                     |    |     |                |    |     |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Greece</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare prospectively the TVT-O procedure concerning the effectiveness, safety and simplicity with the TVT procedure."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>November 2003 to October 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 52 ± 10.2<br/>TVT = 53 ± 9.1</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 4.4 ± 3.1<br/>TVT = 4.7 ± 3.4</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>"All patients included in the study had SUI without evidence of bladder over-activity"</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Evidence of detrusor instability<br/>2] Other gynaecologic disease requiring hysterectomy or other gynaecologic operation<br/>3] Previously failed surgical treatment</p> |               | <p>made at each exit point. A median sagittal incision of the vaginal wall is started 1 cm distal to the urethral meatus and about 2 cm long. A fine dissection path is created with dissection on a horizontal plane with a 45° angle relatively to the urethral sagittal plane, towards the upper part of ischio-pubic ramus. The Gynecare TVT Winged Guide is inserted into the dissected tract until it passes the inferior pubic ramus. The correct TVT Helical Presser is inserted into the dissected tract following the channel of the TVT Winged Guide. The device is pushed inward slightly and passes the obturator membrane and then comes out through the incision of skin. The technique is repeated on the patient's other side ensuring that the tape lies flat under the urethra without tension."</p> <p><u>TVT</u><br/>Additional detail not reported.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-O = 3/43 (6.9%)<br/>TVT = 2/46 (4.3%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "<b>Objective cure</b> was defined as a negative cough stress test during multi-channel urodynamic examination and a 1-hour pad test giving a weight of less than 1 g. <b>Objective improvement</b> was defined as a negative cough stress test and a 1-hour pad test weight of less than 5 g. <b>Failure</b> was defined as a positive cough stress test and urine leakage more than 5 g in the 1-hour pad test."</p> <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 39/43 (90%)*<br/>TVT = 41/46 (89%)*</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-O = 3/43 (7.6%)*<br/>TVT = 3/46 (6.5%)*</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-O = 1/43 (2.5%)*<br/>TVT = 2/46 (4.3%)*</p> <p>*Only % reported, n calculated by</p> | <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes - for continence status; unvalidated questionnaire used to assessing satisfaction (subjective cure)<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> |



| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---|---|--|
|               |              |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>NCC-WCH</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT-O = 0/43 (0%)<br/>TVT = 3/46 (6.5%)</p> <p>Urinary retention (&gt; 100 ml)*<br/>TVT-O = 1/43 (2.3%)<br/>TVT = 4/46 (8.7%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Urinary infection<br/>TVT-O = 1/43 (2.3%)<br/>TVT = 3/46 (6.5%)</p> <p>Vaginal erosion<br/>TVT-O = 0/43 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/46 (2.2%)</p> <p>De novo instability at 12 months<br/>TVT-O = 4/43(9.3 %)**<br/>TVT = 4/46 (8.6%)**</p> <p>De novo urgency at 12 months***<br/>TVT-O = 6/43 (13.9%)**<br/>TVT = 5/46 (10.8%)**</p> <p>**Only % reported, n calculated by NCC-WCH<br/>*** Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analysis</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: no</p> <p>Intervention: no</p> <p>Outcome: Continenence status assessed with cough stress test and pad test.</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Authors report that 91 patients were operated on and that 89 were available for follow-up at 12 months. It is not clear which group the 2 patients lost to follow-up were randomised. The majority of patients were discharged from hospital the next day of the operation. Only one patient required prolonged catheterisation for 10 days and this patient belonged to the TVT group.</p> <p>One patient suffered considerable haemorrhage during the TVT procedure and required vaginal packing for 24 h.</p> <p>In cases of bladder perforation, the needle was repositioned successfully, followed by</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 523 1630 743"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>34</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>33</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 855 1630 1075"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>41</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>39</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1187 1630 1342"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>4</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 34 | 46 | Control | 33 | 43 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 41 | 46 | Control | 39 | 43 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 4 | 46 | <p>catheterisation for 7 days postoperatively.</p> <p>One patient in the TVT group presented vaginal erosion because of rejection of the tape and this patient was treated with excision of the presenting part of the tape and spontaneous healing.</p> <p><b>3-item questionnaire used to assess subjective cure</b><br/>[reported in Results column as Patient Satisfaction]<br/>1] Do you feel cured from your SUI after the operation you had? Yes/No<br/>2] Do you think that your incontinence has been improved after the operation you had? Yes/No<br/>3] Do you think that you are about the same or worse after your operation for the management of your SUI? About the same Yes/No<br/>Worse Yes/No</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 34           | 46            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
| Control       | 33           | 43            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 41           | 46            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
| Control       | 39           | 43            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 4            | 46            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|  |   |   |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>5</td> <td>46</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>6</td> <td>43</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | Control   | 1 | 43 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 5 | 46 | Control | 6 | 43 |  |
| Control  | 1   | 43  |   |  |   |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |   |  |   |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental   | 5   | 46  |   |  |   |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control  | 6   | 43  |   |  |   |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Porena,M., Costantini,E., Frea,B., Giannantoni,A., Ranzoni,S., Mearini,L., Bini,V., Kocjancic,E., Tension-free vaginal tape versus transobturator tape as surgery for stress urinary incontinence: results of a multicentre randomised trial, European Urology, 52, 1481-1490, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100727</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 148</p> <p>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 75</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up retropubic tension-free vaginal tape) = 73</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>148/148 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age, years - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOT = 60.6 ± 10<br/>TVT = 61.8 ± 10.7</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT procedure followed standard operative technique by Delorme (2001). The tape was a fusion-welded, nonwoven, nonknitted polypropylene tape (Obtape®, Mentor-Porges, Le Plessis-Robinson, France).</p> <p>TVT procedure followed standard operative technique by Ulmsten (1996) (Gynecare, Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The procedures were performed under general or spinal anaesthesia according to preference of each centre.</p> <p>In both procedures, a Foley catheter was left for 24 h. After the catheter was removed, if postvoid residual volume was greater than 50% of the bladder volume, intermittent catheterisation was proposed.</p> <p>Pre-, peri- and post-operative evaluations were done by using the same protocol in all centres.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Scale used - "patients were considered dry (no leakage during clinical and/or stress test and/or reported by patients) or wet as deduced from clinical examination, stress test and interview. Patients who referred being wet were separated into 'improved' and 'failure' on the subjective analysis."<br/>Results for whole study population:</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: no - significantly more patients presented with detrusor overactivity in the TOT group<br/>Level of bias: high - significantly more patients presented with detrusor overactivity in the TOT group</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear</p> |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"This prospective, randomised, multicentre study assessed complications and functional outcome of TVT and TOT (primary end points) and the success rate (secondary end point) in women with SUI after a median follow-up of 31 months."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>May 2002 to November 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Duration of SUI, years – Mean ± SD (N)</u><br/>TOT = 4.0 ± 3.1 (75)<br/>TVT = 3.7 ± 2 (73)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>TOT = 14/75 (19%)<br/>TVT = 7/73 (10%)</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>TOT = 34/75 (45%)<br/>TVT = 31/73 (42%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory short form (UDI-6) - Median (range)<br/>TOT = 10 (2–21)<br/>TVT = 8 (0–19)</p> <p>Scale used - Impact Incontinence Quality of life short form (IIQ-7) - Median (range)<br/>TOT = 8 (0–18)<br/>TVT = 8 (0–16)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>"Stress or mixed urinary incontinence (stress component clinically predominant) associated with urethral hypermobility</p> |               | <p>A preliminary power analysis indicated that a sample size of 140 patients (70 for TOT group and 70 for TVT group) provided a statistical power (1 – β) of at least 80% at α = 0.05 for the detection of 19%, 22%, and 24% in differences of proportion of any postoperative condition between the two groups, when the incidence of postoperative conditions equalled 10%, 20%, and 30%, respectively. Power calculation was performed with the PS Power and Sample Size software.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Dry</b><br/>TOT = 58/75 (77.3%)<br/>TVT = 50/73 (68.5%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TOT = 10/75 (13.3%)<br/>TVT = 13/73 (17.8%)</p> <p><b>Unchanged</b><br/>TOT = 7/75 (9.3%)<br/>TVT = 7/73 (9.6%)</p> <p>Results for SUI only population†:<br/><b>Dry</b><br/>TOT = 34/41 (82.9%)<br/>TVT = 36/43 (83.7%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TOT = 2/41 (4.9%)<br/>TVT = 5/43 (11.6%)</p> <p><b>Unchanged</b><br/>TOT = 5/41 (12.2%)<br/>TVT = 2/43 (4.7%)</p> <p>All percentages above calculated by NCC-WCH</p> <p>†Reported denominator excludes 3 patients in TVT group lost to follow-up. Unclear how many of those lost to follow up had SUI only.</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at endpoint</u><br/>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory short form (UDI-6) - Median (range) (N)<br/>TOT = 0 (0 – 21) (75)</p> | <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: unclear - mean follow up reported<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear - mean follow up reported<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes - mean follow up TOT = 31 ± 15 months, TVT = 32 ± 12 months<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - continence status was measured by a blinded assessor<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: 44% of study</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|--|
|               | <p>(International Continence Society definitions)."</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/> 2] Pelvic organ prolapse (POP) greater than stage 1 according to the Half-Way system and POP-Q system classification in any vaginal compartment</p> |               |         | <p>TVT = 0 (0 – 21) (70)</p> <p>Scale used - Impact Incontinence Quality of life short form (IIQ-7) - Median (range) (N)<br/> TOT = 0 (0 – 16) (75)<br/> TVT = 0 (0 – 12) (70)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/> <b>Peri-operative</b><br/> Bladder injury<br/> TOT = 1/75 (1.3%)<br/> TVT = 2/73 (2.7%)</p> <p>Vaginal injury<br/> TOT = 4/75 (5.3%)<br/> TVT = 0/73 (0%)</p> <p>Retropubic haematoma<br/> TOT = 0/75 (0%)<br/> TVT = 1/73 (1.4%)</p> <p>Transient voiding dysfunction (self-catheterisation)*<br/> TOT = 2/75 (2.7%)<br/> TVT = 3/73 (4.1%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/> Vaginal erosion*<br/> TOT = 3/75 (4%)<br/> TVT = 0/73 (0%)</p> <p>Urethrolysis<br/> TOT = 0/75 (0%)<br/> TVT = 1/73 (1.4%)</p> <p>Wound discomfort and suprapubic foreign body granuloma (removal of sovrapubic mesh edges)<br/> TOT = 0/75 (0%)</p> | <p>population had MUI. 14% of the study population had detrusor overactivity and received surgery only if anti-cholinergic therapy failed.</p> <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: Continence status was defined as "no leakage during clinical and/or stress test and/or reported by patients."</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>When detrusor overactivity was diagnosed, patients received anti-cholinergic therapy and were referred to surgery only if pharmacotherapy failed.</p> <p>Patients were followed-up at 3, 6 and 12 months post-operatively and then annually. Mean ± SD (N) follow-up: TOT = 31 ± 15 (75), TVT = 32 ± 12 (70). Three participants in the TVT group were lost to follow-up.</p> <p>The authors state that outcomes were better when stress rather than mixed incontinence was present preoperatively (<i>P</i> = 0.025)</p> <p>Discrepancy between baseline and results in number of women with SUI/MUI in TVT</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p>TVT = 1/73 (1.4%)</p> <p>Paraincisional hernia<br/>TOT = 0/75 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/73 (1.4%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of procedure (min) - Median (range)</u><br/>TOT = 20 (20 – 55)<br/>TVT = 30 (20 – 60)</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 938 1630 1161"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>50</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>58</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1270 1630 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 50 | 73 | Control | 58 | 75 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>group not accounted for by loss to follow-up of three participants: baseline SUI = 42, baseline MUI = 31, results SUI = 43, results MUI = 27.</p> <p>Two different types of tape were compared which is a potential bias.</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 50           | 73            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 58           | 75            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               |              |               |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|   |  |   |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>2</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>0</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>3</td> <td>75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Experimental   | 3 | 73 | Control | 2 | 75 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 0 | 73 | Control | 3 | 75 |  |
| Experimental  | 3  | 73  |   |   |  |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 2  | 75  |   |   |  |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|   | Events   | Total   |   |   |  |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 0  | 73  |   |   |  |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 3  | 75  |   |   |  |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Ross,S., Robert,M., Swaby,C., Dederer,L., Lier,D., Tang,S., Brasher,P., Birch,C., Cenaiko,D., Mainprize,T., Murphy,M., Carlson,K., Baverstock,R., Jacobs,P., Williamson,T., Transobturator tape compared with tension-free vaginal tape for stress incontinence: a randomized controlled trial, Obstetrics and Gynecology, 114, 1287-1294, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100738</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 199</p> <p>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 94<br/>TVT (retropubic tension-free vaginal tape) = 105</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>199/199 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOT = 50.1 ± 8.3<br/>TVT = 51.8 ± 10.4</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT procedure performed using the outside-in Obtryx Halo midurethral sling (Boston Scientific, Natick, MA).</p> <p>TVT procedure performed using the Advantage retropubic midurethral sling (Boston Scientific, Natick, MA).</p> <p>All procedures were carried out according to the usual practice of</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All surgeons received training in both techniques and had carried out at least five of each procedure using Boston Scientific (Natick, MA) devices before recruiting patients to the trial.</p> <p>Anaesthesia was either general or local, depending on the clinical state and choice of the patient, and according to the usual clinical practice of the anaesthesiologist. Local anaesthesia alone was used in 66% of TOT procedures and 71% of TVT procedures; general</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Subjective symptom assessment by questionnaire. Subjective cure defined as 'no experience of lost or leaked urine when you coughed, laughed, sneezed, lifted, exercised etc.' or if urine loss had been 'no problem at all' or a 'small problem' over the previous 7 days."</p> <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TOT = 85/94 (90.4%)*<br/>TVT = 88/105 (83.8%)*</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence: Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: unclear - report baseline characteristics but do not report results of any statistical comparison for differences<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level</p> |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Canada</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"Our study was designed to answer the following primary question: how effective is transobturator tape compared with TVT in terms of objective cure at 12 months postoperatively? Secondary questions examined surgical complications, and subjective effectiveness of transobturator tape compared with TVT at 12 months."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>October 2005 to June 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Peer-reviewed funding was received from Alberta Heritage Fund for Medical Research. Grant-in-aid</p> | <p><math>\pm</math> SD</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory (UDI-6) - Median (range)</p> <p>TOT = 39 (28 - 56)</p> <p>TVT = 44 (33 - 61)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ-7) - Mean (range)</p> <p>TOT = 33 (19 - 52)</p> <p>TVT = 33 (19 - 57)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Elected surgical management of SUI</p> <p>2] Visualised leaking urine from the urethra with cough</p> <p>3] Suitable for either TOT or TVT sling procedure</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Had previous</p> | <p>participating surgeons, consistent with the recommendations of Boston Scientific</p> | <p>anaesthesia was used in 34% of TOT procedures and 27% of TVT procedures.</p> <p>Intraoperative cystoscopy was carried out for all patients.</p> <p>Where possible, operations were planned as outpatient procedures with postoperative home care (usual care in Calgary). If necessary for clinical or logistic reasons, women were admitted to the hospital.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>At the start of our study, the baseline TVT cure rate was estimated to be 73%. The study clinicians decided that a 15% difference between groups (eg, 90% compared with 75%) would be necessary to change clinical practice. To detect a difference of that order, assuming 80% power and a two-sided significance level of 0.05, a sample of 100 patients per group with complete follow-up would be required (total 200).</p> | <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u></p> <p>Scale used – "Objective cure measured using pad test &lt; 1g"</p> <p><b>Cured</b></p> <p>TOT = 68/94 (72.3%)*</p> <p>TVT = 67/105 (63.8%)*</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u></p> <p>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory (UDI-6) - Median (range)</p> <p>TOT = 3 (0-11)</p> <p>TVT = 11 (0-22)</p> <p>Change in UDI-6 score - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>TOT = - 34 <math>\pm</math> 20 (86)</p> <p>TVT = - 30 <math>\pm</math> 23 (95)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ-7) - Median (range)</p> <p>TOT = 0 (0-5)</p> <p>TVT = 9 (0-10)</p> <p>Change in IIQ-7 score - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>TOT = - 30 <math>\pm</math> 24 (86)</p> <p>TVT = - 30 <math>\pm</math> 27 (95)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder perforation**</p> <p>TOT = 0/94 (0%)</p> <p>TVT = 3/105 (3%)</p> <p>Blood loss &gt; 200ml</p> <p>TOT = 0/94 (0%)</p> <p>TVT = 3/105 (3%)</p> | <p>of care: yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: no</p> <p>Intervention: no</p> <p>Outcome: yes - continence status measured by pad test</p> |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|----|--|
| <p>industry funding was received from Boston Scientific (Natick, MA). Devices were purchased by Calgary Health Region as part of usual care.</p> | <p>incontinence surgery<br/>           2] Required any concurrent surgery<br/>           3] Had an overactive bladder (urinary frequency and urgency with or without urge incontinence)<br/>           4] Had more than 100 ml postvoid residual volume<br/>           5] Intended to have more children<br/>           6] Alzheimer's or Parkinson's disease<br/>           7] Progressive neurological disease such as multiple sclerosis<br/>           8] Immunocompromised<br/>           9] Unable to understand English<br/>           10] Would be unavailable for follow up</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Analyses were undertaken following the intention-to-treat principle: women were analysed in the surgical group to which they were randomized. A single analysis was planned when all women had completed the 12 month follow-up.</p> | <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>           Procedures for release of tape or mesh extrusion**<br/>           TOT = 4/94 (4.3%)*<br/>           TVT = 2/105 (1.9%)*</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>           Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>           Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of operation (min) - Median (range)</u><br/>           TOT = 19 (16 - 23)<br/>           TVT = 18 (16 - 23)</p> <p>*percentage calculated by NCC-WCH<br/>           ** Most common adverse effect in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1050 1630 1273"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>88</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>85</td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 88 | 105 | Control | 85 | 94 | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Participants reporting urge urinary incontinence symptoms in the last 7 days as "a big problem" at baseline: TOT = 22/94 (23.4%); TVT = 35/105 (33.3%)</p> <p>A total of 182/199 (91%) women were followed up at 12 months. 84/94 in TOT and 87/105 in TVT completed pad test; 86/94 in TOT and 95/105 in TVT responded to questionnaire (including UDI-6 and IIQ-7).</p> <p>All women had allocated surgery except one woman in the TOT group whose surgeon initiated a TOT procedure but converted to the TVT procedure at the same surgery after urethral muscles were torn.</p> <p>On vaginal examination the tape was palpable for 80% of the TOT group and 26.7% of the TVT group (<math>P &lt; 0.001</math>); more women in the TOT group experience groin pain during vaginal palpation (15.3%) compared with 5.6% in the TVT group (<math>P &lt; 0.044</math>)</p> |
|  | Events   | Total         |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental   | 88   | 105           |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |
| Control  | 85   | 94            |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|--------|-------|----|---------|--------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
|               |              |               |         | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 272 1630 496"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>67</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>68</td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 552 1532 576"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 608 1677 826"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>-30.00</td> <td>24.00</td> <td>95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>-30.00</td> <td>27.00</td> <td>86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 884 1666 908"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 940 1630 1158"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>94</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 1216 1673 1240"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1272 1630 1351"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 67 | 105 | Control | 68 | 94 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | -30.00 | 24.00 | 95 | Control | -30.00 | 27.00 | 86 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 3 | 105 | Control | 0 | 94 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 67           | 105           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 68           | 94            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Mean         | SD            | Total   |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | -30.00       | 24.00         | 95      |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | -30.00       | 27.00         | 86      |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 3            | 105           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
| Control       | 0            | 94            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               |              |               |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |        |       |    |         |        |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |   |     |         |   |    |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|-----|---------|---|----|--|
|   |   |   |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>105</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>4</td> <td>94</td> </tr> </table>   | Experimental   | 2 | 105 | Control | 4 | 94 |  |
| Experimental  | 2   | 105   |   |   |  |   |     |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 4   | 94  |   |   |  |   |     |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p><i>Two publications resulted from the single randomised controlled trial of retropubic 'bottom-up' versus transobturator 'outside-in'. Results are presented in the David-Montifiore et al., 2006, publication unless otherwise indicated.</i></p> <p>David-Montifiore,E., Frobert,J.L., Grisard-Anaf,M., Lienhart,J., Bonnet,K., Poncelet,C., Darai,E., Peri-operative complications and pain after the suburethral sling procedure for urinary stress incontinence: a French prospective randomised multicentre study comparing the retropubic and transobturator routes, European Urology, 49, 133-138, 2006</p> <p>and</p> <p>Darai,E., Frobert,J.L., Grisard-Anaf,M., Lienhart,J., Fernandez, H.,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 88</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 42</p> <p>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 46</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>88/88 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 56.8 ± 12<br/>TOT = 53.4 ± 10.5</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996</p> <p>TOT was performed as described by Delorme 2001</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The I-STOP device (CL Medical, Lyon, France) was used for both procedures and both procedures were performed in the dorsal-lithotomy position. The choice between general or regional anaesthetic was made in each study centre. Tape adjustment for both procedures was performed under the midurethra. Cystoscopy was always performed before vaginal and skin closure with resorbable sutures.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The power calculation assumed that the incidence of de novo urge incontinence and immediate and late voiding dysfunction after the retropubic procedure is 60% and the figure would be halved by using the transobturator approach, with a type 1 error of 0.05 and a type 2 error of 0.2. On this basis it</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Reported as UDI at &gt; 6 months<br/>TVT: 4.7 ± 10<br/>TOT: 1.2 ± 5</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT: 4/42 (9.5%)<br/>TOT: 0/46 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal injury*<br/>TVT: 0/42 (0%)<br/>TOT: 5/46 (10.9%)</p> <p>Haemorrhage (&gt;200ml)<br/>TVT: 2/42 (4.8%)<br/>TOT: 0/46 (0%)</p> <p>Retropubic haematoma<br/>TVT: 2/42 (4.8%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer generated<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear - not reported<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear - not reported<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear</p> |   |     |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|----------|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|-------|----|----------------|------|------|----|--|--------|-------|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Duberand, G., David-Montefiore, E. Functional results after the suburethral sling procedure for urinary stress incontinence: a prospective randomised multicentre study comparing the retropubic and transobturator routes, European Urology, 51, 795-802, 2007.</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100780</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate post-operative pain, peri-operative complications, and the immediate functional outcome of the TVT procedure for SUI, using the same non-elastic polypropylene tape and comparing the retropubic and transobturator routes"</p> | <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT = 5/42 (11.9%)<br/>TOT = 6/46 (13%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women with SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> |               | <p>was necessary to recruit at least 40 women to each arm.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TOT: 0/46 (0%)</p> <p>Pelvic abscess<br/>TVT: 1/42 (2.4%)<br/>TOT: 0/46 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Reported as Emotional and social discomfort at &gt; 6 months<br/>TVT: 1.0 ± 1.7<br/>TOT: 0.5 ± 0.8</p> <p><u>Clinical measures (mL) Mean ± SD</u><br/>Post-void residual volume<br/>TVT: 23 ± 45<br/>TOT: 28 ± 49</p> <p>* Most common adverse effect in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>4.70</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1.20</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 4.70 | 10.00 | 42 | <b>Control</b> | 1.20 | 5.00 | 46 |  | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data on Incontinence quality of life, psychological outcomes and post-void residual outcomes from secondary publication "Darai et al., 2007"</p> |
|   | Mean  | SD            | Total  |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 4.70  | 10.00         | 42   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 1.20  | 5.00          | 46   |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|   | Events  | Total         |  |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|   |   |               |  |  |          |      |    |       |                     |      |       |    |                |      |      |    |  |        |       |  |  |  |   |

| Study details   | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments     |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--------------|---------------|---------|--|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|------|------|----|---------|------|------|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|-------|----|---------|-------|-------|----|--|----|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>March 2004 to March 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> |              |               |         | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 272 1630 413"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>0</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>5</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Psychological outcomes – depression (Darai et al., 2007)</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 550 1666 770"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.70</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0.50</td> <td>0.80</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post void residual volume (Darai et al., 2007)</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 911 1677 1131"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>43.00</td> <td>45.00</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>28.00</td> <td>49.00</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative de novo urinary frequency</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1272 1644 1356"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>No</th> <th>%</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Experimental | 0 | 42 | Control | 5 | 46 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 1.00 | 1.70 | 42 | Control | 0.50 | 0.80 | 46 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 43.00 | 45.00 | 42 | Control | 28.00 | 49.00 | 46 |  | No | % | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 0            | 42            |         |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control   | 5            | 46            |         |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean         | SD            | Total   |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 1.00         | 1.70          | 42      |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control   | 0.50         | 0.80          | 46      |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean         | SD            | Total   |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental  | 43.00        | 45.00         | 42      |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control   | 28.00        | 49.00         | 46      |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | No           | %             | Total   |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |              |               |         |  |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |      |    |       |              |      |      |    |         |      |      |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |    |   |       |  |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |   |      |    |         |   |     |    |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|------|----|---------|---|-----|----|--|
|   |  |   |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>5</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>4</td> <td>8.7</td> <td>46</td> </tr> </table> <p>There were no cases of tape erosion. (Darai et al., 2007) nor of retention.</p>   | Experimental  | 5 | 11.9 | 42 | Control | 4 | 8.7 | 46 |  |
| Experimental  | 5  | 11.9  | 42  |  |   |   |      |    |         |   |     |    |  |
| Control   | 4  | 8.7   | 46  |  |   |   |      |    |         |   |     |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Wang,A.C., Lin,Y.H., Tseng,L.H., Chih,S.Y., Lee,C.J., Prospective randomized comparison of transobturator suburethral sling (Monarc) vs suprapubic arc (Sparc) sling procedures for female urodynamic stress incontinence, International Urogynecology Journal, 17, 439-443, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100785</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Taiwan</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 62</p> <p>TOT = 31</p> <p>SPARC = 31</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>62/62 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 50.5 ± 11.9</p> <p>TOT = 51.4 ± 10.1</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT procedure was performed as described by Dargent 2002 using the MONARC tape (American Medical Systems)</p> <p>SPARC (American Medical Systems) procedure was performed as described by Plzak 2002</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All women underwent preoperative assessment. A 1-hour pad test was performed as well as a urodynamic study including filling and voiding cystometry with electromyography with multichannel urodynamic assessment using a 8-French double-lumen perfusion catheter. Intraoperative urethrocytostomy was performed for both procedures. A routine suprapubic ultrasonography was used to detect unrecognized subcutaneous, retropubic or obturator haematoma the day after each procedure. Because spinal anaesthesia was used, a retention</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder injury</p> <p>TOT = 0/31 (0%)</p> <p>SPARC = 1/29 (3.4%)</p> <p>Vaginal injury*</p> <p>TOT: 4/31 (12.9%)</p> <p>SPARC: 0/29 (0%)</p> <p>Haematoma</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - Computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear - not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: Yes</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> |   |      |    |         |   |     |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the procedure-related complications of the transbutorator tape and suprapubic tape and if the orientation of tape positioning affects postoperative voiding function</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence -n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urodynamically proven stress urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] preoperative BOO (defined as 1 or the following - freeQmax of <math>\leq</math> 12 ml/s in repeated free uroflow studies combined with PdetQman of <math>\geq</math> 20 cm H<sub>2</sub>O, postvoid residual volume <math>\geq</math>100 ml, and Pabd increase of at least 10 cm H<sub>2</sub>O</p> <p>2] previous anti-incontinence surgery and/or pelvic prolapse greater than stage II of the Incontinence Continenece Society grading system</p> |               | <p>catheterization was instituted for each patient and the catheter was removed the day after the procedure. Sterile, intermittent catheterization was offered every 4 hours after urethral catheter was removed. Women were discharged once the amount of postvoid residuals was less that 20% of that from self-voiding consecutively four times.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>To detect a 36.3% difference in perforation rate and 30% difference in voiding dysfunction rate we conducted a test with a significance of 0.05 and 80% power and calculated 30 women would be needed in each arm to detect a difference in voiding dysfunction rate and 18m in each arm to detect a difference in bladder perforation rate.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TOT = 0/31 (0%)<br/>SPARC = 1/29 (3.4%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>* Most common adverse effect in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>4</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>29</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 4 | 31 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 29 | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
|   | Events  | Total         |   |  |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 4   | 31            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>  | 0   | 29            |   |  |          |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Wang,F., Song,Y., Huang,H., Prospective randomized trial of TVT and TOT as primary treatment for female stress urinary incontinence with or without pelvic organ prolapse in Southeast China, Archives of Gynecology and Obstetrics, 281, 279-286, 2010 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 140<br>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 70<br>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 70<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><b>Whole study population</b><br><u>Gender - Female/N (%) female)</u><br>140/140 (100%)<br><br><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br>TOT = 58 ± 11.6<br>TVT = 60 ± 10.8<br><br><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br>TOT = 4.3 ± 3.9<br>TVT = 4.7 ± 4.6<br><br><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br>Scale used - Urogenital | <b>Interventions</b><br>TOT procedures were performed in accordance with the technique by Delorme et al. (2001)<br><br>TVT procedures were performed in accordance with the technique by Ulmsten et al. (1998)<br><br>Prolene tape (Ethicon, Sommerville, NJ, USA) was used in the TVT procedures [unclear whether this tape was also used in the TOT procedures]. | <b>Details</b><br>The two procedures were performed under local anaesthesia supplemented by intravenous sedative, unless the patient was also undergoing vaginal hysterectomy or pelvic floor repair. In these cases, patients were given spinal anaesthesia.<br><br>The urinary catheter was removed 12-24h after surgery. In patients who also underwent various other vaginal reconstructive procedures, the urinary catheter was removed 24-72h after surgery.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br>Not reported<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br>Not reported | <b>Results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br>"Subjective assessment of the outcome of incontinence was classified as cured (UDI-6 and IIQ-7 postoperative < 10), improved (UDI-6 and IIQ-7 if postoperative > preoperative) and worsened (UDI-6 and IIQ-7 if postoperative < preoperative)."<br><b>Cured</b><br>TOT = 64/70 (91.4%)<br>TVT = 63/70 (90%)<br><br>*percentage reported, n calculated<br><br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br>"Objective cure was defined as no stress incontinence during cough stress test (300 cm fluid in the bladder, cough forcefully, visible leakage means a positive test), a 1-h pad test of < 2g."<br>Cough test - n/N (%)<br><b>Whole study population</b><br><b>No visible leakage</b><br>TOT = 64/70 (91%)<br>TVT = 65/70 (93%) | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br><u>A Selection bias</u><br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br>Level of bias: unclear<br><br><u>B Performance bias</u><br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br>B2 - Were participants blinded: no<br>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br>Level of bias: unclear<br><br><u>C Attrition bias</u><br>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear<br>Level of bias: low<br><br><u>D Detection bias</u><br>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p>pelvic organ prolapse (POP)."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>September 2003 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Distress Inventory Short Form (UDI-6) Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>TOT = 46 <math>\pm</math> 20 (70)</p> <p>TVT = 49 <math>\pm</math> 21 (70)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire Short Form (IIQ-7) Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>TOT = 42 <math>\pm</math> 20 (70)</p> <p>TVT = 40 <math>\pm</math> 21 (70)</p> <p><b>SUI only population</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%)</u></p> <p>88/88 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u></p> <p>TOT = 59 <math>\pm</math> 13.5</p> <p>TVT = 58 <math>\pm</math> 11.2</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u></p> <p>TOT = 4.7 <math>\pm</math> 4.1</p> <p>TVT = 5.1 <math>\pm</math> 4.2</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory Short Form (UDI-6) Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</p> |               |         | <p><b>Visible leakage</b></p> <p>TOT = 6/70 (9%)</p> <p>TVT = 5/70 (7%)</p> <p><b>SUI only</b></p> <p><b>No visible leakage</b></p> <p>TOT = 45/48 (94%)</p> <p>TVT = 38/40 (95%)</p> <p><b>Visible leakage</b></p> <p>TOT = 3/48 (6%)</p> <p>TVT = 2/40 (5%)</p> <p>1-h pad test</p> <p><b>Whole study population</b></p> <p><b>&lt; 2g</b></p> <p>TOT = 65/70 (93%)</p> <p>TVT = 66/70 (94%)</p> <p><b>&gt; 2g</b></p> <p>TOT = 5/70 (7%)</p> <p>TVT = 4/70 (6%)</p> <p><b>SUI only</b></p> <p><b>&lt; 2g</b></p> <p>TOT = 46/48</p> <p>TVT = 38/40</p> <p><b>&gt; 2g</b></p> <p>TOT = 2/48</p> <p>TVT = 2/40</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u></p> <p>Scale used - Urogenital Distress Inventory Short Form (UDI-6) Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p><b>Whole study population</b></p> <p>TOT = 14 <math>\pm</math> 17 (70)</p> <p>TVT = 15 <math>\pm</math> 15 (70)</p> | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Results for SUI only and concomitant prolapse populations are presented separately</p> <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: Continence status measured by cough stress test and 1-hr pad test</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>The study reports data for the whole study population and then data for SUI only and SUI with concomitant pelvic organ prolapse separately. Data are reported here for the whole-study and the SUI-only populations. Adverse events data are reported for the whole study population.</p> <p>TOT:</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
|               | <p>(N)<br/>TOT = 50 ± 17 (40)<br/>TVT= 52 ± 18 (48)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire Short Form (IIQ-7) Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TOT = 41 ± 31 (40)<br/>TVT = 45 ± 23 (48)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamically proven SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urge incontinence<br/>2] Overactive bladder</p> |               |         | <p><b>SUI only</b><br/>TOT = 19 ± 12 (40)<br/>TVT = 18 ± 12 (48)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire Short Form (IIQ-7) - Mean ± SD (N)</p> <p><b>Whole study population</b><br/>TOT = 10 ± 12 (70)<br/>TVT = 13 ± 12 (70)</p> <p><b>SUI only</b><br/>TOT = 9 ± 11 (40)<br/>TVT = 8 ± 12 (48)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation*<br/>TOT = 1/70 (1.4%)<br/>TVT = 3/70 (4.3%)</p> <p><b>Post operative</b><br/>Tape division<br/>TOT = 1/70 (1.4%)<br/>TVT = 0/70 (0%)</p> <p>Pain<br/>TOT = 8/70 (11.4%)<br/>TVT = 3/70 (4.3%)</p> <p>Short-term voiding difficulty*<br/>TOT = 6/70 (8.57%)<br/>TVT = 8/70 (11.4%)</p> <p>Frequency<br/>TOT = 3/70<br/>TVT = 4/70</p> <p>Urgency</p> | <p>Isolated SUI = 40/70<br/>Concomitant uterine or vaginal vault prolapse = 30/70</p> <p>TVT:<br/>Isolated SUI = 48/70<br/>Concomitant uterine or vaginal vault prolapse = 22/70</p> <p>All procedures were performed by one surgeon.</p> <p>Patients with uterine prolapse underwent transvaginal hysterectomy, anterior-posterior colporrhaphy (APC) and intravaginal slingplasty reconstructive surgeries plus either TOT or TVT. Patients with vaginal vault prolapse underwent APC plus either TOT or TVT.</p> <p>The authors report that concomitant pelvic reconstructive procedure had no effect on surgical results.</p> <p>"Positive cough stress test was a necessary condition of performing an incontinence stress surgery."</p> <p>Data for whole study population used in meta-analysis (and for incontinence-specific quality of life outcome have used UDI-6 scores)</p> |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|
|                     |              |               |         | <p>TOT = 1/70<br/>TVT = 3/70</p> <p>Leakage of urine when straining<br/>TOT = 2/70<br/>TVT = 1/70</p> <p>Vaginal tape erosion<br/>TOT = 2/70 (at 3-month follow up visit)<br/>TVT = 1/70 (at 1-month follow up visit)</p> <p>Overactive bladder<br/>TOT = 4/70<br/>TVT = 1/70</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1129 1630 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>63</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>64</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 63 | 70 | <b>Control</b> | 64 | 70 |  |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 63           | 70            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 64           | 70            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|-------|----|---------|-------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p data-bbox="1326 331 1532 354"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 384 1630 603"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>65</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>64</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 663 1532 686"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 716 1677 935"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>15.00</td> <td>15.00</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>14.00</td> <td>17.00</td> <td>80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 995 1666 1018"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1048 1630 1267"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 1327 1671 1350"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 65 | 70 | Control | 64 | 70 |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 15.00 | 15.00 | 70 | Control | 14.00 | 17.00 | 80 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 3 | 70 | Control | 1 | 70 |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 65           | 70            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 64           | 70            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Mean         | SD            | Total   |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 15.00        | 15.00         | 70      |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 14.00        | 17.00         | 80      |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 3            | 70            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 1            | 70            |         |  |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|   |  |  |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>8</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>6</td> <td>70</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 8 | 70 | Control | 6 | 70 |  |
|   | Events   | Total  |   |   |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 8  | 70   |   |   |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 6  | 70   |   |   |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Wang,W., Zhu,L., Lang,J., Transobturator tape procedure versus tension-free vaginal tape for treatment of stress urinary incontinence, International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, 104, 113-116, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100787</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>China</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the two surgical approaches to treat Chinese women with SUI to assess</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 315</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 155<br/>TVT (bottom up tension-free vaginal tape) = 160</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (%) female)</u><br/>315/315 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 54.8 ± 12.5<br/>TVT = 55.0 ± 11.9</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 8.5 ± 8.8<br/>TVT = 10.3 ± 9.3</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity –</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O procedures were performed in accordance with the technique described by de Leval (2005) with Gynecare needles and woven polypropylene tapes (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> <p>TVT procedures were performed in accordance with the technique described by Ulmsten (1996) with Gynecare needles and woven polypropylene tapes (Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients received prophylactic antibiotics with one preoperative dose of 500 mg of intravenous levofloxacin.</p> <p>All operations were performed by the same surgeon.</p> <p>The two procedures were performed under local anaesthesia supplemented by an intravenous sedative, unless patients were also undergoing vaginal hysterectomy or pelvic floor repair. In these cases, they were given general or spinal anaesthesia</p> <p>Cystoscopy was performed in the TVT group, before the tape was pulled upward, because of the risk of bladder perforation. Cystoscopy was not performed in the TVT-O group owing to the minimal</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – <b>Cured</b> = "when the cough test was negative".<br/><b>Improved</b> = "when the frequency of involuntary passage of urine and urine weight by the 1-h pad test were decreased by more than 50%". <b>Failed</b> = "frequency of involuntary passage of urine and urine weight by the 1-h pad test were decreased by less than 50% or worse than that before surgery"<br/><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 106/118 (89.8%)<br/>TVT = 103/115 (89.6%)<br/><b>Improved</b></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable</p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p>complications (primary end point) and cure rates at intermediate term follow-up (secondary end point)."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2004 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Women with demonstrable severe SUI, or mild or moderate SUI and failure of conservative therapy.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Pregnancy<br/>2] Urinary tract infection<br/>3] Urge incontinence<br/>4] Postvoid residual volume &gt; 100 ml<br/>5] Past history of neurological disease, urogenital malignancy, fistula or pelvic radiotherapy</p> |               | <p>risk of bladder perforation with this procedure.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT-O = 9/118 (7.6%)<br/>TVT = 10/115 (8.7%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-O = 3/118 (2.5%)<br/>TVT = 2/115 (1.7%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Haematoma<br/>TVT-O = 2/146 (1.4%)<br/>TVT = 2/154 (1.3%)</p> <p>Wound infection<br/>TVT-O = 0/146 (0%)<br/>TVT = 0/154 (0%)</p> <p>Urinary retention*<br/>TVT-O = 4/146 (2.7%)<br/>TVT = 6/154 (3.9%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>De novo urinary urgency<br/>TVT-O = 6/146 (4.1%)<br/>TVT = 9/154 (5.8%)</p> <p>Tape erosion<br/>TVT-O = 3/146 (2.1%)<br/>TVT = 3/154 (1.9%)</p> <p>Groin/thigh pain*<br/>TVT-O = 12/146 (8.2%)<br/>TVT = 4/154 (2.6%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes - although definition of 'cured' is based purely on negative cough test result, definition of improved or failed is based on change from baseline in pad test result and "frequency of involuntary passage of urine" episodes.<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Population: no<br/><br/>Intervention: Concomitant procedures were performed in 78/154 in TVT-O group and 86/160 in TVT group<br/><br/>Outcome: Continence status "cured" measured by negative cough test</p> |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|-----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|-----|----------------|---|-----|--|
|                     |              |               |         | <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>           Post-void residual volume &lt; 100 ml 12 h after surgery<br/>           TVT-O = 119/146 (81.5%)<br/>           TVT = 130/154 (84.4%)</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 659 1630 882"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>103</td> <td>160</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>106</td> <td>155</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 991 1630 1214"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>6</td> <td>154</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>4</td> <td>146</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 103 | 160 | <b>Control</b> | 106 | 155 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 6 | 154 | <b>Control</b> | 4 | 146 | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>One patient assigned to the TVT-O group withdrew from the study before the procedure due to a heart attack, therefore 154 women received the TVT-O procedure.</p> <p>None of the participants had intrinsic sphincter deficiency or mixed incontinence.</p> <p>Concomitant surgical procedures were performed in both groups: TVT-O = 78/154 (50.34%), TVT = 86/160 (53.8%). Procedures were anterior and/or posterior vaginal repair, transvaginal or laparoscopic hysterectomy/hysterosalpingo-oophorectomy, posterior intravaginal slingplasty or scarospinous ligament fixation surgery for concurrent pelvic organ prolapse.</p> <p>Vaginal tape erosions were reported by 3 in the TVT group at 4 and 6 months following surgery; and 3 in the TVT-O group at 3, 4 and 12 months. There were no cases of urethral or bladder erosion.</p> <p>Data at 24 and 36 months follow up is extracted in the evidence table for the question: "What is the long-term</p> |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 103          | 160           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 106          | 155           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 6            | 154           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 4            | 146           |         |  |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |     |     |  |        |       |                     |   |     |                |   |     |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|----|-----|--|
|   |  |  |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>4</td> <td>154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>12</td> <td>146</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 4 | 154 | Control | 12 | 146 | effectiveness of surgical approaches for mid-urethral procedures in women undergoing their primary surgical tape procedure?" |
|   | Events   | Total  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental  | 4  | 154  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| Control   | 12   | 146  |   |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Zullo,M.A., Plotti,F., Calcagno,M., Marullo,E., Palaia,I., Bellati,F., Basile,S., Muzii,L., Angioli,R., Panici,P.B., One-year follow-up of tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) and trans-obturator suburethral tape from inside to outside (TVT-O) for surgical treatment of female stress urinary incontinence: a prospective randomised trial, European Urology, 51, 1376-1382, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100797</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 72</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 37</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 35</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>72/72 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 53.4 ± 10.7<br/>TVT = 52.8 ± 11.8</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI -Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported (see</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Surgical procedures were performed by the same two experienced surgeons, according to the techniques of Ulmsten (1995) and De Leval (2003).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Cystoscopy was routinely performed only in the TVT group.</p> <p>A short-term antibiotic prophylaxis was performed 2 hours prior to surgery (cefazolin 2 g). All surgical procedures were performed under lumbar epidural anaesthesia.</p> <p>When bladder injury occurred, an indwelling catheter was placed for 48 hours.</p> <p>If postoperative postvoid residual volume &gt; 100 ml, the patient carried out intermittent self-catheterisation at home until postvoid residual &lt; 80 ml on two consecutive measurements was obtained.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self-reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Cure = no leakage of urine during the stress test at urodynamic testing<br/>TVT-O = 33/37 (89%)<br/>TVT = 32/35 (91%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Visual Analog Scale (VAS) to quantify perception of symptom severity by standardised question "Can you quantify the influence of urinary incontinence on your daily life?"<br/>TVT-O = 0.9 ± 0.7 (37)<br/>TVT = 1.1 ± 0.9 (35)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: no<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable</p> |        |       |              |   |     |         |    |     |  |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"This prospective randomised trial compared use of TVT and transobturator suburethral tape from inside to outside (TVT-O) for surgical treatment of SUI in terms of complications (primary end point) and short-term success rate (secondary end point)."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>July 2004 to May 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> | <p>exclusion criteria)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used - Visual Analog Scale (VAS) to quantify perception of symptom severity by standardised question "Can you quantify the influence of urinary incontinence on your daily life?"</p> <p>TVT-O = 8.2 ± 2.8 (37)</p> <p>TVT = 8.6 ± 3.4 (35)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] SUI with no contraindications to vaginal surgery and signed informed consent.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urogenital prolapse greater than stage 1<br/>2] Detrusor overactivity<br/>3] Symptoms of overactive bladder<br/>4] Intrinsic urethral sphincter deficiency<br/>5] Urinary retention<br/>6] Previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/>7] Neurogenic bladder<br/>8] Psychiatric disease</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"We believed that that incidence of intraoperative and postoperative complications would be 39% (higher value reported in the literature) in the TVT group and 7% in the TVT-O group. Based on 0.9 power to detect a significant different (p = 0.05, 2-sided), 35 patients were required for each study group. To compensate for non-evaluable patients (estimated 10%) we planned to enroll 38 patients per group."</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"All 72 patients were treated in an intention-to-treat basis."</p> | <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder injury*<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 2/35</p> <p>Vaginal perforation<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 1/35</p> <p>Retropubic haematoma<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 1/35</p> <p><b>Postoperative</b></p> <p>Fever<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 2/35</p> <p>Urinary tract infection<br/>TVT-O = 1/37<br/>TVT = 2/35</p> <p>Severe pain (pain requiring analgesic 1 wk after surgery)<br/>TVT-O = 1/37<br/>TVT = 0/35</p> <p>Urinary retention<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 1/35</p> <p>Tape erosion<br/>TVT-O = 0/37<br/>TVT = 0/35</p> <p>Frequency at 12 months<br/>TVT-O = 0/37 (0%)<br/>TVT = 2/35 (6%)</p> | <p>for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - all follow-up examinations were performed by physicians not involved in study protocol (masked)<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: no<br/>Intervention: no</p> <p>Outcome: continence status measured by stress test. Quality of life was assessed with a question about quantifying influence of symptoms on daily life, measured on a VAS.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>At 1, 6 and 12 months after</p> |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|------|------|----|----------------|------|------|----|---|
|                     |              |               |         | <p>Urgency at 12 months*<br/>TVT-O = 0/37 (0%)<br/>TVT = 3/35 (9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 743 1630 965"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>32</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>33</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1075 1666 1297"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>1.10</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0.90</td> <td>0.70</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 32 | 35 | <b>Control</b> | 33 | 37 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 1.10 | 0.90 | 35 | <b>Control</b> | 0.90 | 0.70 | 37 | <p>surgery, patients were asked to answer urogynaecologic standardised questions addressing urinary symptoms and physical examination was performed.</p> <p>Median follow-up was 16 months (range 13 to 21 months).</p> |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 32           | 35            |         |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 33           | 37            |         |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
|                     | Mean         | SD            | Total   |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 1.10         | 0.90          | 35      |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 0.90         | 0.70          | 37      |  |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |      |      |    |                |      |      |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|  |   |   |  | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 328 1630 549"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 657 1630 877"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>37</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 2 | 35 | Control | 0 | 37 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 3 | 35 | Control | 0 | 37 |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental   | 2   | 35  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control  | 0   | 37  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental   | 3   | 35  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control  | 0   | 37  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Deffieux,X., Daher,N., Mansoor,A., Debodinance,P., Muhlstein,J., Fernandez,H., Transobturator TVT-O versus retropubic TVT: results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial at 24 months follow-up, International Urogynecology Journal, 21, 1337-1345, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 149</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 74<br/>TVT (botton-up retropubic tension-free vaginal tape) = 75</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>149/149 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon, Gynecare) procedures were all performed using the vaginal approach from inside to outside, as described by de Leval.</p> <p>TVT procedures were all performed using the vaginal approach in</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The method of anaesthesia was left to the discretion of each surgeon.</p> <p>Vaginal incision was made in the same fashion in both groups.</p> <p>The polypropylene sling was identical in both procedures.</p> <p>For both procedures, the surgeons were instructed to place the slings "tension-free". Beyond this no other</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - subjective cure rate = "no referred leakage at interview"<br/>TVT-O = 61/69 (88%)<br/>TVT = 63/69 (91%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - objective cure rate = negative stress test<br/>TVT-O = 67/69 (97%)</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>124241</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the retropubic TVT and transobturator TVT-O procedures (both using the same macroporous monofilament polypropylene sling), with emphasis being placed on cure rates and intraoperative and post-operative complications, with a minimum follow-up of 24 months."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2005 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT-O = 52.8 ± 9.8<br/>TVT = 54.6 ± 10.9</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT-O = 20/74 (27%)<br/>TVT = 26/75 (35%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Isolated or mixed urodynamic stress incontinence (USI; according to the International Continence Society classification)<br/>2] Indication for surgical treatment of USI<br/>3] Positive cough stress test (cough stress test was performed during cystometry in sitting position, volume 200 – 300 ml)<br/>4] At least 18 years of age</p> | <p>accordance with the technique described by Ulmsten and the manufacturer (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon, Gynecare).</p> | <p>standardisation of the sling tension was imposed.</p> <p>No per-operative cough stress test was required.</p> <p>All patients, including those in the TVT-O group, underwent an intraoperative cystoscopy to check for the presence of lower urinary tract injury.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The sample size calculation (SPSS analysis) was performed assuming a bladder injury rate of 8% for TVT and 0.5% for TVT-O. With <math>\alpha</math> equal to 5% and 80% power (<math>1-\beta</math>) the sample size should be 180 patients, with 90 patients in each group, to reveal a 7.5% difference. The number of subjects included in the trial did not reach this figure because of insufficient enrolment in some centres.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT = 65/69 (94%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury*<br/>TVT-O = 2/74 (2%)<br/>TVT = 4/75 (5%)</p> <p>Urethral injury<br/>TVT-O = 0/74 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/75 (1%)</p> <p>Vaginal extrusion (erosion)<br/>TVT-O = 1/74 (1%)<br/>TVT = 0/75 (0%)</p> <p>Pain over 30/100 on Visual Analog Scale at 24 months<br/>TVT-O = 4/67 (6%)<br/>TVT = 2/64 (3%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures at 12 months</u><br/>Post-void residual volume (ml) - Median (interquartile range)<br/>TVT-O = 00.00 (00.00 – 10.25)<br/>TVT = 10.00 (00.00 – 50.00)</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> | <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes - 69/74 in TVT-O and 69/75 in TVT completed assessment at 12 months<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: 31% of the study population had mixed urinary stress incontinence.</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|---|
|               | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Concomitant pelvic organ prolapse surgery<br/> 2] Concomitant hysterectomy<br/> 3] Previous incontinence surgery<br/> 4] Pregnancy<br/> 5] Anticoagulation therapy<br/> 6] Higher than first stage urogenital prolapse<br/> 7] Patient unable to understand the purpose of the trial</p> |               |         | <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 411 1630 632"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>63</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>61</td> <td>74</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 743 1630 963"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>65</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>67</td> <td>74</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1075 1630 1295"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>4</td> <td>75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>2</td> <td>74</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 63 | 75 | Control | 61 | 74 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 65 | 75 | Control | 67 | 74 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 4 | 75 | Control | 2 | 74 | <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: Continence status measured by cough stress test</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>The authors state that "Gynecare (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon) had no role in the design, implementation or analysis of this study or in the writing of the present publication."</p> <p>Three patients required repeat surgery: one patient in TVT-O group as a result of vaginal sling extrusion, two patients in the TVT group as a result of persistent bladder outlet obstruction symptoms and a major postvoid residual volume.</p> <p>The authors report that improvements in most items of the CONTILIFE questionnaire, including global quality of life were observed in both groups with no difference between the groups.</p> <p>Data at 24 months follow up is extracted in the evidence table for the question: "What is the long-term effectiveness of surgical approaches for mid-urethral procedures in women</p> |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 63  | 75            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control       | 61  | 74            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 65  | 75            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control       | 67  | 74            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 4   | 75            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control       | 2   | 74            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  |   |  | undergoing primary surgical tape procedure?"  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Lord,H.E., Taylor,J.D., Finn,J.C., Tsokos,N., Jeffery,J.T., Atherton,M.J., Evans,S.F., Bremner,A.P., Elder,G.O., Holman,C.D.J., A randomized controlled equivalence trial of short-term complications and efficacy of tension-free vaginal tape and suprapubic urethral support sling for treating stress incontinence, BJU International, 98, 367-376, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>134944</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 313</p> <p>TVT = 154</p> <p>SPARC = 159</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>313/313 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 53.2 ± 12.1</p> <p>SPARC = 51.9 ± 11.2</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/16 hours – Median (range)</u></p> <p>TVT: 6.4 (4.0 - 9.0)</p> <p>SPARC: 6.4 (4.0 - 8.0)</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u></p> <p>TVT: 89/154 (60.5%)</p> <p>SPARC: 91/159 (59.2%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT and SPARC procedures were performed by experienced surgeon but no further information provided.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Cystoscopy was performed to check on bladder or urethra perforation. Standardized suprapubic adjustment was performed with no urethral elevation and Metzenbaum scissors between urethra and tape. A vaginal pack and catheter were inserted overnight both removed at 6am the next morning. Two voids &gt;150 mL and two urinary residuals &lt; 150 ml prior to discharge</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size was based on a retrospective estimated 2% bladder perforation rate of the study surgeons. A one-sided equivalence model with power of 80% and an <math>\alpha</math> of 0.05 was selected and these yielded a minimum sample size of 145 per arm.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>ITT analysis was reported but no information given on</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder perforation</p> <p>TVT: 1/147 (0.7%)</p> <p>SPARC: 3/154 (1.9%)</p> <p>&gt;100 ml blood loss*</p> <p>TVT: 32/147 (21.8%)</p> <p>SPARC: = 28/154 (18.2%)</p> <p>Haematoma</p> <p>TVT: 6/147 (4.1%)</p> <p>SPARC: 4/154/80 (2.6%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Yes - sealed opaque envelopes used</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: Yes</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2003 to October 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p>   | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Clinical diagnosis of SUI and a recommendation for minimally invasive surgery</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] age &lt; 18 years<br/>2] pregnancy<br/>3] major voiding dysfunction specified as an abnormal flow (i.e. maximal flow rate &lt;10mL/s or a residual urinary volume of &gt; 150ml)</p> |  | <p>how it was performed.</p>   | <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>32</td> <td>147</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>28</td> <td>154</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 32 | 147 | Control | 28 | 154 | <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
|  | Events   | Total  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |   |
| Experimental   | 32   | 147  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |   |
| Control  | 28   | 154  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>HinouI,P., Vervest,H.A.M., Den,BoonJ, Venema,P.L., Lakeman,M.M., Milani,A.L., Roovers,J.P.W.R., A randomized, controlled trial comparing an innovative single incision sling with an established transobturator</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 195</p> <p>TVT-Secur (single incision) = 97<br/>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 98</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-Secur was performed according to manufacturer instructions for use and placed in the direction of the obturator muscles</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Before the RCT all surgeons had performed 5–10 TVT Secur procedures and were comfortable with the technique.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was not routinely performed during</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – <b>Subjective SUI</b> "response to whether any SUI episodes had occurred during the last month" [only percentage reported]<br/>TVT-Secur = 24%</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes</p> |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>sling to treat female stress urinary incontinence, Journal of Urology, 185, 1356-1362, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>134949</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Belgium, The Netherlands</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"Since TVT Secur was the first single incision sling to be marketed, a prospective RCT to compare its efficiency and morbidity to those of the well established TVT-O sling was deemed appropriate."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 2007 to January 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Supported by a grant from Ethicon, Somerville, NJ,</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>195/195 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 52.3 ± 11<br/>TVT-O = 53.2 ± 12</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 62 ± 21 (97)<br/>TVT-O = 58 ± 23 (98)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] All patients in whom SUI could be objectified during clinical and/or urodynamic examination were considered eligible to participate in the trial.</p> | <p>(the hammock position) [manufacturer not reported].</p> <p>TVT-O was performed according to manufacturer instructions.</p> | <p>the trial</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"Power analysis was based on a similar RCT available at the inception of our trial that showed a 90% objective and an 80% subjective cure rate after TVT-O placement. A difference between the techniques of more than 15% was considered clinically relevant. With 80% power to show a 15% difference at <math>\alpha = 0.05</math> sample size had to be 158 patients, including 79 per arm. By anticipating a dropout rate of 15% of patients per arm the study aimed to include at least 184 patients."</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"Analysis was by intent to treat."</p> | <p>TVT-O = 8.3%</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction calculated by NCC-WCH</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 73/96 (76%)<br/>TVT-O = 90/98 (91.7%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence: Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – <b>Objective SUI</b><br/>"measured by a standing cough stress test with a bladder volume of 300 cc or greater than 70% of maximal bladder capacity according to the patient voiding diary. Volume was confirmed by bladder scan" i.e. percentage with SUI diagnosed by cough test. Only percentage reported.<br/>TVT-Secur = 16.4%<br/>TVT-O = 2.4%</p> <p><b>Continence status calculated by NCC-WCH</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 80/96 (83.6%)<br/>TVT-O = 96/98 (97.6%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - Urinary incontinence subscale of Dutch version of Urinary Distress Inventory (UDI)<br/>TVT-Secur = 21 ± 24 (96)<br/>TVT-O = 13 ± 21 (98)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment Peri-operative</u></p> | <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: unclear - results of statistical tests of baseline data comparability not reported<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: no - not possible as one procedure resulted in skin wounds while the other was exit free<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no - not possible as one procedure resulted in skin wounds while the other was exit free<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear - 77% of TVT-Secur compared with 87% of TVT-O group were clinically assessed at 12 months; 65% of TVT-Secur compared with 92% of TVT-O group returned completed QOL questionnaires<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> |



| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|--|---|
| USA           | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Recurrent SUI<br/> 2] Any concomitant surgery<br/> 3] Stage 2 or greater genital prolapse according to the International Continence Society classification</p> |               |         | <p>Bleeding greater than 100 cc*<br/> TVT-Secur = 28/96 (29%)<br/> TVT-O = 17/98 (19%)</p> <p>Bleeding greater than 500 cc<br/> TVT-Secur = 0/96 (0%)<br/> TVT-O = 1/98 (1%)</p> <p>Vaginal perforation<br/> TVT-Secur = 1/96 (1%)<br/> TVT-O = 0/98 (0%)</p> <p>Haematuria<br/> TVT-Secur = 1/96 (1.1%)<br/> TVT-O = 1/98 (1%)</p> <p>Urinary retention<br/> TVT-Secur = 3/96 (3%)<br/> TVT-O = 4/98 (4%)<br/> Wound infection<br/> TVT-Secur = 1/96 (1%)<br/> TVT-O = 0/98 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/> Urinary tract infection<br/> TVT-Secur = 6/96 (7%)<br/> TVT-O = 2/98 (2%)</p> <p>Pyelonephritis<br/> TVT-Secur = 1/96 (1%)<br/> TVT-O = 0/98 (0%)</p> <p>Mesh tape exposure<br/> TVT-Secur = 7/96 (7%)<br/> TVT-O = 1/98 (1%)</p> <p>Tape takedown<br/> TVT-Secur = 0/96 (0%)<br/> TVT-O = 2/98 (2%)</p> | <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/> Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes - continence status measured by cough stress test<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>One patient originally assigned to TVT Secur mistakenly received the TVT-O and was excluded from further analysis.</p> <p>At 12 months 75/96 (78%) in the TVT Secur and 85/98 (87%) in the TVT-O groups were clinically assessed. 63/96 (66%) in the TVT Secur and 90/98 (92%) in the TVT-O groups returned completed</p> |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|---|
|                     |              |               |         | <p>Anticholinergics*<br/>TVT-Secur = 12/96 (14%)<br/>TVT-O = 14/98 (15%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>*Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative adverse effects used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 799 1630 1019"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>73</td> <td>97</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>90</td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1131 1630 1351"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>80</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>96</td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 73 | 97 | <b>Control</b> | 90 | 98 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 80 | 96 | <b>Control</b> | 96 | 98 | <p>QOL questionnaires for analysis.</p> <p>Three tape exposures in the TVT-Secur group were noted at 6 weeks, 3 at 6 months and 1 at 12 months. All 7 tape exposures in the TVT-Secur group warranted surgical closure using local anaesthesia. All resolved completely. The only patient with exposure in the TVT-O group was successfully treated with local oestrogen therapy.</p> <p>Eight patients in the TVT-Secur group required re-intervention to address unresolved SUI 6 months postoperatively. Re-intervention in another 6 patients was planned to treat SUI at 12 months. OR to undergo re-intervention for SUI 1 year after TVT Secur vs TVT-O placement was 2.3 (95% CI 1.9 to 2.7).</p> <p>Reported denominator for peri-operative adverse effects was 92 for TVT-O group (Table 2), rather than the 98 randomised. Assumed this was a typing error; not accounted for by loss to follow up (which would not be relevant for peri-operative adverse effects, as all participants received surgery).</p> |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 73           | 97            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 90           | 98            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 80           | 96            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 96           | 98            |         |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|------|----|-------|--------------|-------|-------|----|---------|-------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|
|  |   |  |  | <p data-bbox="1323 331 1532 355"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 384 1677 604"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>21.00</td> <td>24.00</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>21.00</td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 663 1666 687"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 716 1630 936"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>28</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>17</td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 995 1673 1019"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1048 1630 1268"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>12</td> <td>96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>14</td> <td>98</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |  | Mean | SD | Total | Experimental | 21.00 | 24.00 | 96 | Control | 13.00 | 21.00 | 98 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 28 | 96 | Control | 17 | 98 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 12 | 96 | Control | 14 | 98 |  |
|  | Mean  | SD   | Total  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental   | 21.00   | 24.00  | 96   |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control  | 13.00   | 21.00  | 98   |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental   | 28  | 96   |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control  | 17  | 98   |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental   | 12  | 96   |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control  | 14  | 98   |  |  |  |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| <p data-bbox="190 1281 327 1305"><b>Full citation</b></p> <p data-bbox="190 1339 439 1393">Zhu,L., Lang,J., Hai,N., Wong,F., Comparing</p> | <p data-bbox="495 1281 633 1305"><b>Sample size</b></p> <p data-bbox="495 1339 568 1362">N = 55</p> | <p data-bbox="788 1281 943 1305"><b>Interventions</b></p> <p data-bbox="788 1339 898 1393">TOT was performed</p> | <p data-bbox="1005 1281 1088 1305"><b>Details</b></p> <p data-bbox="1005 1339 1256 1393">All operations were performed by the same</p> | <p data-bbox="1323 1281 1413 1305"><b>Results</b></p> <p data-bbox="1323 1339 1682 1393"><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p>  | <p data-bbox="1706 1281 1839 1305"><b>Limitations</b></p> <p data-bbox="1706 1339 1984 1393">NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology</p> |      |    |       |              |       |       |    |         |       |       |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>vaginal tape and transobturator tape for the treatment of mild and moderate stress incontinence. A prospective randomized controlled study, International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics, 99, 14-17, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>135063</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>China</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To compare the two approaches and determine whether the TVT-O procedure could be recommended for widespread use in Chinese women with mild or moderate SUI."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2004 to</p> | <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 27<br/>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 28</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>55/55 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 53.3 ± 11.5<br/>TVT = 56.2 ± 12.5</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Mild or moderate SUI not improved by conservative therapy</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Pregnancy</p> | <p>according to the technique described by Delorme (2001). TVT was performed according to the technique described by Ulmsten (1996).</p> <p>In both procedures the needles and woven polypropylene tape were Gynecare products (Gynecare, Ethicon Inc, Somerville, NJ, USA).</p> | <p>surgeon. The two procedures were performed under local anaesthesia supplemented by an intravenous sedative, unless patients were also undergoing hysterectomy when they were given general or spinal anaesthesia.</p> <p>In the TVT group, after needles were in place but before the tape was pulled upward, cystoscopy was performed because of the risk of bladder perforation. Cystoscopy was not performed in the TVT-O group owing to the minimal risk of bladder perforation with this procedure.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury<br/>TVT: 0/28 (0%)<br/>TVT-O: 0/27 (0%)<br/><br/>Urethral injury<br/>TVT: 0/28 (0%)<br/>TVT-O: 0/27 (0%)<br/><br/>Bowel injury<br/>TVT: 0/28 (0%)<br/>TVT-O: 0/27 (0%)<br/><br/>Blood loss &gt; 200ml<br/>TVT: 0/28 (0%)<br/>TVT-O: 0/27 (0%)<br/><br/>Post-operative<br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: no<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: no - definition of cure and the timing of outcome assessment is unclear<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: unclear what</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|---|
| <p>September 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>2] Urinary tract infection<br/>3] Urge incontinence<br/>4] Post void residual volume &gt; 100 ml</p> |               |         | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 328 1630 549"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>0</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>27</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 0 | 28 | Control | 0 | 27 | <p>outcome(s) questionnaire was designed to measure and unclear how definition of cure can be appropriately interpreted<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: high</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: none.</p> <p>Intervention: all patients underwent at least one other concomitant surgery.</p> <p>Outcome: it is unclear how frequently clinical and questionnaire assessments were performed following the 6-month post-surgery questionnaire.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>In the TVT-O group 15 women had mild SUI, 12 had moderate SUI. In the TVT group 12 had mild SUI, 16 had moderate SUI. Degree of SUI determined by 1-h pad test. Mild SUI defined as pad weight &lt; 2g, moderate SUI defined as pad weight 2 – 10 g.</p> <p>All patients had conditions associated with prolapse of</p> |
|   | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental  | 0   | 28            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control   | 0   | 27            |         |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
|   |   |  |  |   | <p>other pelvic organs. All patients underwent anterior colporrhaphy.</p> <p>15/27 in TVT-O group and 14/28 in TVT group underwent concomitant hysterectomy.</p> <p>20/27 in TVT-O group and 24/28 in TVT group underwent posterior colporrhaphy.</p> <p>Median follow-up was 27.6 months (range 22 – 30 months)</p> <p>It is unclear how frequently follow-up visits occurred (where "cure" or "improvement" was assessed, as defined by authors). All patients answered a standardised questionnaire 1 and 6 months after the surgery. "For long-term assessment, follow-up visits will last a lifetime".</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Schierlitz,L., Dwyer,P.L., Rosamilia,A., Murray,C., Thomas,E., De,SouzaA, Lim,Y.N., Hiscock,R., Effectiveness of tension-free vaginal tape compared with transobturator tape in women with stress urinary incontinence and intrinsic sphincter deficiency: A randomized controlled trial, Obstetrics and</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 164</p> <p>TVT = 82</p> <p>TOT = 82</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>164/164 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996</p> <p>TOT was performed as described using the Monarc subfascial hammock system (American Medical</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All women received prophylactic antibiotic treatment at the beginning of surgery.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was routinely used to verify the absence of bladder and urethral injury after the procedure.</p> <p>Tension was adjusted by placing a fine dissecting</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day)</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Unclear</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable</p>  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|---|----------|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Gynecology, 112, 1253-1261, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>135175</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To compare the efficacy of the TVT retropubic approach with transobturator tape in women with SUI and intrinsic sphincter deficiency"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>February 2004 to February 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT = 60 ± 11.5<br/>TOT = 60 ± 10.9</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Women with SUI who had failed conservative treatment<br/>2] had urodynamically proven intrinsic sphincter deficiency</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] presence of pelvic infection<br/>2] persistent post-void residual volume &gt; 100ml<br/>3] malignancy<br/>4] fistula<br/>5] congenital or neurogenic bladder disorder</p> | <p>Systems Inc) and as described by the manufacturer</p> | <p>scissors between urethra and tape with or without the aid of a cough test. The post-operative catheter management for women who has a tape surgery alone was removal of the catheter followed by a voiding trial. Women who had concomitant prolapse surgery often had a vaginal and catheter left in for 24 to 48 hours.</p> <p>A successful voiding trial was defined as two postvoid residual urine volumes &lt; 150mL on ultrasound management.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Sample size calculation was performed assuming an 80% success rate in the TVT group and a chose effect size of 20%. At a power of 80% and a significance level of 0.05, the sample size estimate was 91 women per group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury<br/>TVT = 6/82 (7.3%)<br/>TOT = 0/82 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal wall perforation<br/>TVT = 0/82 (0%)<br/>TOT = 4/82 (4.9%)</p> <p>Urethral injury<br/>TVT: 0/82 (0%)<br/>TOT: 0/82 (0%)</p> <p>Bowel injury<br/>TVT: 0/82 (0%)<br/>TOT: 0/82 (0%)</p> <p>Blood transfusion<br/>TVT = 0/82 (0%)<br/>TOT = 0/82 (0%)</p> <p>Blood loss &gt; 300ml*<br/>TVT: 7/82 (8.5%)<br/>TOT: 14/82 (17.1%)</p> <p>* Most common adverse effect in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>at baseline: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: Unclear - not reported<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: Unclear - not reported<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes - all participants received treatment to which they were randomised<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: Unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> |
|  | Events   | Total  |  |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----|---------|----|----|--|
|   | 6] inability to give informed consent   |   |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>7</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>14</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </table>   | Experimental   | 7 | 82 | Control | 14 | 82 | <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
| Experimental  | 7   | 82  |   |   |  |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 14  | 82  |   |   |  |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Tommaselli,G.A., Di,CarloC, Gargano,V., Formisano,C., Scala,M., Nappi,C., Efficacy and safety of TVT-O and TVT-Secur in the treatment of female stress urinary incontinence: 1-Year follow-up, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 21, 1211-1217, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135188</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 84</p> <p>TVT Secur (single incision) = 42<br/>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 42</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>84/84 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 57.8 ± 8.5<br/>TVT-O = 58.2 ± 9.1</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 4.0 ± 1.5</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-Secur (Gynecare, a division of Ethicon, Inc., Sommerville, NJ, USA), was performed according to the technique proposed by Neuman (2008).</p> <p>TVT-O (Gynecare, a division of Ethicon, Inc., Sommerville, NJ, USA) was performed according to the technique described by de Leval (2003).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All procedures were performed with patients in spinal anaesthesia. In all procedures urinary catheters were left in place for 24 hours after the procedure.</p> <p>All participants received antibiotic prophylaxis immediately before the procedure with cefazolin 2g IV. All procedures were performed by one investigator who had already performed more than 50 of the two procedures.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – Visual Analog Scale (VAS) - 0 = minimal satisfaction, 10 = maximal satisfaction - Mean ± SD<br/>TVT-Secur = 8.5 ± 3.5<br/>TVT-O = 7.9 ± 3.2</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of frequency<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale/measure used – cough test.<br/>Cured = completely continent during cough test and during exertion in urodynamic evaluation; improved = only showed rare leakage; failed = unchanged or worsened incontinence<br/><b>Cured</b></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes</p> |   |    |         |    |    |  |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"A comparison between the TVT-O and the TVT-Secur techniques in terms of efficacy and safety of the two procedures to assess if the new, single-incision device has similar short-term cure rates and lower complication rates."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2007 to March 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT-O = 4.2 ± 1.2</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Concomitant urge incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 6/37 (16.2%)<br/>TVT-O = 5/38 (13.1%)</p> <p><u>Concomitant urge - n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 10/37 (27%)<br/>TVT-O = 12/38 (31.6%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] SUI lasting for at least 2 years as diagnosed by clinical evaluation and urodynamics<br/>2] Age &gt; 40 years</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Previous surgical and/or pharmacological treatment of SUI<br/>2] Predominant or isolated urge incontinence<br/>3] Genital prolapse ≥ stage 2 according to PoP-Q scoring system<br/>4] Serious contraindications to surgical procedures</p> |               |         | <p>TVT-Secur = 31/37 (83.8%)<br/>TVT-O = 31/38 (81.6%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 4/37 (10.8%)<br/>TVT-O = 5/38 (13.1%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 2/37 (5.4%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/38 (5.3%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale use - King's Health Questionnaire (KHQ) - Mean ± SD<br/><b>General health perceptions</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 36.2 ± 19.8 (37)<br/>TVT-O = 40.1 ± 18.8 (38)</p> <p><b>Incontinence impact</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 28.0 ± 24.8 (37)<br/>TVT-O = 30.7 ± 25.6 (38)</p> <p><b>Severity measures</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 46.9 ± 26.3 (37)<br/>TVT-O = 54.8 ± 27.5 (38)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Pre-operative</b><br/>None reported</p> <p><b>Post operative</b><br/>Urinary retention<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/37 (0%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/38 (5.2%)</p> <p>Vaginal erosion<br/>TVT-Secur = 1/37 (2.7%)<br/>TVT-O = 0/38 (0%)</p> | <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: unclear<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Excluded women who had previous pharmacological treatment of SUI. 15% of women had urge incontinence and 29% of women had urge symptoms at baseline.</p> <p>Intervention: none</p> <p>Outcome: continence status measured by cough stress test</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>9/84 (5/42 in TVT-Secur, 4/42</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Leg pain<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/37 (0%)<br/>TVT-O = 3/38 (7.9%)</p> <p>De novo urgency*<br/>TVT-Secur = 2/37 (5.4%)<br/>TVT-O = 1/38 (2.6%)</p> <p>Post operative pain at 1 month -<br/>Visual Analog Scale from 0 to 10 -<br/>Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0 (37)<br/>TVT-O = 1.5 <math>\pm</math> 0.5 (38)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of procedure, minutes -<br/>Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 7.1 <math>\pm</math> 2.1 (37)<br/>TVT-O = 11.3 <math>\pm</math> 2.9 (38)</p> <p>*Most common adverse effect in<br/>post-operative category used in<br/>meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1187 1630 1342"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>31</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 31 | 42 | <p>in TVT-O) did not complete the follow-up schedule and were considered excluded from the study. It is not clear whether drop-outs occurred before or after surgery.</p> <p>Only baseline data for women followed-up at 12 months reported.</p> <p>No intraoperative complications were observed in the two groups.</p> <p>Time to first voiding was significantly higher in the TVT-O group compared with single incision group (93.4<math>\pm</math>32.1 min vs 65.8<math>\pm</math>18.5 min, <math>p &lt; 0.05</math>).</p> <p>In both groups, ICIQ-SF and KHQ scores were significantly improved at 12-month evaluation compared with baseline. There were no differences in scores at the beginning and end of the study between the two groups (data for ICIQ-6 reported graphically; data not extracted).</p> <p>Only KHQ mean <math>\pm</math> SD for general health perceptions, incontinence impact and severity measures reported in this evidence table. Authors report mean <math>\pm</math> SD for each of the KHQ domains - general health perceptions,</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |   |
| Experimental  | 31           | 42            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|----|----|--|------|----|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|----|----------------|-------|-------|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|
|   |   |   |  | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 272 1630 344"> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>31</td> <td>42</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 400 1532 424"><b>Incontinence QOL</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 456 1680 676"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean</th> <th>SD</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>36.20</td> <td>19.80</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>40.10</td> <td>18.80</td> <td>38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 732 1675 756"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 788 1630 1007"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>2</td> <td>37</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>1</td> <td>38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Control</b>   | 31 | 42 |  | Mean | SD | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 36.20 | 19.80 | 37 | <b>Control</b> | 40.10 | 18.80 | 38 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 2 | 37 | <b>Control</b> | 1 | 38 | <p data-bbox="1709 272 2042 440">incontinence impact, role limitations, physical limitations, social limitations, personal relationships, emotions, sleep/energy, severity measures.</p> |
| <b>Control</b>  | 31  | 42  |  |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|   | Mean  | SD  | Total  |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 36.20   | 19.80   | 37   |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 40.10   | 18.80   | 38   |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
|   | Events  | Total   |  |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b>   | 2   | 37  |  |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>  | 1   | 38  |  |   |  |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |
| <p data-bbox="192 1023 331 1046"><b>Full citation</b></p> <p data-bbox="192 1078 474 1353">Oliveira,R., Botelho,F., Silva,P., Resende,A., Silva,C., Dinis,P., Cruz,F., Exploratory study assessing efficacy and complications of TVT-O, TVT-Secur, and Mini-Arc: results at 12-month follow-up, European Urology, 59, 940-944, 2011</p> | <p data-bbox="497 1023 636 1046"><b>Sample size</b></p> <p data-bbox="497 1078 779 1294">N = 90<br/>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 30<br/>TVT-Secur (single incision) = 30<br/>Mini-Arc (single incision) = 30</p> | <p data-bbox="790 1023 943 1046"><b>Interventions</b></p> <p data-bbox="790 1078 992 1241">TVT-O (Gynecare; Ethicon Inc., Somerville, NJ, USA) was inserted according to De Leval (2003)</p> <p data-bbox="790 1273 992 1377">TVT-Secur (Gynecare; Ethicon Inc., Somerville, NJ, USA) was</p> | <p data-bbox="1008 1023 1093 1046"><b>Details</b></p> <p data-bbox="1008 1078 1290 1294">The surgeries were performed by the authors with the patient in the lithotomy position, with hips flexed at 90°. All the surgeons had a minimum experience of 30 cases for each procedure.</p> <p data-bbox="1008 1326 1200 1377">For prophylactic antibiotherapy, i.v.</p> | <p data-bbox="1326 1023 1413 1046"><b>Results</b></p> <p data-bbox="1326 1078 1686 1129"><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1326 1161 1637 1265"><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1326 1297 1664 1377"><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Patients were considered cured if they did not</p>  | <p data-bbox="1709 1023 1839 1046"><b>Limitations</b></p> <p data-bbox="1709 1078 2033 1377">NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br/><b>A Selection bias</b><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: unclear</p> |    |    |  |      |    |       |                     |       |       |    |                |       |       |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135218</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Portugal</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>The study assessed two single-incision slings, TVT-Secur and Mini-Arc and TVT-O, a conventional transobturator midurethral sling.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2008 - September 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>90/90 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 52.0 ± 11.7<br/>TVT-Secur = 52.7 ± 10.9<br/>Mini-Arc = 52.6 ± 11.8</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day [reported as number of pads/day] – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 3.1 ± 2.0<br/>TVT-Secur = 2.5 ± 1.3<br/>Mini-Arc = 2.5 ± 1.8</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 10.8 ± 8.5<br/>TVT-Secur = 8.4 ± 5.9<br/>Mini-Arc = 8.0 ± 6.1</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Clinically and urodynamically proven SUI associated with urethral hypermobility</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> | <p>positioned in the hammock position (Neuman 2007)</p> <p>Mini-Arc (American Medical Systems, Minnetonka, MN, USA) procedure followed the original description (Moore 2009; Kennelly 2010)</p> | <p>ceftriaxone 1g was used. A 16F Foley catheter was introduced and urine evacuated.</p> <p>Surgical incisions were closed with a 3-0 running suture, and a vaginal gauze was left in place.</p> <p>Postoperative analgesia included paracetamol (1g orally 3 times a day) and ibuprofen (400mg orally 3 times a day).</p> <p>On postoperative day 1 the vaginal gauze and Foley catheter were removed and residual volume measured after spontaneous voiding. If &lt; 100 ml, patients were discharged on paracetamol 1g orally 3 times a day.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Previous case series have shown that success rates after conventional transobturator midurethral slings vary from 35% to 98%; success rates reported after Mini-Arc and TVT-Secur vary from 40% to 100%. Sample size was computed considering a one-stage procedure by Fleming. A minimum of 26</p> | <p>report any episodes of urine leakage, ceased to wear any incontinence protection, and had a negative cough test. If a patient reported maintenance of SUI or a positive cough test, but the number of incontinence protections necessary decreased by &gt;50% and she answered affirmatively to the question “Are you satisfied with the result of the surgery?”, the patient was considered improved. All other cases were deemed failures.”</p> <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 20/30 (67%)<br/>Mini-Arc = 26/30 (87%)<br/>TVT-O = 25/30 (83%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 4/30 (13%)<br/>Mini-Arc = 2/30 (7%)<br/>TVT-O = 3/30 (10%)</p> <p><b>Failed</b><br/>TVT-Secur = 6/30 (7%)<br/>Mini-Arc = 2/30 (7%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/30 (7%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Sling transection due to recurrent urinary retention<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/30 (0%)<br/>Mini-Arc = 0/30 (0%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/30 (7%)</p> | <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>B Performance bias</b><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>C Attrition bias</b><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>D Detection bias</b><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Population: none<br/>Intervention: none</p> |

| Study details       | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
|---------------------|---|---------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|
|                     | <p>1] Previous surgery for SUI</p> <p>2] Genital prolapse stage <math>\geq 2</math> (by the Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification System)</p> <p>3] Complaints of urgency, frequency or nocturia</p> <p>4] Demonstrating detrusor overactivity</p> |               | <p>patients in each group was needed assuming a higher proportion for acceptance of 0.85, a lower proportion for rejection of 0.6, an alpha of 0.05, and beta of 0.1.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Transient urinary retention*</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 1/30 (3%)</p> <p>Mini-Arc = 1/30 (3%)</p> <p>TVT-O = 0/30 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b></p> <p>Moderate de novo urgency*</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 3/30 (10%)</p> <p>Mini-Arc = 3/30 (10%)</p> <p>TVT-O = 5/30 (17%)</p> <p>Urinary tract infection</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 1/30 (3%)</p> <p>Mini-Arc = 1/30 (3%)</p> <p>TVT-O = 0/30 (0%)</p> <p>Prolonged leg pain</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 0/30 (0%)</p> <p>Mini-Arc = 1/30 (3%)</p> <p>TVT-O = 2/30 (7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>46</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>25</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 46 | 60 | <b>Control</b> | 25 | 30 | <p>Outcome: continence status measured by self-report plus cough stress test</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Five patients had a valsava leak point pressure (VLPP) slightly below 60 cm H<sub>2</sub>O [the authors definition of intrinsic sphincter deficiency]. However, surgeons maintained the surgical option because they believed the most important component for SUI was urethral hypermobility. One patient was randomised for TVT-O (VLPP: 59 cm H<sub>2</sub>O), two for TVT-Secur (VLPP: 58 cm H<sub>2</sub>O each), and two for Mini-Arc (VLPP: 54 cm H<sub>2</sub>O and 58 cm H<sub>2</sub>O).</p> <p>No cases of intra-operative major bleeding, haematuria, urethral injury or vaginal perforation were observed.</p> <p>Pain score in the first 24 h was highest in TVT-O and lowest in Mini-Arc.</p> <p>Data for TVT-Secur used in meta-analysis (as two other studies compared TVT-Secur with TVT-O).</p> |
|                     | Events  | Total         |   |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 46  | 60            |   |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 25  | 30            |   |   |          |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|  |   |   |  | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>5</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 2 | 60 | Control | 0 | 30 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 60 | Control | 5 | 30 |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental   | 2   | 60  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control  | 0   | 30  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental   | 6   | 60  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control  | 5   | 30  |  |   |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Teo,R., Moran,P., Mayne,C., Tincello,D., Randomized trial of tension-free vaginal tape and tension-free vaginal tape-obturator for urodynamic stress incontinence in women, Journal of Urology, 185, 1350-1355, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 127</p> <p>TVT = 66</p> <p>TVT-O = 61</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>127/127 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 52.4 ± 11.8</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT procedure was not described in detail</p> <p>TVT-O was performed as described by de Leval 2005 but local (not general) anaesthetic was used.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Intra-operative cystoscopy with a 70 degree cystoscope was used in all studies, included twice after each trocar pass during the TVT procedure and one at the end of the TVT-O procedure. Urethral catheterization was used intra-operatively but not postoperatively. Cough testing was used to guide TVT tension.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u></p> <p>Object cure - defined as "24 hour pad test &lt; 5gm"</p> <p>TVT: 33/41 (80.5%)</p> <p>TVT-O: 25/29 (86.2%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer generated</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Yes - opaque envelopes used</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes</p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|
| <p>135601</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United Kingdom</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the effectiveness and complications of TVT and TVT-O for USI in women</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2005 to September 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p>TVT-O = 50.9 ± 11.4</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day [reported as leakage episodes/day] – Median (Range)</u><br/>TVT = 3 (0 - 13)<br/>TVT-Secur = 3 (0 - 16)</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] sole diagnosis of SUI<br/>2] no previous continence surgery</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] uterovaginal prolapse greater than stage I on the Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification staging system<br/>2] voiding dysfunction (defined as maximal flow rate less than 15 mL per second or post-void residual urine volume 100 ml or greater)</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Using a 65% objective cure rate for TVT 100 women were required per study arm to detect a 20% difference in the cure rate with 80% power. Significance was considered at 0.05</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>ITT analysis considered women lost to follow-up considered as treatment failures for subjective and objective outcomes.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT = 0/66 (0%)<br/>TVT-O = 0/61 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal injury*<br/>TVT = 0/66 (0%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 3/61 (4.9%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Leg pain*<br/>TVT: 1/66 (1.7%)<br/>TVT-O: 14/61 (23.0%)</p> <p>Vaginal tape erosion<br/>TVT: 3/66 (5.9%)<br/>TVT-O: 1/61 (1.6%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>33</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>25</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 33 | 66 | Control | 25 | 61 | <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: Serious</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: No<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: No<br/>Level of bias: Serious</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes</p> |
|   | Events   | Total         |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental  | 33   | 66            |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 25   | 61            |   |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|--|
|   |  |  |   | <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>0</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>3</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>14</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 0 | 66 | Control | 3 | 61 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 3 | 66 | Control | 14 | 61 | <p>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Study recruitment terminated early due to publication of 2 studies reported high adverse effect rates (leg pain) with TVT-<br/>O</p> |
|   | Events   | Total  |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental  | 0  | 66   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 3  | 61   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|   | Events   | Total  |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental  | 3  | 66   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 14   | 61   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Andrada,Hamer M., Larsson,P.G., Teleman,P., Eten-Bergqvist,C., Persson,J., Short-term results of a prospective randomized evaluator blinded multicenter study comparing TVT and TVT-Secur, International Urogynecology Journal, 22, 781-787, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135672</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 133<br/>TVT = 62<br/>TVT-Secur = 61</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>133/133 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (Range)</u><br/>TVT = 48 (33 - 78)<br/>TVT-Secur = 47 (33 - 84)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT procedure was performed as described in Ulmsten 1996.</p> <p>TVT-Secur was performed using the 'H' hammock approach to avoid risk of bladder injury and subsequent need for intra-operative cystoscopy.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The bladder was catheterized (12-French Foley catheter for TVT-Secur and 18-French Foley catheter for TVT) immediately prior to surgery and removed as soon as the procedure was finished.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was performed on surgeons discretion.</p> <p>Local anaesthetic was used for both procedures</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b></p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Unclear - Not reported<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Yes - Sealed, opaque envelopes used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |



| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
|--|--|---------------|---|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Sweden</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the TVT-Secur with the retropubic TVT procedure in terms of safety and efficacy"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>2007 to 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Economical support from Gynecare Scandinavia</p> | <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day [reported as leakage episodes/day] – Mean (Range)</u><br/>TVT = 3 (0 - 9)<br/>TVT-Secur = 3 (0 - 16)</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean (Range)</u><br/>TVT = 9 (1 - 45)<br/>TVT-Secur = 6.5 (1 - 40)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] history of SUI<br/>2] wish for surgical treatment<br/>3] no wish for future pregnancy<br/>4] age ≥ 18 years<br/>5] ≥ 3ml leakage at a standardized pad test<br/>6] cough-synchronous leakage at stress test (up to ten coughs in standing position) the latter two with a bladder volume of 300 ml</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] need for concomitant surgery for genital organ</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The study was designed to detect 10% difference in cure rate at an estimated 85% level of cure and aimed to included 280 patients with an additional 28 patients to compensate for an estimated 10% dropout. An interim analysis was carried out after 140 patients or earlier if there were serious adverse events.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT = 2/62 (3.2%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/61 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal wall perforation*<br/>TVT = 1/62 (1.6%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 1/61 (1.6%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>* Most common adverse effect in peri-operative category used in meta-analysis</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>61</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 1 | 62 | Control | 1 | 61 | <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: No - inclusion criteria not reported</p> |
|  | Events   | Total         |   |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Experimental   | 1  | 62            |   |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |
| Control  | 1  | 61            |   |   |          |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |   |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|----------------------|--|
|               | <p>prolapse</p> <p>2] regular pelvic floor training in previous 3 months</p> <p>3] planned or current pregnancy</p> <p>4] previous surgery for urinary incontinence</p> <p>5] bladder capacity less than 300mL</p> <p>6] residual urinary volume more than 100mL</p> <p>7] known detrusor instability</p> <p>8] cystitis more than 4 times in previous 12 months</p> <p>9] pyelonephritis more than once in previous 5 years</p> <p>10] known or suspected neurological conditions</p> <p>11] current anticoagulation therapy which could not be interrupted in dur time prior to surgery</p> <p>12] know abnormal coagulation</p> <p>13] allergy to local anaesthetics and/or metronidazol</p> <p>14] cognitive or language problems precluding comprehension of written study information or questionnaires</p> |               |         |                      | <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes - some outcomes reported at &lt; 12 months</p> <p>Indirectness - Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |        |       |              |   |    |   |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Abdelwahab,O., Shedid,I., Al-Adl,A.M., Tension-free vaginal tape versus secure tension-free vaginal tape in treatment of female stress urinary incontinence, Current Urology, 4, 93-98, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135793</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Egypt</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the outcome of the TVT procedure versus the TVT-Secur procedure for the management of females complaining of genuine SUI"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 60</p> <p>TVT = 30</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 30</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u></p> <p>60/60 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>TVT = 39.2 ± 9</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 40.2 ± 11</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] detrusor overactivity</p> <p>2] Low bladder volume (&lt; 200ml)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>The TVT procedure performed as described by Ulmsten 1995 where the tape was placed loosely under the mid-urethra and the two ends of the tape pulled through two small supapubic incisions.</p> <p>The TVT-Secur procedure was performed using the U shape technique. A single incision was made in the anterior vaginal wall over the mid-urethra. The tape was passed on both sides of the urethra to be inserted into the endopelvic fascia on both sides without passing into the retropubic space.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>None reported</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>None reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p><b>Peri-operative</b></p> <p>Bladder perforation</p> <p>TVT = 2/30 (6.7%)</p> <p>TVT-Secur = 0/30 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b></p> <p>None reported at 12 months</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>2</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 2 | 30 | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Unclear - not reported</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Unclear - Not reported</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: Unclear - Not reported</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: Unclear - Not reported</p> <p>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: No</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined</p> |
|  | Events   | Total  |  |  |          |        |       |              |   |    |   |
| Experimental   | 2  | 30   |  |  |          |        |       |              |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |   |    |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|----|---|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p>   | <p>3] grade III or V cystocele<br/>4] type 0 SUI (according to Blavias and Olsson classification 1988)<br/>5] Recurrent cases</p>                   |   |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </table>  | <b>Control</b>  | 0 | 30 | <p>precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear - Not reported<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear - Not reported<br/>Level of bias: Some</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of :<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: No - Most outcomes reported at &lt; 12 months<br/>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
| <b>Control</b>   | 0   | 30  |  |  |   |   |    |   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>El-Hefnawy,A.S.,<br/>Wadie,B.S., El,MekreshM,<br/>Nabeeh,A., Bazeed,M.A.,<br/>TOT for treatment of stress urinary incontinence: How should we assess its equivalence with TVT?,<br/>International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 21,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 40<br/><br/>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 21<br/>TVT (bottom-up retropubic tension-free vaginal tape) = 19</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT was performed according to the original technique by Delorme (2001)<br/><br/>TVT was performed according to the original technique</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Surgery was performed with the patient under spinal anaesthesia - 2 or 3 ml of 2.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride was injected in the subarachnoid space.<br/><br/>Cystoscopy was done only for patients who presented with mixed urinary</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 1 year follow up</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear<br/>"Patient's randomisation is accomplished through closed</p> |   |    |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions            | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| <p>947-953, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>135900</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Egypt</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"Comparing the effectiveness and safety of TVT and TOT as a treatment for SUI in a prospective randomised manner. For more composite assessment, success was evaluated in terms of stress-related and overall success."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2006 to September 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>40/40 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOT = 45 ± 7<br/>TVT = 47 ± 5</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>TOT = 6/21 (28.6%)<br/>TVT = 1/19 (5.3%)</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Urodynamically proven SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Pelvic or vaginal surgery within a period less than 6 months</p> | <p>by Ulmsten (1996)</p> | <p>incontinence.</p> <p>Cystoscopy was carried out after TVT procedure to exclude bladder or urethral injury.</p> <p>Before discharge, patients were evaluated with respect to postvoid residual volume, wound status and presence of any groin and/or thigh pain.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Scale used – "Overall success was defined by no reporting of any type of incontinence and negative stress test and 1-h pad test"<br/>TOT = 14/21 (66.7%)*<br/>TVT = 17/19 (93.8%)*</p> <p>* Only percentage reported. n calculated by NCC-WCH.</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Urinary tract infection<br/>TOT = 1/21 (4.8%)**<br/>TVT = 1/19 (5.3%)**</p> <p>Anterior vaginal wall stitch sinus<br/>TOT = 0/21 (0%)<br/>TVT = 1/19 (5.3%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Urethral erosion<br/>TOT = 1/21 (4.8%)<br/>TVT = 0/19 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal erosion<br/>TOT = 1/21 (4.8%)**<br/>TVT = 0/19 (0%)</p> <p>Postoperative thigh pain<br/>TOT = 3/21 (14.3%)**<br/>TVT = 0/19 (0%)</p> <p>** Percentage calculated by NCC-WCH</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> | <p>envelopes. A randomly selected envelope is dispatched to a running nurse with the patient's name and ID hand typed on the envelope."</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: no -29% of TOT group had detrusor overactivity, compared with 5% in TVT group (authors do not report P value for comparison at baseline for this variable)<br/>Level of bias: high</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: unclear - authors report mean follow up<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: unclear<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear - authors report mean follow up<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes - mean follow up was 19.7 ± 7 months</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
|               | <p>2] Associated urethral and/or bladder pathology</p> <p>3] Active urinary tract infection documented by urine culture</p> <p>4] Reported urge incontinence as predominant complaint</p> |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continenence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 491 1630 715"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>14</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>17</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 826 1630 1050"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1161 1630 1385"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>3</td> <td>21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 14 | 21 | Control | 17 | 19 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 1 | 21 | Control | 1 | 19 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 3 | 21 | Control | 0 | 19 | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Number of women with MUI not reported but suggestion in text that some women with MUI were included (see Other information).</p> <p>Intervention: Number of women undergoing concomitant surgery not reported but suggestion in text that at least one woman received concomitant surgery (see Other information).</p> <p>Outcome: Results reported as mean follow up. Continenence status (calculated by NCC-WCH from reported percentage "overall success rate") was defined as "no reporting of incontinence and negative stress and 1-h pad test"</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 14  | 21            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 17  | 19            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 1   | 21            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 1   | 19            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|               | Events  | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 3   | 21            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control       | 0   | 19            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details  | Participants                 | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
|  |                              |   |  |  | <p>Mixed UI was not stated as inclusion or exclusion criteria but authors state that "Cystoscopy was done only for patients who presented with mixed urinary incontinence". Unclear how many participants had MUI.</p> <p>The authors report operative findings (operative time, blood loss and early postoperative PVR) data with and without anterior colporrhaphy. However it is unclear how many patients underwent this concomitant surgery.</p> <p>Patients were evaluated at 3, 6, 12 months and then every 6 months. Mean follow up was <math>19.7 \pm 7</math> months; TOT = <math>20.8 \pm 7</math>, TVT = <math>18.8 \pm 7</math>. Time of data freezing was when the last patient completed 6-month follow up.</p> <p>Accidental bladder injury was observed in one TOT patient (4.7%) during the dissection of bladder base from anterior vaginal wall in preparation for colporrhaphy.</p> |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Barber, M.D., Kleeman, S., Karram, M.M., | <b>Sample size</b><br>N= 170 | <b>Interventions</b><br>TOT procedures were all performed | <b>Details</b><br>All study surgeons had substantial experience with | <b>Results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment - 12 months</u> | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Paraiso,M.F.R.,<br/>Walters,M.D.,<br/>Vasavada,S.,<br/>Ellerkmann,M.,<br/>Transobturator tape<br/>compared with tension-free<br/>vaginal tape for the<br/>treatment of stress urinary<br/>incontinence: A<br/>randomized controlled trial,<br/>Obstetrics and<br/>Gynecology, 111, 611-621,<br/>2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>135923</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the<br/>study was carried out</b><br/><br/>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/><br/>"To test the hypothesis that<br/>transobturator tape is not<br/>inferior to the TVT in the<br/>treatment of stress urinary<br/>incontinence in patients<br/>with and those without<br/>concurrent pelvic organ<br/>prolapse."</p> | <p>TVT = 88<br/>TOT = 82</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%<br/>female)</u><br/>170/170 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 52 ± 11<br/>TOT = 53 ± 12</p> <p><u>Incontinence<br/>episodes/day - Median<br/>(range)</u><br/>TVT = 2.3 (0 – 8.3)<br/>TOT = 2.6 (0 – 16.3)</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI - years -<br/>Median (range)</u><br/>TVT = 5 (0.5 - 30)<br/>TOT = 5 (0.5 - 30)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary<br/>incontinence -n/N (%)</u><br/>Defined as "stress and<br/>urge incontinence<br/>symptoms"<br/>TOT = 5 (0.5 - 30)*<br/>TOT = 54/82 (66%)*</p> <p>* only % reported, n<br/>calculated by NCC-WCH.</p> <p>7% had undergone a</p> | <p>with the Monarc<br/>Subfascial<br/>Hammock system<br/>(American Medical<br/>Systems Inc.,<br/>Minnetonka, MN)<br/>using the<br/>technique<br/>recommended by<br/>the manufacturer.</p> <p>TVT procedures<br/>were all performed<br/>using the vaginal<br/>or "bottom up"<br/>approach following<br/>the technique<br/>described by the<br/>manufacturer<br/>(Gynecare, Ethicon<br/>Inc., Somerville,<br/>NJ).</p> <p>For both<br/>procedures,<br/>surgeons were<br/>instructed to place<br/>the slings "tension-<br/>free". Beyond this,<br/>no other<br/>standardisation of<br/>sling tensioning<br/>was dictated.</p> | <p>TVT and had performed at<br/>least 10 TOT procedures<br/>before enrolling patients in<br/>the study. Method of<br/>anaesthesia was left to the<br/>discretion of the study<br/>surgeon. All patients<br/>underwent intra-operative<br/>cystoscopy to assess for<br/>lower urinary tract injury.</p> <p>Concomitant surgery was<br/>performed at the discretion<br/>of the surgeon but had to be<br/>declared before<br/>randomisation.</p> <p>Peri-operative care,<br/>including catheter<br/>management and pain<br/>management, was<br/>performed as was routine for<br/>the site in which the woman<br/>was enrolled.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>This is a non-inferiority study<br/>design. The null hypothesis<br/>was that the difference in<br/>the proportion of women<br/>with abnormal bladder<br/>function in the TOT group<br/>compared with the TVT<br/>group was 15% or more. In<br/>a RCT comparing TVT and<br/>laparoscopic Burch<br/>colposuspension performed<br/>by two of the sites</p> | <p>Scale used – Global Index of<br/>Improvement (PGI-I) [data<br/>included in meta-analysis]</p> <p><b>Very much better</b><br/>TVT = 45/82 (56%)<br/>TOT = 38/75 (51%)</p> <p><b>Much better</b><br/>TVT = 18/82 (23%)<br/>TOT = 23/75 (31%)</p> <p><b>Somewhat better</b><br/>TVT = 6/82 (7%)<br/>TOT = 5/75 (7%)</p> <p><b>No different</b><br/>TVT = 7/82 (9%)<br/>TOT = 5/75 (7%)</p> <p><b>Somewhat worse</b><br/>TVT = 4/82 (5%)<br/>TOT = 3/75 (4%)</p> <p><b>Much worse</b><br/>TVT = 2/82 (2%)<br/>TOT = 1/75 (1%)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Severity<br/>Index (ISI)</p> <p><b>Dry</b><br/>TVT = 50/85 (58.8%)<br/>TOT = 48/77 (62.3%)</p> <p><b>Slight</b><br/>TVT = 12/85 (14.1%)<br/>TOT = 9/77 (11.7%)</p> <p><b>Moderate</b></p> | <p>checklist: Randomised<br/>controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate<br/>randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate<br/>concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable<br/>at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level<br/>of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded:<br/>no - "not possible<br/>postoperatively due to different<br/>incisions required for each<br/>procedure"<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded:<br/>no - "not possible<br/>postoperatively due to different<br/>incisions required for each<br/>procedure"<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for<br/>both groups: unclear - authors<br/>report mean follow up<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable<br/>for dropout: yes - all<br/>participants received treatment<br/>to which they were randomised<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable<br/>for missing data: unclear -<br/>authors report mean follow up;<br/>denominators vary for reported<br/>outcome measures</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>November 2004 to January 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>American Medical Systems (Minnetonka, MN, USA)</p> | <p>previous incontinence procedure (retropubic urethropexy or bulking agent injection). 20% had vaginal or uterine prolapse that extended beyond the hymen with maximal straining. 10% had a history of previous surgery for pelvic organ prolapse.</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Demonstrated urodynamic stress urinary incontinence on multi-channel urodynamic testing<br/>2] ≥ 21 years of age<br/>3] Desired surgical correction of their incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Detrusor overactivity on urodynamic testing<br/>2] Posvoid residual volume &gt; 100 ml<br/>3] History of previous sling procedure<br/>4] Desired future childbearing<br/>5] History of hidradenitis suppurativa, inguinallymphadenopathy or an inguinal or vulvar</p> |               | <p>participating in the present study, the proportion of women in the TVT arm considered cured by the present study's definition was 83% at 12 months. Assuming similar results for the present study, 82 participants in each group (164 total) provides 80% power to reject the null hypothesis using a two-group large-sample normal approximation test of proportions with a one-sided 5% significance level. Anticipating 10% loss to follow-up and/or dropout rate over the period of the study, enrolment goal was 180.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>The primary and secondary outcomes were analysed according to original treatment assignment. Participants with missing data that did not allow an assessment of the primary outcome were considered failures for the purpose of this analysis.</p> | <p>TVT = 10/85 (11.8%)<br/>TOT = 13/77 (16.8%)</p> <p><b>Severe</b><br/>TVT = 13/85 (15.3%)<br/>TOT = 7/77 (9.1%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence – Bladder diary<br/>Median (range)<br/>TVT = 0 (0 - 16) (N = 70)<br/>TOT = 0 (0 - 7) (N = 64)</p> <p><u>Continence status (Zero episodes per day) - 12 months</u><br/>Standing cough stress test (300 ml)<br/><b>Negative stress test</b><br/>TVT = 73/79 (92.4%)<br/>TOT = 62/71 (87.3%)</p> <p>Scale used – 3-day bladder diary<br/>"No incontinence episodes on diary" [data included in meta-analysis]<br/>TVT = 46/70 (66%)<br/>TOT = 44/64 (69%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury<br/>TVT = 7/88 (8%)*<br/>TOT = 0/82 (0%)*</p> <p>Blood transfusion</p> | <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes - mean follow-up was 18.2 ± 6 months<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - all postoperative assessments and examinations were performed by a research nurse blinded to treatment assignment<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: 71% of the study population (66% in TOT and 76% in TVT group) had stress and urge symptoms (mixed urinary incontinence).</p> <p>Intervention: Concomitant surgery was performed in 53% of participants.</p> <p>Outcome: Mean follow up reported - some missing data for some reported outcomes indicated by varying reported denominators (see Other Information)</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               | <p>mass</p> <p>6] Current genitourinary fistula or urethral diverticulum</p> <p>7] Otherwise had a contraindication for surgery</p> |               |         | <p>TVT = 1/88 (1.1%)*</p> <p>TOT = 0/82 (0%)*</p> <p>Vaginal wall perforation</p> <p>TVT = 1/88 (1.1%)*</p> <p>TOT = 0/82 (0%)*</p> <p>Urethral injury</p> <p>TVT = 0/88 (0%)*</p> <p>TOT = 1/82 (1.2%)*</p> <p>Cardiac arrhythmia</p> <p>TVT = 1/88 (1.1%)*</p> <p>TOT = 0/82 (0%)*</p> <p><b>Postoperative</b></p> <p>Infection requiring antibiotics (excluding urinary tract infections requiring antibiotics)</p> <p>TVT = 11/88 (12.5%)*</p> <p>TOT = 13/82 (15.9%)*</p> <p>Urinary tract infection</p> <p>TVT = 12/88 (13.6%)*</p> <p>TOT = 11/82 (13.4%)*</p> <p>Pulmonary</p> <p>TVT = 0/88 (0%)*</p> <p>TOT = 1/82 (1.2%)*</p> <p>Pelvic abscess</p> <p>TVT = 1/88 (1.1%)*</p> <p>TOT = 1/82 (1.2%)*</p> <p>Blood transfusion</p> <p>TVT = 1/88 (1.1%)*</p> <p>TOT = 0/82 (0%)*</p> <p>Emergency room evaluations</p> <p>TVT = 2/88 (2.3%)*</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Some discrepancies between numbers reported in tables/figures and those reported in the text. Where discrepancies appear data has been extracted from tables/figures.</p> <p>Participants were evaluated at 6, 12, 24 months with mean follow up 18.2 ± 6 months. Denominators for each outcome varied.</p> <p>160/170 (94%) completed at least 12 months of follow up; TOT = 75/82, TVT = 85/88 [data taken from Fig,1 flow diagram of patient enrolment. Authors report in Results text 162/170 (95%) completed at least 12 months of follow up].</p> <p>7% of participants had undergone a previous incontinence procedure (retropubic urethropexy or bulking agent injection).</p> <p>Table 2 reports TOT or TVT alone was performed in 77/170 (45%) of women (TOT = 37/82, TVT = 40/88). In text and Table 3 report TOT or TVT alone was performed in 65/170 (39%) of women (not</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--|--|--|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p>TOT = 4/82 (4.9%)*</p> <p>Mesh erosion<br/>TVT = 5/88 (5.6%)<br/>TOT = 1/82 (1.2%)</p> <p>Leg pain or difficulty ambulating<br/>TVT = 2/88 (2.4%)<br/>TOT = 3/82 (4%)</p> <p>Urinary retention<br/>TVT = 5/88 (5.7%)*<br/>TOT = 2/82 (2.4%)*</p> <p>De novo or worsened urge incontinence<br/>TVT = 9/88 (10%)**<br/>TOT = 3/82 (4%)**</p> <p>*percentages calculated by NCC-WCH.<br/>** only percentages reported, n calculated by NCC-WCH.</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1241 1630 1326"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>broken down by group). The remainder received additional surgical procedures. Concomitant procedures were comparable between groups and included hysterectomy, anterior colporrhaphy, paravaginal repair, posterior colporrhaphy, vaginal vault suspension, sacral colpopexy, colpocleisis, oophrectomy, anal sphincteroplasty, mesh/graft reinforcement of anterior and posterior vaginal walls, trachlectomy, hysteroscopic surgery, benign vulvar surgery, bladder biopsy, salpingectomy, abdominoplasty and laparoscopic cholecystectomy.</p> <p>The proportion of participants who were classified as "dry" after surgery by the ISI was similar between those with and those without concurrent prolapse surgery (59% compared with 55%, p = 0.91)</p> <p>Postoperative complications requiring emergency room evaluations included vaginal bleeding (n = 2), chest pain (n = 1), acute abdominal pain with negative workup (n = 1) and bladder spasms (n = 2).</p> <p>Five of the six mesh erosions (83%) required a return to the operating room for excision.</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |   |
|               |              |               |         |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |   |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments            |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|----------------|----|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|---|----|----------------|---|----|--|--------|-------|---------------------|----|----|---|
|                     |              |               |         | <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 274 1630 411"> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>63</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>41</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 472 1532 496"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 523 1630 743"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>73</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>62</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 804 1666 828"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 855 1630 1075"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>7</td> <td>88</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1326 1136 1671 1160"><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 1187 1630 1343"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>11</td> <td>88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>Experimental</b> | 63 | 88 | <b>Control</b> | 41 | 82 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 73 | 88 | <b>Control</b> | 62 | 82 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 7 | 88 | <b>Control</b> | 0 | 82 |  | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 11 | 88 | <p data-bbox="1709 304 2042 715">Reported observed denominators for each outcome vary as follows. Patient satisfaction measured with PGI-I: TOT = 75, TVT = 82 Patient satisfaction measured with ISI: TOT = 77, TVT = 85 Incontinence episodes measured with bladder diary: TOT = 64, TVT = 70 Continence status measured with cough stress test: TOT = 71, TVT = 79 Adverse effect - urinary retention: TOT = 77, TVT = 85</p> <p data-bbox="1709 746 2042 911">Where more than one measure for an outcome was reported, the measure reporting the lowest effect was included in the meta-analysis (to produce an underestimate of effect).</p> |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 63           | 88            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 41           | 82            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 73           | 88            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 62           | 82            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 7            | 88            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Control</b>      | 0            | 82            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 11           | 88            |         |   |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |                |    |    |  |        |       |                     |   |    |                |   |    |  |        |       |                     |    |    |   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |    |    |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|----|----|--|
|   |   |  |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>13</td> <td>82</td> </tr> </table>   | Control  | 13 | 82 |  |
| Control   | 13  | 82   |  |   |  |    |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Araco,F., Gravante,G., Sorge,R., Overton,J., De,VitaD, Sesti,F., Piccione,E., TVT-O vs TVT: A randomized trial in patients with different degrees of urinary stress incontinence, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 19, 917-926, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref id</b></p> <p>135971</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"We compared TVT-O with TVT in SUI1 and SUI2 patients to evaluate the efficacy of both techniques, the eventual urodynamic changes and complications rates in each subgroup of</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 240</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 120<br/>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 120</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>240/240 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 53.2 ± 4.9<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 54.0 ± 5.1<br/>TVT SUI1 = 53.6 ± 3.4<br/>TVT SUI2 = 54.5 ± 7.9</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 4.4 ± 1.1<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 5 ± 1.4<br/>TVT SUI1 = 4.8 ± 1.9<br/>TVT SUI2 = 5 ± 1.7</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O procedure was performed using the TVT Obturator System (Gynecare Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA).</p> <p>TVT procedure was performed using the TVT kit (Gynecare Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Two surgeons performed the procedures within an inpatient setting, both of whom had previously performed more than 40 TVT-O and TVT each.</p> <p>Oral anticoagulants were discontinued 7 days before surgery where appropriate. NICE guidelines were adopted for preoperative testing, Standard prophylaxis measures of deep vein thrombosis and infections were implemented. All patients underwent spinal anaesthesia.</p> <p>No additional doses of antibiotics were administered unless an infection or an intra-operative complication was present. Ketorolac was usually given on patient's request as an analgesic. Early mobilisation was encouraged 1–3 h postoperatively, and elastic bands or garments were maintained for 6–12 h postoperatively.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence:<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – "Incontinence <b>cure</b> was evaluated with the postoperative ambulatory urodynamic tests 1 year after and failures defined as the persistency of SUI on that occasion."<br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 50/50 (100%)<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 33/50 (66%)<br/>TVT SUI1 = 50/50 (100%)<br/>TVT SUI2 = 58/58 (100%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence Quality of Life Questionnaire (I-QOL) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 104 ± 6.3 (50)<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 73 ± 31.0 (50) [this is as reported in paper but SD of 31.0 seems out of keeping with other reported SDs]<br/>TVT SUI1 = 96 ± 5.7 (50)<br/>TVT SUI2 = 104 ± 5.8 (58)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: "two surgeons explained experimental nature of the trial, obtained the informed consent signed and presented 2 identical closed envelopes to patients, one containing the paper 'TVT' and the other 'TVT-O'. After choosing and opening of the envelope, further stratification was performed with a sampling chart."<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> |    |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p>patients."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2004 to March 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Quality of Life Questionnaire (I-QOL) - Mean <math>\pm</math> SD (N)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 54 <math>\pm</math> 13.5 (50)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 32 <math>\pm</math> 7.3 (50)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 52 <math>\pm</math> 16.5 (50)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 32 <math>\pm</math> 7.3 (58)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Symptomatic SUI grade 1 (loss of urine during excessive strains) and grade 2 (loss of urine during minor strains)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] SUI grade 3 (loss of urine at rest)</p> <p>2] Overactive bladder</p> <p>3] Associated prolapses</p> <p>4] Neurovegetative disorders</p> <p>5] Recurrent SUI</p> <p>6] Rehabilitative or medical therapies for SUI (i.e. pelvic floor muscle training or duloxetine)</p> |               | <p>Urinary catheter was removed 6–12 h after surgery. After removal, if a urinary residual greater than 100cc was present, the patient performed intermittent catheterisation. If she still failed to resume normal voiding after 3 weeks, a permanent bladder obstruction was considered and tape resection planned.</p> <p>Patients without complications were discharged 24 h after the operation.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size of the study was determined assuming a significance level (<math>\alpha</math>) of 0.05 and a desired power of the experiment of 87–90% (87%: drop-out of 25%, 90% absence of drop-out). For all these reasons, the study enrolled 240 subjects.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Bladder obstructions*</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 12/50 (24%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 0/58 (0%)</p> <p>Vaginal perforations</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 2/50 (4%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 4/50 (8%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 0/58 (0%)</p> <p>Bladder perforations</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 1/50 (2%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 2/58% (3%)</p> <p>Haematomas</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 0/50 (0%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 3/50 (6%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 3/58 (6%)</p> <p><b>Post operative</b></p> <p>Detrusor overactivity</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 2/50 (4%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 1/50 (2%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 2/50 (4%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 0/58 (0%)</p> <p>Re-catheterisations</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 8/50 (16%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 9/50 (18%)</p> <p>TVT SUI1 = 7/50 (14%)</p> <p>TVT SUI2 = 8/58 (14%)</p> <p>Vaginal erosions</p> <p>TVT-O SUI1 = 2/50 (4%)</p> <p>TVT-O SUI2 = 1/50 (2%)</p> | <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes - 100/120 in TVT-O and 108/120 in TVT were assessed at 12 month follow up</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: unclear exactly which urodynamic measures were used to determine incontinence cure</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: No</p> <p>Intervention: No</p> <p>Outcome: Unclear exactly which urodynamic measures were used to determine incontinence cure (continence status)</p> |

| Study details       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |                     |     |     |                |    |     |  |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|---------------------|-----|-----|----------------|----|-----|--|
|                     |              |               |         | <p>TVT SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)<br/>TVT SUI2 = 1/58 (2%)</p> <p>Reoperations<br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 0/50 (0%)<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 17/50 (34%)<br/>TVT SUI1 = 15/50 (30%)<br/>TVT SUI2 = 4/58 (7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures at 12 months</u><br/>Postvoid residual volume (ml) -<br/>Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O SUI1 = 19 ± 15 (50)<br/>TVT-O SUI2 = 20 ± 13 (50)<br/>TVT SUI1 = 52 ± 44 (50)<br/>TVT SUI2 = 19 ± 14 (50)</p> <p>* Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1023 1630 1241"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Experimental</b></td> <td>108</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Control</b></td> <td>83</td> <td>120</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | <b>Experimental</b> | 108 | 120 | <b>Control</b> | 83 | 120 | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>A stratified randomisation was carried out. Results are reported separately for SUI grade 1 and SUI grade 2 populations randomised to TVT-O or TVT. Patients were classified according to the SUI system on the basis of urodynamics studies (McGuire classification: SUI1 = abdominal leak-point pressure (ALPP) greater than 90cm water, SUI2 = ALPP of 60–90 cm water, SUI3 = intrinsic sphincter deficiency and ALPP less than 60 cm water).</p> <p>208/240 completed follow up at 12 months: TVT-O = 100/120, TVT = 108/120</p> <p>Reoperations:<br/>In TVT/SUI1 group, 12 were conducted for bladder obstructions and 3 to drain haematomas.<br/>In TVT/SUI2 group, 3 were to drain haematomas and 1 for cystoscopic resection of the tape that perforated the bladder during initial surgery.<br/>In TVT-O/SUI2 group, 17 patients underwent TVT procedure due to failure of TVT-O to cure incontinence.</p> |
|                     | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Experimental</b> | 108          | 120           |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |    |     |  |
| <b>Control</b>      | 83           | 120           |         |   |          |        |       |                     |     |     |                |    |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|---|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|--|
|  |   |  |  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>12</td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>19</td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>17</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 12 | 108 | Control | 0 | 100 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 19 | 108 | Control | 17 | 100 | <p>Results for SUI1 and SUI2 subgroups were pooled for meta-analysis as per Cochrane Handbook (<a href="http://www.cochrane.org.uk">http://www.cochrane.org.uk</a>)</p> <p>As I-QOL uses high scores to indicate better quality of life we have added a minus sign in the meta-analysis to account for this.</p> |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental   | 12  | 108  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
| Control  | 0   | 100  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
|  | Events  | Total  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental   | 19  | 108  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
| Control  | 17  | 100  |  |   |   |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Freeman,R., Holmes,D., Hillard,T., Smith,P., James,M., Sultan,A., Morley,R., Yang,Q., Abrams,P., What patients think: Patient-reported outcomes of retropubic versus trans-obturator mid-urethral slings for urodynamic stress incontinence-a multi-centre randomised controlled trial, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 22, 279-286, 2011</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 193</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 93</p> <p>TOT (transobturator outside in) = 100</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>193/193 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Median (interquartile range)</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TOT (Monarc, American Medical Systems) and TVT (Gynecare) were performed using standard techniques for both procedures, as agreed by all investigators.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients had a choice of local, regional or general anaesthetic. Antibiotic and venous thromboembolism prophylaxes were provided in all cases.</p> <p>Patients were discharged when they were voiding volumes of &gt; 200 ml with post-void residuals of &lt; 100 ml.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>"The proportion of subjects in the TVT arm expecting</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – Patient Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I)</p> <p><b>Very much better</b><br/>TVT = 58/85 (68.2%)<br/>TOT = 56/95 (58.9%)</p> <p><b>Much better</b><br/>TVT = 13/85 (15.3%)<br/>TOT = 20/95 (21.1%)</p> <p><b>A little better</b><br/>TVT = 7/85 (8.2%)<br/>TOT = 3/95 (3.2%)</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes</p> |        |       |              |    |     |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>136054</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To use patient-report outcomes to determine if the trans-obturator MUS was equivalent (but not inferior) to the retropubic MUS in a randomised controlled trial."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>"Independent research commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)".</p> | <p>TVT = 50 (44 – 60)<br/>TOT = 54 (45 – 59)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Median (interquartile range)</u><br/>TVT = 7 (6 – 8)<br/>TOT = 7 (6 – 9)</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women over age 21 years with urodynamic stress incontinence or mixed urinary incontinence where SUI was predominant symptom<br/>2] Failed pelvic floor muscle training<br/>3] Willing and able to complete a 4-day urinary diary</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women with</p> |               | <p>cure at 12 months is 82%. Assuming that the TOT group showed 15% or less difference in the primary outcome when compared to the TVT group, then a clinically equivalent rate of cure would be accepted. Using a statistical power of 80% (1-β) and a one-sided significant level of 0.05 (α), the sample size was calculated as 160, basing on a two-group large sample normal approximation test of proportion, 80 for each group. Anticipating a 10% loss to follow-up, the target sample size was 180.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"The analysis and outcome measures were by 'intention to treat'".</p> | <p><b>No change</b><br/>TVT = 2/85 (2.4%)<br/>TOT = 4/95 (4.1%)</p> <p><b>A little worse</b><br/>TVT = 1/85 (1.2%)<br/>TOT = 0/95 (0%)</p> <p><b>Much worse</b><br/>TVT = 0/85 (0%)<br/>TOT = 1/95 (1.1%)</p> <p><b>Very much worse</b><br/>TVT = 0/85 (0%)<br/>TOT = 0/95 (0%)</p> <p><b>Missing data</b><br/>TVT = 4/85 (4.7%)<br/>TOT = 11/95 (11/6%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – International Consultation on Incontinence Modular Questionnaire - Female Urinary Tract Symptoms (ICIQ-FLUTS) "Cured' being defined as the answer 'no' to the ICIQ-FLUTS question 'does urine leak when you are physically active, exert yourself, cough or sneeze?' Possible answers are 'no' (i.e. never) or 'yes' (i.e. occasionally, sometimes, most of the time, all of the time)."</p> | <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: surgeons - not possible; ward staff - yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: unclear<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear - denominators for each outcome vary slightly<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: Inclusion criteria state women with MUI were included but numbers not reported.<br/>Intervention: No.</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               | <p>neurological disease</p> <p>2] Previous surgery for urodynamic stress incontinence (those with previous prolapse surgery were not excluded)</p> <p>3] Urodynamic detrusor overactivity or low compliance</p> <p>4] Postvoid residual volume &gt; 100 ml on two occasions</p> <p>5] Pregnant within last 3 months or planning pregnancy during study period</p> <p>6] Inguinal or vulval mass</p> <p>7] Lymphadenopathy or abscess or history of hidradenitis suppurativa</p> <p>8] Bleeding diathesis or current anticoagulation therapy</p> <p>9] Pelvic organ prolapse extending beyond the hymen</p> |               |         | <p><b>Cured</b><br/>TOT = 59/93 (63.4%)*<br/>TVT = 55/84 (65.5%)*</p> <p><b>Not cured</b><br/>TOT = 34/93 (36.6%)*<br/>TVT = 29/84 (34.5%)*</p> <p>* N not reported; calculated from combining n reported for cured and not cured</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months - Mean (range)</u><br/>Scale used - International Consultation on Incontinence Modular Questionnaire - Female Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms (ICIQ-FLUTS) question "Overall, how much do urinary symptoms affect your everyday life?" Not at all (0), a great deal (10).<br/>TOT = 3.1 (1-10) (N = 91)<br/>TVT = 3.3 (1-8) (N = 83)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment**</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TOT = 0/100<br/>TVT = 2/92</p> <p>Vaginal skin perforation<br/>TOT = 4/100<br/>TVT = 0/92</p> <p>Groin pain**<br/>TOT = 8/100<br/>TVT = 1/92</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b></p> | <p>Outcome: No.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Women with urodynamic stress incontinence or mixed urinary incontinence where stress urinary incontinence was predominant symptom were included. The number of women with MUI in each group was not reported.</p> <p>One patient withdrew from the TVT group before surgery. 180/193 (93.3%) were followed up at 12 months; TOT = 95/100 (95%), TVT = 85/93 (91.4%).</p> <p>Overall urgency was not improved by either procedure, as 74.7 % of the TOT group and 82.4% of the TVT group reported urgency at 12 months (measured by response to ICIQ-FLUTS question "Do you have a sudden need to rush to the toilet to urinate?"). The only within-group difference was an increase in those who did not have urgency in the TOT group (11% at baseline increasing to 23.2% at 12 months; McNemar's test <math>P &lt; 0.01</math>).</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|----------|
|               |              |               |         | <p>Removal of tape for pain<br/>TOT= 1/100<br/>TVT = 0/92</p> <p>Tape extrusion<br/>TOT= 3/100<br/>TVT = 2/92</p> <p>Voiding difficulty requiring catheterisation**<br/>TOT= 5/100<br/>TVT = 5/92</p> <p>Required ISC at 4 weeks [no definition of ISC given]<br/>TOT= 4/100<br/>TVT = 3/92</p> <p>Required ISC at 12 months [no definition of ISC given]<br/>TOT= 2/100<br/>TVT = 1/92</p> <p>Urinary tract infection requiring antibiotics<br/>TOT= 2/100<br/>TVT = 7/92</p> <p>De novo overactive bladder symptoms<br/>TOT= 4/100<br/>TVT = 4/92</p> <p>Wound infections<br/>TOT= 2/100<br/>TVT = 0/92</p> <p>Vaginal infection/discharge<br/>TOT= 4/100<br/>TVT = 0/92</p> |          |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|-----|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p data-bbox="1323 304 1585 357"><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1323 387 1514 440"><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p data-bbox="1323 470 1697 552">** Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p data-bbox="1323 608 1599 660"><b>Patient satisfaction with treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 687 1630 911"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>71</td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>76</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 967 1532 994"><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1023 1630 1246"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>55</td> <td>93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>59</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="1323 1302 1666 1329"><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 71 | 93 | Control | 76 | 100 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 55 | 93 | Control | 59 | 100 |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental  | 71           | 93            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
| Control       | 76           | 100           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
|               | Events       | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
| Experimental  | 55           | 93            |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |
| Control       | 59           | 100           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|-----|--|
|  |   |   |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>1</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>8</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>5</td> <td>92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>5</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Events | Total | Experimental | 1 | 92 | Control | 8 | 100 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 5 | 92 | Control | 5 | 100 |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental   | 1   | 92  |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
| Control  | 8   | 100   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
|  | Events  | Total   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental   | 5   | 92  |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
| Control  | 5   | 100   |   |  |   |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Tseng,L.-H., Wang,A.C., Lin,Y.-H., Li,S.-J., Ko,Y.-J., Randomized comparison of the suprapubic arc sling procedure vs tension-free vaginal taping for stress incontinent women, International Urogynecology Journal, 16, 230-235, 2005</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>155642</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 62</p> <p>SPARC (retropubic top-down) = 31</p> <p>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 31</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%)</u><br/>62/62 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>SPARC = 50.43 ± 11.15<br/>TVT = 51.57 ± 12.45</p> <p><u>Incontinence</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>SPARC procedures were performed as described by Plzak and Staskin (2002) using SPARC devices manufactured by American Medical Systems (Minnetonka, MN, USA)</p> <p>TVT procedures were performed as described by Ulmsten et al</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Procedures were performed under regional or local anaesthesia.</p> <p>Anterior colporrhaphy with or without posterior colporrhaphy was performed in women with symptomatic vaginal prolapse. Vaginal total hysterectomy with or without sacrospinous ligament fixation was performed for those with pelvic prolapse greater than ICS stage II.</p> <p>All patients underwent</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Episodes of incontinence: Not reported</p> <p>Episodes of urgency: Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Scale used - "Objective cure was defined as pad weight 1g or less; patients whose loss decreased to less than half of the preoperative value were considered improved"</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear</p> |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |     |  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>Taiwan</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the surgical outcomes of these two continence taping procedures [TVT and SPARC] and to determine whether a finer and downward pass SPARC needle caused less iatrogenic injury"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>October 2001 to April 2002</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Genuine stress incontinence alone or combined with pelvic prolapse</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Pelvic prolapse greater than stage II of the International Continence Society grading system<br/>2] Previous anti-incontinence surgery</p> | <p>(1995) using devices manufactured by Gynecare (Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> <p>No catheterisation was instituted postoperatively except in those patients for whom concurrent vaginal repair was undertaken. In these patients, catheters were removed on the third postoperative day. Sterile, intermittent catheterisation was offered every 4 hours for women without an indwelling catheter when they left the operating room.</p> <p>Patients were discharged once the amount of postvoid residuals was less than 20% of that from self-voiding consecutively four times.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Since one of the study objectives was to determine the difference in iatrogenic injury rate, the cystotomy rate was used to calculate sample size. Two (20%) bladder perforations occurred in a pilot study of 10 SPARC procedures.</p> | <p>routine suprapubic ultrasonography for detecting unrecognised subcutaneous or retropubic haematoma on the day immediately after the operation.</p> <p>No catheterisation was instituted postoperatively except in those patients for whom concurrent vaginal repair was undertaken. In these patients, catheters were removed on the third postoperative day. Sterile, intermittent catheterisation was offered every 4 hours for women without an indwelling catheter when they left the operating room.</p> <p>Patients were discharged once the amount of postvoid residuals was less than 20% of that from self-voiding consecutively four times.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Since one of the study objectives was to determine the difference in iatrogenic injury rate, the cystotomy rate was used to calculate sample size. Two (20%) bladder perforations occurred in a pilot study of 10 SPARC procedures.</p> | <p><b>Cured</b><br/>SPARC = 25/31 (80.7%)<br/>TVT = 27/31 (87.1%)</p> <p><b>Improved</b><br/>SPARC = 6/31 (19.3%)<br/>TVT = 4/31 (12.9%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury<br/>SPARC = 4/31 (12.9%)<br/>TVT = 0/31 (0%)</p> <p>Retrpubic haematoma<br/>SPARC = 3/31 (9.7%)<br/>TVT = 5/31 (16.1%)</p> <p>Rejection of tape<br/>SPARC = 1/31 (3.2%)<br/>TVT = 2/31 (6.5%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Defective vaginal wound healing<br/>SPARC = 1/31 (3.2%)<br/>TVT = 3/31 (9.7%)</p> <p>Protrusion of tape edge<br/>SPARC = 1/31 (3.2%)<br/>TVT = 4/31 (12.9%)</p> <p>Nocturia<br/>SPARC = 2/31 (6.5%)<br/>TVT = 1/31 (3.2%)</p> <p>Frequency<br/>SPARC = 5/31 (16.1%)</p> | <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: None</p> <p>Intervention: Percentage of study population undergoing concomitant surgery not reported</p> <p>Outcome: Continence status</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|--|---|----------|--------|-------|--|--|--|--|
|               |              |               | <p>Perforation rate for TVT was only 0.8% in a series of 600 cases. To detect a 19.2% difference (20-0.8), with a significance level of 0.05 and power of 0.8, at least 28 participants in each group were required.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>TVT = 3/31 (9.7%)</p> <p>Urgency<br/>SPARC = 5/31 (16.1%)<br/>TVT = 3/31 (9.7%)</p> <p>Urge incontinence<br/>SPARC = 5/31 (16.1%)<br/>TVT = 2/31 (6.5%)</p> <p>Dysuria<br/>SPARC = 1/31 (3.2%)<br/>TVT = 0/31 (0%)</p> <p>Incomplete voiding<br/>SPARC = 10/31 (32.3%)<br/>TVT = 6/31 (19.4%)</p> <p>Strain to void<br/>SPARC = 3/31 (9.7%)<br/>TVT = 2/31 (6.5%)</p> <p>Post-micturition dribble<br/>SPARC = 4/31 (12.9%)<br/>TVT = 0/31 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1323 1241 1630 1326"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total |  |  |  | <p>was defined as pad weight of 1g or less. Unclear when continence status outcome was measured. Follow-up was performed at 1, 6, 12 and 24 months.</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Rate of bladder perforation in TVT case series, used in power calculation, seems low compared to rates reported in other studies included in this question.</p> <p>All procedures performed by one surgeon.</p> <p>Authors state exclusion criteria as "pelvic prolapse greater than stage II of ICS"; however in methods authors state "vaginal total hysterectomy... was performed in those with pelvic prolapse greater than ICS stage II"</p> |
|               | Events       | Total         |  |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |  |
|               |              |               |  |   |          |        |       |  |  |  |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|--|
|   |  |   |  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>27</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>25</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>5</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>3</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>10</td> <td>31</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Experimental   | 27 | 31 | Control | 25 | 31 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 5 | 31 | Control | 3 | 31 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 31 | Control | 10 | 31 |  |
| Experimental  | 27   | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 25   | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|   | Events   | Total   |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental  | 5  | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 3  | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
|   | Events   | Total   |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Experimental  | 6  | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| Control   | 10   | 31  |  |   |  |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Wang,Y.J., Li,F.P., Wang,Q., Yang,S., Cai,X.G., Chen,Y.H., Comparison of three mid-urethral tension-free tapes (TVT, TVT-O, and TVT-Secur) in the treatment of female stress urinary</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 102</p> <p>TVT = 32<br/>TVT-O = 36<br/>TVT-Secur = 34</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten et al.</p> <p>TVT-O was performed as described by De</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>During the U procedure, 50mL normal saline was injected into the bladder before withdrawing the inserter. This was then retracted and observed for blood. If blood was observed a cystoscopy was ordered to</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u></p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer</p> |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |    |    |  |



| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>incontinence: 1-year follow-up, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 22, 1369-1374, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>188102</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>China</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare the efficacy and possible post-operative complications of the TVT-Secur with TVT and TVT-O procedures</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>October 2008 to December 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>No funding reported</p> | <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>102/102 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 56.6 ± 9.6<br/>TVT-O = 56.0 ± 9.1<br/>TVT-Secur = 57.3 ± 9.5</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI(years) – Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 6.1 ± 5.5<br/>TVT-O = 4.4 ± 3.6<br/>TVT-Secur = 4.8 ± 4.4</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] previous surgical procedure for SUI</p> | <p>Leval.</p> <p>For TVT-Secur the hammock position was selected for patients with a higher ALPP (≥ H2O) and were performed as recommended by the manufacturer or as described by Tartaglia.</p> <p>All procedures were performed by experienced surgeons who had received the appropriate training.</p> | <p>identify any bladder injury. Unlike TVT or TVT-O, the TVT-Secur was inserted as close to the urethra as possible to maintain the necessary pull-out force between the two ends.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>A sample-size calculation showed objective cure rates for SUI, which included 90% for TVT and 88% for TVT-O and assuming a cure rate of 55% for TVT-Secur, 90 patients would be needed (30 in each group) to detect a difference of 35% in cure rates among the three procedures with 90% power and a value of 0.05. Assuming a drop-out rate of 20% study aimed to recruit 108 patients in total.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Negative cough stress test and the absence of urine leak by patients report - n/N (%)<br/>TVT = 30/32 (93.8%)<br/>TVT-O = 33/36 (91.7%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 23/34 (76.6%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Bladder perforation<br/>TVT = 1/32 (3.1%)<br/>TVT-O = 0/36 (0%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 1/34 (2.9%)</p> <p>Patients with &gt; 100ml blood loss<br/>TVT = 2/32 (6.3%)<br/>TVT-O = 1/36 (2.8%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/34 (0%)</p> <p>Complete retention<br/>TVT = 1/32 (3.1%)<br/>TVT-O = 1/36 (2.9%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/34 (70%)</p> <p>Thigh pain<br/>TVT = 0/32 (0%)<br/>TVT-O = 5/36 (13.9%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/34 (0%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>generated<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Yes - Seale, opaque envelopes used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: Yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: Unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   |   |  |  |   | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: No - no inclusion criteria listed</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes - continence status measured by cough stress test and patient report</p> <p>Indirectness - Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p>   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Barber,M.D., Weidner,A.C., Sokol,A.I., Amundsen,C.L., Jelovsek,J.E., Karram,M.M., Ellerkmann,M., Rardin,C.R., Iglesia,C.B., Toglia,M., Single-incision mini-sling compared with tension-free vaginal tape for the treatment of stress urinary incontinence: A randomized controlled trial, Obstetrics and gynecology, 119, 328-337, 2012</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 263<br/>TVT = 127<br/>TVT-Secur = 136</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>263/263 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT = 54.6 ± 11.3<br/>TVT-Secur = 54.6 ± 10.5</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed using the vaginal or 'bottom-up' approach recommended by the manufacturer (Ethicon) with tension set free so a spacer could be placed between the sling and the urethra.</p> <p>TVT-Secur was used by the</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients underwent intra-operative cystoscopy at the end of the procedure. Peri-operative care and pain management were performed as per the routine at the study site.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Assuming a subjective cure rate for TVT of 82%, 127 individuals in each group would provide 80% to reject the null hypothesis that the</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months</u><br/>Scale used – Patient Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I). "Patient-reported success rate defined as 'Very much improved' or 'Much improved'"<br/>TVT = 91/127 (71.7%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 87/136 (64.0%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br/>Subjective cure = "incontinence</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes - computer-generated<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes - sealed opaque envelopes used<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions                                     | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>188330</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>'To compare efficacy of a single-incision mini-sling placed in the "U" position with retropubic TVT in the treatment of SUI in patients with and without concurrent pelvic organ prolapse'</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>August 2007 to March 2010</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Foundation for Female Health Awareness</p> | <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT = 0/127 (0%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/136 (0%)</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported per group but overall mixed UI = 63%</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] &gt; 21 years of age<br/>2] multi-channel urodynamic proven SUI<br/>3] desired surgical treatment for incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urodynamic proven detrusor overactivity<br/>2] postvoid residual volume &gt; 100mL<br/>3] history of previous synthetic, biologic, or fascial suburethral sling surgery</p> | retropubic 'U' approach with tension set tightly. | <p>true difference in cure rates between the two procedures is less than or equal to 12% in favour of the alternate hypothesis. Assuming a 10% loss to follow up or drop-out rate for the duration of the study, the total enrolment goal was 280.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Reports on intention to treat (ITT) analysis for primary and secondary outcomes but no details given.</p> | <p>severity index score = 0 (dry) and no retreatment for stress incontinence"<br/>TVT = 77/127 (60.6%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 77/136 (56.6%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Bladder injury*<br/>TVT = 6/127 (4.7%)<br/>TOT-Secur = 1/136 (0.8%)</p> <p>Blood transfusion needed<br/>TVT = 1/127 (0.8%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/136 (0%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Mesh erosion<br/>TVT = 1/127 (0.08%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 0/136 (0%)</p> <p>Tape release / reoperations*<br/>TVT = 7/127 (5.5%)<br/>TVT-Secur = 4/136 (2.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p>* Most common adverse effects in peri-operative and post-operative categories used in meta-analyses</p> <p><b>Patient satisfaction with</b></p> | <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: yes - sham incisions made<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: Unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes - postoperative assessment at 1 year performed by clinician blinded to intervention<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|----|-----|---------|----|-----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|-----|--|
|               | <p>4] desires future childbearing</p> <p>5] currently using anticoagulation therapy or had a known bleeding diathesis</p> <p>6] had a current urethral diverticulum or fistula of the lower urinary tract</p> <p>7] another contraindication for surgery</p> |               |         | <p><b>treatment</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 328 1630 549"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>91</td> <td>127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>87</td> <td>136</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 660 1630 880"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>77</td> <td>127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>77</td> <td>136</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Peri-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1326 992 1630 1212"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>6</td> <td>127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>1</td> <td>136</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 91 | 127 | Control | 87 | 136 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 77 | 127 | Control | 77 | 136 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 6 | 127 | Control | 1 | 136 | <p>Population: No - Included women with MUI and women with previous incontinence surgery</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: No - Continence status was subjective and no objective cure rates given</p> <p>Indirectness: Serious</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |
|               | Events   | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 91   | 127           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 87   | 136           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Events   | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 77   | 127           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 77   | 136           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|               | Events   | Total         |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 6  | 127           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control       | 1  | 136           |         |   |          |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |    |     |         |    |     |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|-----|---------|---|-----|--|
|   |   |  |  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>7</td> <td>127</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>4</td> <td>136</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 7 | 127 | Control | 4 | 136 |  |
|   | Events  | Total  |  |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Experimental  | 7   | 127  |  |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| Control   | 4   | 136  |  |  |  |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Hota,L.S., Hanaway,K., Hacker,M.R., Disciullo,A., Elkadry,E., Dramitinos,P., Shapiro,A., Ferzandi,T., Rosenblatt,P.L., TVT-Secur (Hammock) versus TVT-Obturator: a randomized trial of suburethral sling operative procedures, Female pelvic medicine &amp; reconstructive surgery, 18, 41-45, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188440</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomized controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare objective</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 86</p> <p>TVT-Secur (single incision) = 42<br/>TVT-Obturator (transobturator inside out) = 44</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>87/87 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- median (interquartile range)</u><br/>TVT-Secur = 52.0 (45.0 – 62.0)<br/>TVT-O = 50.5 (45.5 – 60.0)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-Secur "hammock method" (Ethicon Women's Health &amp; Urology, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> <p>TVT-Obturator (Ethicon Women's Health &amp; Urology, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Women with urodynamic SUI and symptomatic prolapse underwent a suburethral sling procedure with concomitant prolapse repair procedure, determined by the surgeon.</p> <p>Women undergoing sling procedure alone had a weight lifting restriction of 5lb for 2 weeks after surgery, women undergoing concomitant procedures for prolapse had a 10-week restriction period.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Authors hypothesised that one of the procedures would be successful for 80% of women while the other would be successful for 95% of women. Using a one-sided test the sample size required to have 80% power to detect this effect size with</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>defined as a negative cough stress test<br/>TVT-S: 11/42 (26.2%)<br/>TVT-O: 20/44 (45.5%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life - Median (Interquartile range)</u><br/>Scale used = PFIQ change score at 12 months<br/>TVT-S: 33.3 (7.6 - 42.9)<br/>TVT-O: 23.8 (14.3 - 42.8)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/><b>Peri-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Tape exposure<br/>TVT-S: 8/42 (19.1%)<br/>TVT-O: 0/44 (0%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: no<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: no<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: unclear<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable</p> |        |       |              |   |     |         |   |     |  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|---|---|---------------|--|---|----------|--------|-------|--------------|----|----|---------|----|----|--|--------|-------|--------------|---|----|---------|---|----|--|
| <p>outcomes, as well as changes in quality of life, after TVT-O and TVT-S ("Hammock" method) for the treatment of SUI</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>May 2007 to April 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Support from Harvard Catalyst, The Harvard Clinical and Translational Science Center (National Institutes of Health Award No. UL1 RR 025758 and financial contributions from Harvard University and its affiliated academic health care centers. Financial support was obtained from Ethicon Women's Health &amp; Urology, a division of Ethicon Inc, a Johnson &amp; Johnson Company, as an investigator-initiated study.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] History of SUI with a demonstrable impact of SUI as seen on quality of life questionnaires<br/>2] Positive cough stress test during urodynamic testing</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Intrinsic sphincter deficiency (maximum urethral closure pressure &lt; 20cm H<sub>2</sub>O)<br/>2] Previous suburethral sling<br/>3] Predominant overactive bladder symptoms<br/>4] Planning a pregnancy<br/>5] Elevated postvoid residual volume &gt;100ml<br/>6] Bleeding condition or undergoing anticoagulant therapy<br/>7] Immunosuppression<br/>8] Progressive neurological disease<br/>9] Evidence of systemic infection</p> |               | <p><math>\alpha = 0.05</math> was 67 women in each treatment arm. The sample size was increased by six in each group to account for loss to follow up.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Authors report intention to treat results (unclear when measured) and per protocol results at 1 year</p> | <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Continence status</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>11</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>20</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Post-operative adverse effects</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Events</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Experimental</td> <td>8</td> <td>42</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>0</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |          | Events | Total | Experimental | 11 | 42 | Control | 20 | 44 |  | Events | Total | Experimental | 8 | 42 | Control | 0 | 44 | <p>for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population:<br/>Intervention:<br/>Outcome:</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Women included in the study were permitted to undergo concomitant procedures to treat prolapse and/or fecal incontinence.</p> <p>Study was terminated early after poor interim analysis reported.</p> |
|   | Events  | Total         |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 11  | 42            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 20  | 44            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
|   | Events  | Total         |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Experimental  | 8   | 42            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |
| Control   | 0   | 44            |  |   |          |        |       |              |    |    |         |    |    |  |        |       |              |   |    |         |   |    |  |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Scheiner,D.A., Betschart,C., Wiederkehr,S., Seifert,B., Fink,D., Perucchini,D., Twelve months effect on voiding function of retropubic compared with outside-in and inside-out transobturator midurethral slings, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 23, 197-206, 2012 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 160<br>TVT-O = 40<br>TOT = 40<br>TVT = 80<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br>160/160 (100%)<br><br><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br>TVT-O = 59.3 ± 12.1<br>TOT = 56.6 ± 10.3<br>TVT = 57.8 ± 13.0<br><br><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Overactive bladder dry - n/N (%)</u><br>TVT-O = 13/40 (32.5%)<br>TOT = 9/40 (22.5%)<br>TVT = 25/80 (31.3%) | <b>Interventions</b><br>Tension-free vaginal tape (TVT), transobturator outside-in (TOT), transobturator inside-out (TVT-O).<br><br>Further details not reported. | <b>Details</b><br>Experienced gynaecologists performed the procedures according to the original methods (not described), preferably under analgesia and sedation. The first 10 procedures were observed by a urogynaecologist. Cefazolin or clindamycin (in case of penicillin allergy) was given as prophylactic single-shot antibiotic. Cystoscopy was mandatory for every procedure.<br><br>To determine appropriate tape tension a cough test was performed, and Metzenbaum scissors were placed as a spacer between tape and urethra to ascertain a tension-free position.<br><br>An indwelling catheter was placed in case of concomitant prolapse surgery, intraoperative bladder injury or increased intraoperative bleeding with need of intra-vaginal packing.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b> | <b>Results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 12 months - n/N (%)</u><br>"Patient's global impression of improvement (cured)"<br>TVT-O = 29/27 (78.4%)<br>TOT = 28/34 (82.4%)<br>TVT = 57 (87.7%)<br><br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 12 months - n/N (%)</u><br>"Both a negative cough (supine position) and a negative short-pad test [weight gain < 3g, performed with a bladder filling at 300ml]"<br>TVT-O = 33/37 (89.2%)<br>TOT = 31/34 (91.2%)<br>TVT = 58/65 (93.6%)<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br>Scale used - Visual Analogue Scale on incontinence impact (0 = no urinary complaints, 10 = unbearable urinary complaints) - mean ± SD, N<br>TVT-O = 1.3 ± 1.8, 28<br>TOT = 1.2 ± 1.7, 28<br>TVT = 0.7 ± 1.3, 47<br><br>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br><u>A Selection bias</u><br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: Yes - computer generated<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Unclear - not reported<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Unclear - not reported<br>Level of bias:<br><br><u>B Performance bias</u><br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br>Level of bias: unclear<br><br><u>C Attrition bias</u><br>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br>Level of bias: low |
| <b>Ref Id</b><br>188443   |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br>Switzerland   |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Study type</b><br>Randomized controlled trial  |  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Aim of the study</b><br>To compare retropubic tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) with transobturator out-in (TOT) and in-out (TVT-O) for female stress urinary incontinence.  |  |   |  |   |   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2006 to October 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>"No funding received"</p> | <p><u>Overactive bladder wet - n/N (%)</u><br/>           TVT-O = 3/40 (7.5%)<br/>           TOT = 2/40 (5.0%)<br/>           TVT = 8/80 (10.0%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at baseline</u><br/>           Scale used - Visual Analogue Scale on incontinence impact (0 = no urinary complaints, 10 = unbearable urinary complaints) - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 7.1 <math>\pm</math> 2.6, 37<br/>           TOT = 7.7 <math>\pm</math> 1.9, 38<br/>           TVT = 7.5 <math>\pm</math> 2.1, 74</p> <p>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, greater impairment)<br/>           General Health Perception - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 33.6 <math>\pm</math> 26.4, 37<br/>           TOT = 42.9 <math>\pm</math> 24.7, 38<br/>           TVT = 36.1 <math>\pm</math> 21.8, 74</p> <p>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, greater impairment)<br/>           Incontinence impact - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 68.6 <math>\pm</math> 31.3, 37<br/>           TOT = 82.9 <math>\pm</math> 26.0, 38<br/>           TVT = 75.9 <math>\pm</math> 24.5, 74</p> |               | <p>Equivalence for all techniques in regard to efficacy and continence was assumed, but fewer obstructions in the two transobturator approach groups (TVT-O and TOT). A postoperative Qmax of 25 and 30 ml/s (SD <math>\pm</math> 10) in the TVT and transobtruator groups, respectively. Based on 0.8 power to detect this difference, a total of 200 patients was estimated (P = 0.05, two-sided).</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>greater impairment)<br/>           General Health Perception - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 25.0 <math>\pm</math> 2.08, 28<br/>           TOT = 22.3 <math>\pm</math> 19.6, 28<br/>           TVT = 22.3 <math>\pm</math> 18.4, 47</p> <p>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, greater impairment)<br/>           Incontinence impact - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 10.7 <math>\pm</math> 18.6, 28<br/>           TOT = 11.9 <math>\pm</math> 22.6, 28<br/>           TVT = 8.5 <math>\pm</math> 14.7, 47</p> <p>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, greater impairment)<br/>           Overactive bladder - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>           TVT-O = 4.9 <math>\pm</math> 14.5, 28<br/>           TOT = 5.2 <math>\pm</math> 19.3, 28<br/>           TVT = 3.9 <math>\pm</math> 13.0, 47</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>           Bladder perforation<br/>           TVT-O = 0/40 (0%)<br/>           TOT = 0/40 (0%)<br/>           TVT = 3/80 (3.75%)</p> <p>Vaginal perforation<br/>           TVT-O = 4/40 (10%)<br/>           TOT = 6/40 (15%)<br/>           TVT = 1/80 (1.25 %)</p> <p>Haemorrhage<br/>           TVT-O = 0/40 (0%)<br/>           TOT = 0/40 (0%)<br/>           TVT = 1/80 (1.25%)</p> | <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>           D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>           D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>           D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>           D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>           D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>           Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study reflect the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes. 38% of women had MUI (wet or dry OAB), 8% underwent concomitant surgery</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>The trial was stopped early due to an unexpected occurrence of de novo female sexual dysfunction in TOT. Study therefore underpowered.</p> <p>Preoperatively conservative</p> |



| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---------------|---------|---|--|
|               | <p>Scale used - King's Health Questionnaire (higher scores, greater impairment)<br/>Overactive bladder - mean <math>\pm</math> SD, N<br/>TVT-O = 48.7 <math>\pm</math> 39.6, 37<br/>TOT = 44.6 <math>\pm</math> 33.3, 38<br/>TVT = 46.9 <math>\pm</math> 31.7, 74</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamically confirmed SUI<br/>2] Mixed urinary incontinence with predominant component of SUI<br/>3] Women with concomitant sling insertion to prolapse repair were eligible</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Missing urodynamic assessment<br/>2] Previous sling procedure<br/>3] Predominant overactive bladder syndrome<br/>4] Post-void residual volume above 100 ml<br/>5] Pregnancy or considering further pregnancy<br/>6] Known or suspected</p> |               |         | <p>Tape loosening within first week<br/>TVT-O = 0/40 (0%)<br/>TOT = 1/40 (2.5%)<br/>TVT = 1/80 (1.25%)</p> <p>Tape release within 12 months by complete incision, including partial excision<br/>TVT-O = 1/40 (2.5%)<br/>TOT = 0/40 (0%)<br/>TVT = 2/80 (2.5%)</p> <p>Second sling insertion<br/>TVT-O = 0/40 (0%)<br/>TOT = 1/40 (2.5%)<br/>TVT = 1/80 (1.25%)</p> <p>Vaginal tape exposure<br/>TVT-O = 0/40 (0%)<br/>TOT = 4/40 (10%)<br/>TVT = 1/80 (1.5%)</p> <p>Thigh or groin pain<br/>TVT-O = 1/40 (2.7%)<br/>TOT = 3/40 (8.3%)<br/>TVT = 1/80 (1.5%)</p> <p>Female sexual dysfunction (in sexually active women; not associated with tape exposure)<br/>TVT-O = 0/25 (0%)<br/>TOT = 5/29 (17.2%)<br/>TVT = 1/52 (1.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>measures for SUI were recommended. Symptomatic cystocele stage 2 or higher according to POP-Q were corrected first.</p> <p>After excluding women with concomitant prolapse surgery, no statistically significant differences were found for either objective or subjective continence status outcomes.</p> <p>One woman undergoing TVT experienced haemorrhage in the retropubic space requiring laparotomy the next day. She received TOT 6 months later and became continent.</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
|   | coagulopathy<br>7] Known allergy to local anaesthetics<br>8] Unable to understand German<br>9] Unable or unwilling for follow up   |   |   |  |  |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Masata,J., Svabik,K., Zvara,K., Drahoradova,P., El,Haddad R., Hubka,P., Martan,A., Randomized trial of a comparison of the efficacy of TVT-O and single-incision tape TVT SECUR systems in the treatment of stress urinary incontinent women--2-year follow-up, International Urogynecology Journal, 23, 1403-1412, 2012<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br>215843<br><br><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br><br>Czech Republic<br><br><b>Study type</b><br>Randomized controlled trial | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 197<br><br>Transobturator Inside-Out (TVT-O) = 68<br>TVT-Secur (H) = 64<br>TVT-Secur (U) = 65<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br>160/160 (100%)<br><br>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br>TVT-O = 56.6 ± 9.7<br>TVT-Secur H = 55.2 ± 10.2<br>TVT-Secur U = 57.7 ± 10.1<br><br>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD<br>Not reported<br><br>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD<br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>TVT-O was performed as described by de Leval 2003. To avoid excess tension during the plastic sheath removal, the Mayo scissors were placed between the tape and urethra. Cystoscopy was not routinely performed for these patients.<br><br>The TVT-S was performed as per manufacturer's instructions. During placement in the H position, the needle driver and device were parallel to the pelvic floor and the device was rotated | <b>Details</b><br><br>All surgeries were performed under general anaesthetic with laryngeal mask airway. The patient was placed in the lithotomy position (90 degrees between table and thigh) with a urethral catheter. Vaginal incision was initiated after infiltration with Supracain 4% (one 2ml ampoule diluted in 18ml of water).<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br><br>The required sample based on 10% dropout rate was 72 per group.<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br><br>Not reported | <b>Results</b><br><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 12 months</u><br>Defined as positive stress test<br>TVT-O = 64/68 (93.9%)<br>TVT-Secur H = 50/64 (77.4%)<br>TVT-Secur U = 45/65 (68.8%)<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br><b>Peri-operative</b><br>Bladder perforation*<br>TVT-O = 0/68 (0%)<br>TVT-Secur H = 1/64 (1.6%)<br>TVT-Secur U = 0/65 (0%)<br><br>Urethral injury<br>TVT-O = 0/68 (0%)<br>TVT-Secur H = 0/64 (0%)<br>TVT-Secur U = 0/65 (0%) | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials<br><br><u>A Selection bias</u><br>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes<br>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: Yes envelopes used<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes<br>Level of bias: low<br><br><u>B Performance bias</u><br>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: unclear<br>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br>Level of bias: Some<br><br><u>C Attrition bias</u><br>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes<br>C2 - Were groups comparable |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---------|--|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the efficacy of the TVT-O and TVT-Secur systems in the treatment of stress urinary incontinent women</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2007 to November 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Ministry of Health of the Czech Republic</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] age &gt; 18 years<br/>2] signed informed consent<br/>3] urodynamic stress urinary incontinence<br/>4] agreement with post-operative follow-up</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] predominant urge incontinence<br/>2] urodynamic detrusor instability<br/>3] immobile urethra<br/>4] previously failed anti-incontinence surgery<br/>5] previous radiotherapy<br/>6] post-void residual volume &gt; 100ml<br/>7] bladder capacity &lt; 300ml<br/>8] pelvic organ prolapse stage II or greater according to the ICSPOPQS<br/>9] planned concomitant surgery<br/>10] age &lt; 18 years</p> | <p>with the inserter tip at an angle of 45% from the patient's midline towards the ischiopubic ramus. For the U position, the tip of the device was pointed upward, the needle driver was rotated for the sagittal midline to aim the device toward the ipsilateral shoulder</p> |         | <p>Vaginal wall perforation*<br/>TVT-O = 0/68 (0%)<br/>TVT-Secur H = 2/64 (3.1%)<br/>TVT-Secur U = 0/65 (0%)</p> <p>Urinary tract infection<br/>TVT-O = 6/68 (8.8%)<br/>TVT-Secur H = 3/64 (4.5%)<br/>TVT-Secur U = 4/65 (6.2%)</p> <p><b>Post-operative</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: yes<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> |

What is the long-term effectiveness of surgical approaches for mid-urethral procedures in women undergoing their primary surgical tape procedure?

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Castillo-Pino,E., Sasson,A., Pons,J.E., Comparison of retropubic and transobturator tension-free vaginal implants for the treatment of stress urinary incontinence, International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, 110, 23-26, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100575</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Uruguay</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the surgical results and frequency of complications associated with two suburethral slings in the management of stress urinary incontinence in women - tension-free vaginal tape</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 104</p> <p>TVT = 55</p> <p>TOT = 49</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (%) female)</u></p> <p>104/104 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (range)</u></p> <p>TVT = 50 (33 - 75)</p> <p>TOT = 51 (34 - 63)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u></p> <p>TVT = 6/55 (11%)</p> <p>TOT = 6/49 (12%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT (Johnson &amp; Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ, USA)</p> <p>Safyre-t plus (Promedon, Cordoba, Argentina) was used in the TOT group</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants were assigned to one of the non-randomised convenience samples - TVT or TOT.</p> <p>The operating room was equipped with an endoscope so that cystoscopy could be performed. All participants received a prophylactic dose of antibiotics. Depending on the surgical technique selected and the operative indications, the anaesthetic technique used was local plus midazolam, epidural or general.</p> <p>Participants were followed for 2 years. At each visit women were interviewed and underwent a stress test</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 24 months</u></p> <p>Scale used - objective cure rate = no leakage symptoms and negative stress test</p> <p>TVT = 45/55 (81.8%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p>Tape erosion</p> <p>TVT = 1/55 (1.82%)</p> <p>Retention</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction</p> <p>TVT = 10/55 (18.2%)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? no loss to follow up</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>(TVT) and transobturator tape (TOT)</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2003 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>  | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Primary or recurrent urinary incontinence<br/>2] Urethral hypermotility<br/>3] Intrinsic urethral deficiency</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Overactive bladder<br/>2] Extra-urethral leakage<br/>3] Coagulopathies<br/>4] Urinary tract infections<br/>5] Desire for future pregnancy<br/>6] Contraindication for surgery</p> |  |   | <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>TVT = 10/49* (20%)<br/>* 49 women had pure SUI</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p>  | <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data for TOT procedure not extracted as &lt; 50 women in TOT group (see methodology chapter)</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Meschia,M., Pifarotti,P., Bernasconi,F., Magatti,F., Vigano,R., Bertozzi,R., Barbacini,P., Tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) and intravaginal slingplasty (IVS) for stress urinary incontinence: a multicenter randomized trial, American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 195, 1338-1342, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 95</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender -Female/N (% female)<br/>95/95 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)-Mean ± SD<br/>56 ± 10</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day-<br/>Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Retropubic "bottom-up" was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996</p> <p>The procedure was performed under local anaesthesia, with the use of 2 small abdominal incisions on each side of the midline just above the pubic symphysis, with a small sagittal incision in</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Post-operative evaluations were at 12 and 24 months. Assessments included onjective and subjective cure, operative factors and complications</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>N/A</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 36 months</u><br/>Cure was defined as "no leakage of urine during a cough stress</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---------|--|---|
| <p>100694</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2002 to December 2002</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Duration of SUI-Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>0/95 (0%)</p> <p>Number with OAB symptoms<br/>35/95 (37%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urodynamically proven stress urinary incontinence<br/>2] urethral hypermobility</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/>2] vaginal prolapse requiring treatment<br/>3] coexisting pelvic pathology<br/>4] known bleeding diathesis or concurrent anticoagulant therapy<br/>5] detrusor overactivity<br/>6] urethral hypomobility (Q-tip <math>\leq</math> 20 degrees from the horizontal with straining)</p> | <p>the midline of the anterior vaginal wall approximately equal to 1cm below the external urethral meatus. As recommended the Mayo scissors were used as a spacer between the tape and the urethra during positioning and tensioning of the tape.</p> |         | <p>test, with at least 300ml of saline solution in the bladder and a pad weight gain less than 1gm during the 1-hour test"<br/>Cured = 78/95 (83%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>0/95 (0%)</p> <p>Retention<br/>9/95 (9.5%)</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>8/60* (13%)<br/>*60 women had pure stress UI</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>minimise bias? yes<br/>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? Yes<br/>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear<br/>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear<br/>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 14/191 (7%) loss to follow up<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Detection bias: low risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Data from retropubic "bottom-up" only extracted and used in review</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Viereck, V., Nebel, M., Bader, W., Harms, L., Lange, R., Hilgers, R., Emons, G., Role of bladder neck mobility and urethral closure pressure in predicting outcome of tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) procedure, Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 28, 214-220, 2006 | <b>Sample size</b><br>N = 191<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br>191/191 (100%)<br><br><u>Age (years)-Median (range)</u><br>59 (22-81)   | <b>Interventions</b><br>Tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) procedures were performed as described by Ulmsten et al 1996. | <b>Details</b><br>191 consecutive women with genuine stress urinary incontinence with or without intrinsic sphincter deficiency were evaluated prospectively with multichannel urodynamics, 24-h voiding diaries, clinical stress tests and introital ultrasound measurements preoperatively and 6 months after surgery.<br><br>Immediately after the operation, outcome was evaluated objectively and subjectively as well as at follow-up after 6, 12, 24 and 36 months. Postoperative subjective assessment included a condition-specific quality of life tool, the Kings Health Questionnaire, the patient's history and 24-h voiding diaries. Objective assessment was by supine and standing cough stress test, clinical examination and ultrasound. | <b>Results</b><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 36 months</u><br>Cure was defined as "a dry, symptom-free patient without objective urine loss during vigorous coughing and other provocative activities at a standard bladder filling on 300ml, and a demonstrable positive urethral closure pressure during stress provocation. Additional criteria were no episodes of stress or urge incontinence in the 24-h voiding diary and no post void residual volume. Moreover the definition of cure comprised assessment of subjective continence by means of a self-completed | <b>Limitations</b><br>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes<br>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes<br>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women<br>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes<br>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? continence status - measure as described in study likely to overestimate number of women continent<br>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear<br>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear<br>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete |
| <b>Ref Id</b><br>110091   | <u>Incontinence episodes/day-Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br>Not reported   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br><br>Switzerland   | <u>Duration of SUI-Mean <math>\pm</math> SD</u><br>Not reported   |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Study type</b><br><br>Prospective cohort study   | <u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br>Not reported  |   |  |   |   |
| <b>Aim of the study</b><br><br>To investigate how urethral mobility and urethral closure pressure affect the outcome of tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) insertion for stress incontinence.  | <b>Inclusion criteria</b><br><br>Patients whose symptoms had an adverse effect on quality of life and who had failed to respond to conservative measures were offered TVT procedure.<br><br>The presence of intrinsic |   | <b>Power calculation</b><br><br>Not reported   |   |   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 1999 to December 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>                  | <p>sphincter deficiency (defined as a maximum urethral closure pressure of &lt; 20 cmH<sub>2</sub>O was not considered a contraindication to surgery.</p> <p>Concomitant detrusor instability was not an absolute contraindication to surgery, provided it was very mild and had responded to bladder drill and anticholinergic therapy preoperatively.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> |  | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>   | <p>questionnaire and the patient's history."<br/>Cured = 171/191 (89.5%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>enough? - 14/191 (7%)<br/>loss to follow up<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Detection bias: high risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>36-month follow-up: 177/191 (93%)</p> <p>The TVT procedure failed (defined as not becoming continent within 6 months of procedure) in 8/191 (4.2%) of women.<br/>Recurrence was seen in 6.3% of cases.</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Chene,G., Amblard,J., Tardieu,A.S., Escalona,J.R., Viallon,A., Fatton,B., Jacquetin,B., Long-term</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 94</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996 with the exception that spinal anaesthesia</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Postoperative check-ups were at 12 and 30 months and these included clinical and urodynamic assessments (24 hour pad test,</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br/>1. Did the study address a</p>  |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| <p>results of tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) for the treatment of female urinary stress incontinence, European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Biology, 134, 87-94, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124205</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 1997 to December 1998</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Gender -Female/N (% female)<br/>94/94 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)-Mean (range)<br/>54.6 (19 - 80)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day-<br/>Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI-Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Mixed Urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women who were treated for stress urinary incontinence with a single TVT procedure</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Associated procedure e.g. hysterectomy, prolapse treatment</p> | <p>was used for patient comfort and the participation of the cough test (with 250 ml of water in the bladder) when adjusting the tape</p> | <p>quality of life assessment, current symptoms questionnaire, flow measurement)</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>N/A</p> | <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 60 months</u><br/>Cured = 65/94 (65.2%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>0/94 (0%)</p> <p>Retention<br/>2/94 (2.1%)</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>12/64* (18.8%)</p> <p>* 64 women had pure stress UI</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? Yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? Yes - 12/94 (72.8) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Detection bias: Low risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
|   |   |   |   |  | Outcomes: Yes<br>Indirectness: None<br><br><b>Other information</b><br><br>None   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Deffieux,X., Daher,N., Mansoor,A., Debodinance,P., Muhlstein,J., Fernandez,H., Transobturator TVT-O versus retropubic TVT: results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial at 24 months follow-up, International Urogynecology Journal, 21, 1337-1345, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124241</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>France</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To compare the retropubic</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 149</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 74</p> <p>TVT (botton-up retropubic tension-free vaginal tape) = 75</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>149/149 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TVT-O = 52.8 ± 9.8<br/>TVT = 54.6 ± 10.9</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon, Gynecare) procedures were all performed using the vaginal approach from inside to outside, as described by de Leval.</p> <p>TVT procedures were all performed using the vaginal approach in accordance with the technique described by Ulmsten and the manufacturer (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon, Gynecare).</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The method of anaesthesia was left to the discretion of each surgeon.</p> <p>Vaginal incision was made in the same fashion in both groups.</p> <p>The polypropylene sling was identical in both procedures.</p> <p>For both procedures, the surgeons were instructed to place the slings "tension-free". Beyond this no other standardisation of the sling tension was imposed.</p> <p>No per-operative cough stress test was required.</p> <p>All patients, including those in the TVT-O group, underwent an intraoperative cystoscopy to check for the presence of lower urinary tract injury.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 24 months</u><br/>Scale used - subjective cure rate = "no referred leakage at interview"<br/>TVT-O = 56/67 (83%)<br/>TVT = 55/65 (84%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 24 months</u><br/>Scale used - objective cure rate = negative stress test<br/>TVT-O = 65/67 (97%)<br/>TVT = 61/65 (94%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? Yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p>TVT and transobturator TVT-O procedures (both using the same macroporous monofilament polypropylene sling), with emphasis being placed on cure rates and intraoperative and post-operative complications, with a minimum follow-up of 24 months."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2005 to December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>(%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>TVT-O = 20/74 (27%)<br/>TVT = 26/75 (35%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Isolated or mixed urodynamic stress incontinence (USI; according to the International Continence Society classification)<br/>2] Indication for surgical treatment of USI<br/>3] Positive cough stress test (cough stress test was performed during cystometry in sitting position, volume 200 – 300 ml)<br/>4] At least 18 years of age</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Concomitant pelvic organ prolapse surgery<br/>2] Concomitant hysterectomy<br/>3] Previous incontinence surgery<br/>4] Pregnancy<br/>5] Anticoagulation therapy<br/>6] Higher than first stage urogenital prolapse<br/>7] Patient unable to</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The sample size calculation (SPSS analysis) was performed assuming a bladder injury rate of 8% for TVT and 0.5% for TVT-O. With <math>\alpha</math> equal to 5% and 80% power (<math>1-\beta</math>) the sample size should be 180 patients, with 90 patients in each group, to reveal a 7.5% difference. The number of subjects included in the trial did not reach this figure because of insufficient enrolment in some centres.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 14/191 (7%)<br/>loss to follow up<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Detection bias: low risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 31% of the study population had mixed urinary stress incontinence.<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>24 month follow up:<br/>132/149 (89%)</p> <p>The authors state that "Gynecare (Johnson and Johnson, Ethicon) had no role in the design, implementation or analysis of this study or in the writing of the present publication."</p> <p>Three patients required repeat surgery: one</p> |

| Study details  | Participants                        | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
|  | understand the purpose of the trial |   |  |   | <p>patient in TVT-O group as a result of vaginal sling extrusion, two patients in the TVT group as a result of persistent bladder outlet obstruction symptoms and a major postvoid residual volume.</p> <p>The authors report that improvements in most items of the CONTILIFE questionnaire, including global quality of life were observed in both groups with no difference between the groups.</p> <p>12-month data (and all adverse event data) from this study is extracted in the evidence table for the question "What is the comparative (short-term) effectiveness of surgical approaches for mid-urethral procedures in women undergoing primary surgical tape procedure?"</p> |
| Full citation  | Sample size                         | Interventions   | Details  | Results   | Limitations   |
| Doo,C.K., Hong,B., Chung,B.J., Kim,J.Y., Jung,H.C., Lee,K.S., Choo,M.S., Five-year | N = 155                             | Tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) procedure was performed by experienced surgeons | 155 consecutive women with complaints of SUI underwent TVT procedure in three institutions in Korea. All women underwent | <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 60 months</u><br>Patient perception was categorised as very | Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br>1. Did the study address a  |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>outcomes of the tension-free vaginal tape procedure for treatment of female stress urinary incontinence, European Urology, 50, 333-338, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124253</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"We therefore evaluated the long-term efficacy and safety of the TVT procedure, with a follow-up of &gt;5 years for the treatment of female SUI"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 1999 to June 2000</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>155/155 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>52.3 ± 9.3</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>25/134 (19%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women who underwent concomitant surgery were excluded from the analysis.</p> | <p>using the standard technique by Ulmsten et al 1996 with some modifications. Operations were usually performed using a combination of light sedation and local anaesthesia, but general or spinal anaesthesia was used if requested or when concomitant procedures were performed.</p> | <p>preoperative evaluations including urodynamics and a 3-day voiding diary.</p> <p>All women visited the clinics 12 months and 60 months after surgery, and were evaluated by physical examination, uroflowmetry and postvoid residual volume measurement. Patient global satisfaction was assessed at 60 months.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>satisfied, satisfied, so-so, and dissatisfied, with both very satisfied and satisfied scored as satisfied<br/>Satisfied = 116/134 (86.6%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 60 months</u><br/>Cured defined as absence of any episodes of involuntary urine leakage during the stressful activities and stress cough test<br/>Cured = 103/134 (76.9%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 21/155 (14%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Risk of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes though</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--|--|
|               |              |               |         | <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>16/109* (15.4%)</p> <p>* 109 women had pure stress UI</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>7/134 (5.2%) women had previously undergone anti-incontinence surgery (Raz procedure, anterior vaginal wall sling or bladder neck suspension) and 25/134 (19%) women had mixed urinary incontinence.</p> <p>Intervention: No 11/134 (8%) women underwent concomitant posterior repair surgery<br/>Outcome: No - Unclear whether standardised questionnaire was used to measure subjective cure.<br/>Indirectness: Serious</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>60-months follow-up: 134/155 (86%)</p> <p>17/155 women were not followed up because they did not respond to mail or telephone contact. 4/138 underwent concomitant surgery and were excluded from the analysis. 131/155 (85%) were observed at 12 months.</p> <p>Women undergoing concomitant procedures (hysterectomy, caruncle</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |  |   |   | excision and cystocele repair) were excluded from the analysis. However, 11 women (8.2%) underwent concomitant posterior repair and were included in the analysis.   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Liapis,A., Bakas,P., Creatsas,G., Long-term efficacy of tension-free vaginal tape in the management of stress urinary incontinence in women: efficacy at 5- and 7-year follow-up, International Urogynecology Journal, 19, 1509-1512, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124427</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Greece</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 70</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (% female)</u><br/>70/70 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>58.1 ± 10.4</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day- Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI-Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Tension-free vaginal tape. Further details not reported</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients were operated on with epidural anaesthesia</p> <p>Patient assessment at 5 years included cysometry, uroflow and 1-h pad test. Assessment at 7 years also included patient satisfaction</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>It was estimated that, for a type I error-alpha 0.10 and a type II error-beta 0.10 (power of the study 90%) and an 82% success rate for TVT at 5-years follow up requires a sample size of at least 54 patients</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 5 years</u><br/>Objective cure rate = negative stress test and pad test &lt;1g TVT = 54/70 (77%)</p> <p><u>Continence status at 7 years</u><br/>Objective cure rate = negative stress test TVT = 49/70 (70%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</li> <li>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</li> <li>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</li> <li>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</li> <li>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</li> <li>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</li> <li>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the</li> </ol> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>To assess the long-term efficacy of TVT procedure for the management of stress urinary incontinence in women</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p>  | <p>1] Urinary stress incontinence with stage I prolapse or less of the anterior compartment (according to ICSC)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamic findings of detrusor overactivity<br/>2] Previous operation in the genital tract<br/>3] Maximum urethral closure pressure of &lt; 20cm H<sub>2</sub>O<br/>4] Prolapse of the anterior compartment &gt; stage I according to ICSC<br/>5] Prolapse of the middle or posterior compartment requiring management</p> |  |  | <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? 9/70 lost to follow up at 7 years</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Palva,K., Rinne,K., Aukee,P., Kivela,A., Laurikainen,E., Takala,T., Valpas,A., Nilsson,C.G., A randomized trial comparing tension-free vaginal tape with tension-free vaginal tape-obturator: 36-Month results, International urogynecology journal and pelvic floor dysfunction, 21,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 267</p> <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 132<br/>TVT (bottom-up tension-free vaginal tape) = 136</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender - Female/N (%)</u></p>  | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT-O procedures were performed as described by de Leval (2003)</p> <p>TVT procedures were performed as described by Ulmsten (1996)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Eight specialists in gynaecology, with wide experience in urogynaecology and TVT operations, were specially trained to perform the TVT-O procedure. After the training period, they had to perform at least 5 TVT-O operations independently including patients in the study.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 36 months</u><br/>Scale used – unclear.<br/>"Patients were asked if they were satisfied with the operation completely, partly or not at all."<br/><b>Completely satisfied</b><br/>TVT-O = 115/126</p>                                       | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort</p>  |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p>1049-1055, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>134948</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Finland</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Randomised controlled trial</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>"To randomly compare two mid-urethra tape procedures, the TVT with the TVT-O, in the treatment of primary stress urinary incontinence."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>March 2004 to November 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>University-administered funding</p> | <p>267/267 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age- Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - Urinary Incontinence Severity Score (UISS) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 11 ± 3 (126)<br/>TVT = 11 ± 3 (131)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire-Short form (IIQ-7) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 17 ± 4 (126)<br/>TVT = 16 ± 4 (131)</p> <p>Scale used - Urinary Distress Inventory-Short form (UDI-6) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 17 ± 3 (126)<br/>TVT = 14 ± 3 (131)</p> <p>Scale use - Visual Analog Scale (VAS), 0 = no urinary problems, 100 = unbearable</p> |               | <p>Prophylactic antibiotics were given at the beginning of the operation: a single dose of cefuroxime 1.5g or metronidazole 500 mg intravenously. All procedures were performed in local infiltration anaesthesia using 0/25% prilocain with adrenalin.</p> <p>A cough stress test was performed during the operation with 300 ml saline in the bladder for adjustment of the tape. Cystoscopy with 70° optic was performed twice during TVT and once during TVT-O to detect possible bladder injury.</p> <p>The bladder was emptied at the end of the operation and no catheter was left in the bladder. Spontaneous voiding was attempted at the latest 3 hours after the operation and PVR volume was measured by ultrasound or by catheterisation</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Sample size calculation was performed assuming a 95% success rate for the TVT procedure and that a 10% difference in either success rate or rates of complications would be clinically important, with a 70% power to show a 10% difference; the sample size should be 260</p> | <p>(91%)*<br/>TVT = 118/131 (90%)*</p> <p><b>Partly or not at all satisfied</b><br/>TVT-O = 11/126 (9%)*<br/>TVT = 13/131 (10%)*</p> <p>* Only percentage reported for "completely satisfied". All other values calculated using N at 36 months.</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 36 months</u><br/>Scale used - cough stress test. "Objective cure was defined as a negative stress test".</p> <p><b>Per protocol:</b><br/><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 112/126 (89.5%)**<br/>TVT = 124/131 (94.6%)**</p> <p><b>Intention to treat:</b><br/><b>Cured</b><br/>TVT-O = 112/132 (84.7%)**<br/>TVT = 124/136 (91.2%)**</p> | <p>recruited in an appropriate way? yes</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? Yes</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Risk of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Unclear - Baseline characteristics not adequately described to allow full assessment of indirectness<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes - Continence status assessed by cough stress</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---------------|--|---------------|--|--|---|
|               | <p>urinary complaints - Median (range)<br/>TVT-O = 71 (18-100)<br/>TVT = 70 (11-100)</p> <p><u>24-hour pad test</u><br/>Mean ± SD<br/>TVT-O = 42g ± 53g<br/>TVT = 41g ± 38g</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] History of SUI<br/>2] Indication for surgical treatment of SUI<br/>3] Positive cough stress test<br/>4] Detrusor instability score ≤ 7</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Previous incontinence surgery<br/>2] Postvoid residual (PVR) urine volume &gt; 100 ml<br/>3] Lower urinary tract anomaly<br/>4] Current urinary tract infection (UTI) or &gt; 3 UTI episodes within the past year<br/>5] Urogenital prolapse of more than second degree (Baden-Walker)<br/>6] BMI &gt; 35 kg/m<sup>2</sup><br/>7] Previous radiation therapy of the pelvis<br/>8] Active malignancy</p> |               | <p>patients with 130 in each group.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>"Cure rates" [reported here as continence status] for both groups were calculated on an intention-to-treat basis, postulating that all losses to follow up were treatment failures.</p> | <p>**Authors report % cured in a per protocol and intention to treat analysis. All other values calculated using reported % and N at 36 months for per protocol result and N randomised for intention to treat result</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 36 months</u><br/>Scale used - Urinary Incontinence Severity Score (UISS) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 0.9 ± 1.8 (126)<br/>TVT = 1.2 ± 2.3 (131)</p> <p>Scale used - Incontinence Impact Questionnaire-Short form (IIQ-7) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 7.4 ± 1.2 (126)<br/>TVT = 7.8 ± 2.1 (131)</p> <p>Scale used - Urinary Distress Inventory-Short form (UDI-6) - Mean ± SD (N)<br/>TVT-O = 7.7 ± 2.1 (126)<br/>TVT = 8.0 ± 2.4 (131)</p> <p>Scale use - Visual Analog Scale (VAS), 0 = no urinary problems,</p> | <p>test, satisfaction measured with unvalidated questionnaire<br/>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>36 month follow up: 257/267 (96%); TVT-O = 126/132 (95.5%), TVT = 131/136 (96.3%)</p> <p>Type of tape used in all procedures was not reported</p> <p>Five patients (1.8%) withdrew from the study before the procedure. It is unclear to which groups they were randomised. One patient randomised to TVT-O received TVT due to technical difficulties with the TVT-O procedure.</p> <p>Tape resection was performed in one TVT-O patient with tape erosion at 12 month follow up visit, which resulted in recurrent incontinence and a TVT re-operation was performed.</p> <p>One TVT-O patient had retention problems; division of tape was</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions                     | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|
|   | 9] Anticoagulation<br>10] Hemophilia<br>11] Neurogenic disease that can associated with bladder disorders<br>12] Use of anticholinergics/duloxetine<br>13] Inability to understand purpose of study<br>14] Immobilisation |                                   |  | 100 = unbearable urinary complaints - Median (range)<br>TVT-O = 2 (0-87)<br>TVT = 2 (0-91)<br><br><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 36 months</u><br>Tape erosion<br>Not reported<br><br>Retention<br>Not reported<br><br>Voiding dysfunction<br>Not reported<br><br>De novo OAB symptoms<br>TVT-O = 7/126 (5.6%)<br>TVT = 12/131 (9.2%)<br><br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures at 36 months</u><br>Post-void residual volume - Median (range)<br>TVT-O = 10ml (0 - 302)<br>TVT = 5ml (0 - 115) | performed twice and retention was resolved but the patient developed de novo urge symptoms.<br><br>This study report does not include baseline mixed urinary incontinence data. The 12-month outcomes report of this study[Palva 2011, included in 12-month outcomes review] indicates that 75% of the study population had preoperative frequency symptoms and 66% had preoperative urgency urinary incontinence symptoms.<br><br>Intention to treat result for continence status used in meta-analysis. |
| Full citation   | Sample size   | Interventions                     | Details  | Results  | Limitations   |
| Lieberia-Juanos,J., Bataller-Sanchez,E., Pubill-Soler,J., | N = 366   | TVT (Gynecare, Johnson & Johnson, | Consecutive women with SUI underwent continence surgery. | <u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u>   | Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Mestre-Costa,M., Ribot-Luna,L., Vizcaino,M.A.C., De novo urgency after tension-free vaginal tape versus transobturator tape procedure for stress urinary incontinence, European Journal of Obstetrics Gynecology and Reproductive Biology, 155, 229-232, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135124</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Spain</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"The objective of this prospective study was to compare the frequency of de novo urgency after TVT and TOT procedures in women with SUI"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2000 to January</p> | <p>TOT = 123<br/>TVT = 243</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>366/366 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>TOT = 57.7 (range 35 – 85)<br/>TVT = 60.5 (range 32 – 84)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Only patients with SUI due to urethral hypermobility of longer than 1 year's duration were eligible.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Intrinsic sphincter deficiency<br/>2] Intrinsic sphincter</p> | <p>Somerville, NJ, USA) was carried out as described by Ulmsten et al 1995.</p> <p>From 2005, consecutive patients underwent the TOT (Gynecare, Johnson &amp; Johnson, Somerville, NJ, USA) procedure as described by de Leval et al 2003.</p> | <p>After 2005 women underwent TOT.</p> <p>Preoperative evaluation included detailed history, urogynaecological examination and urodynamic studies. An assessment of perioperative and postoperative complication was made for each patient. All patients were asked to visit the clinic 1, 6 and 12 months after surgery at which time the surgeon performed a clinical examination. At 6 and 12 months patients also conducted a self-evaluation of the severity of their symptoms compared with preoperative symptomatology into four categories - cured, improved, similar and worse.</p> <p>Follow-up checks at 24 and 36 months were performed by standardised telephone interviews.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Scale used – patients conducted a self-evaluation of the severity of their symptoms as compared with preoperative symptomatology into four categories: cured, improved, similar or worse (failed)</p> <p>24 months:<br/>TOT = 55/57 (96.5%)<br/>TVT = 214/241 (88.8%)</p> <p>36 months:<br/>TOT = 14/14 (100%)<br/>TVT = 199/227 (87.7%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>24 months<br/>Tape erosion<br/>Retention<br/>Voiding dysfunction<br/>De novo OAB symptoms</p> | <p>checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? no - losses to follow up in TOT group significantly higher than in TVT group (see Other information)</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Detection bias: high</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|--|--|
| <p>2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>deficiency with urethral hypermobility</p> <p>3] Mixed incontinence</p> <p>4] Occult SUI</p> <p>5] Involuntary detrusor contractions or filling defects on urodynamic evaluation</p> |               |         | <p>TVT = 60/241 (24.8%)</p> <p>36 months:</p> <p>Tape erosion</p> <p>Retention</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms</p> <p>TVT = 56/227 (24.7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes - 3/123 (2/4%) in TOT group and 4/243 (1.6%) in TVT group had undergone previous anti-incontinence procedures</p> <p>Intervention: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>24 months follow up: TOT = 57/123 (46%), TVT = 241/243 (99%) so data from this group not used in the analyses</p> <p>36 months follow up: TOT = 14/123 (11%), TVT = 227/243 (94%)</p> <p>The majority of patients in both groups were operated on under spinal anaesthesia.</p> <p>Women with de novo urgency were treated with anticholinergics.</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Koops,S.E.S., Bisseling,T.M., Heintz,A.P.M., Vervest,H.A.M., The effectiveness of tension-free vaginal tape (TVT) and quality of life measured in women with previous urogynecologic surgery: Analysis from The Netherlands TVT database, American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 195, 439-444, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>135829</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>The Netherlands</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"We present the outcome and follow-up of 3 years of low-tension midurethral sling (TVT) in women with previous incontinence or prolapse surgery, by means of objective (patient self-reported) health-related</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 809</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>809/809 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean ± SD</u><br/>No prior surgery: 50.5 ± 10.2<br/>Prior surgery: 55.5 ± 10.5</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Willing to participate in the study<br/>2] Indication for TVT<br/>3] History of previous incontinence or prolapse surgery</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT (Gynecare, Ethicon Inc, Sommerville, NJ, USA) was performed as described by Ulmsten et al (1995, 1996).</p> <p>Procedures took place in 41 different hospitals by 54 gynaecologists and urologists.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>A standardised history was taken and physical examination was performed preoperatively and again at 2, 6, 12, 24 and 36 months after the procedure. All women were asked to complete the short version of the IIQ-7 and UDI-6 before and at 2, 6, 12, 24 and 36 months. Questionnaires were administered by mail.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 24 and 36 months</u><br/>Defined as "Women's reply to the UDI questionnaire, on the question: 'Do you experience urinary leakage during physical activity, coughing or sneezing?' compared with their preoperative status"<br/>24 months:<br/>Improved =644/678 (95%)<br/>36 months:<br/>Improved = 628/678 (92.6%)</p> <p>* Data reported separately for women with and women without previous incontinence surgery. Data presented here for women without previous incontinence surgery. Only</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7 only<br/>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes<br/>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes<br/>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? unclear whether women were enrolled consecutively<br/>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes<br/>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes<br/>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear<br/>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear<br/>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? losses to follow up not reported<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Risk of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p>quality of life (HRQOL) questionnaires (the Incontinence Impact Questionnaire [IIQ] and the Urogeital Distress Inventory [UDI])."</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2000 to September 2001</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>1] Recurrent and difficult-to-treat urinary tract infections</p> <p>2] Predominant symptoms of urge urinary incontinence (defined as urge incontinence being more prevailing than stress incontinence)</p> <p>3] Detrusor overactivity at cystometry</p> <p>4] Post void bladder retention (&gt; 150 ml)</p> <p>5] Bladder capacity less than 200 ml</p> <p>6] Physical/mental impairment that would make participation impossible</p> |               |         | <p>percentage reported, n calculated by NCC-WCH using N with no prior surgery (678) reported in Table IV</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 24 and 36 months</u></p> <p>Urogenital Distress Inventory (UDI-6)</p> <p>24 months: 23.1 (SD not reported)</p> <p>36 months: 24.5 (SD not reported)</p> <p>Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (IIQ-7)</p> <p>24 months: 12.2 (SD not reported)</p> <p>36 months: 13.6 (SD not reported)</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u></p> <p>24 months</p> <p>Tape erosion</p> <p>Retention</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms</p> <p>36 months</p> <p>Tape erosion</p> <p>Retention</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms</p> | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes - data extracted for 'no priory surgery' population only</p> <p>Intervention: Unclear - authors state concomitant surgery performed, unclear whether this was in full study population, or just those women who had previous incontinence and/or prolapse surgery.</p> <p>Outcome: Unclear - unclear how many women were followed up at 24 and 36 months</p> <p>Indirectness: Some</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Study focuses on results in women with prior surgery but data for women with 'no prior surgery' extracted by NCC-WCH.</p> <p>Authors do not report number of women followed up at 24 and 36 months.</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |   | <u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported   |   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Al Taweel,W., Rabah,D.M.,<br>Transobturator tape for<br>female stress incontinence:<br>follow-up after 24 months,<br>Canadian Urological<br>Association Journal, , 33-36,<br>2010<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br>135929<br><br><b>Country/ies where the<br/>           study was carried out</b><br><br>Saudi Arabia<br><br><b>Study type</b><br><br>Prospective cohort study<br><br><b>Aim of the study</b><br><br>To report on the objective and<br>subjective outcomes of<br>transobturator "outside-in"<br>after 24 months follow-up. | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 52<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br>Gender - Female/N (%<br>female)<br>52/52 (100%)<br><br>Age (years)-Mean (range)<br>50 (37-72)<br><br>Incontinence episodes/day-<br>Mean ± SD<br>Not reported<br><br>Duration of SUI-Mean ± SD<br>Not reported<br><br>Detrusor overactivity - n/N<br>(%)<br>Not reported<br><br><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br><br>1] All female patients with<br>SUI undergoing<br>transobturator "outside-in" | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>The transobturator<br>approach was<br>performed as described<br>by Delorme in 2001<br>using a helical tunneler<br>from the outside<br>entrance point to adjust<br>the tape without any<br>tension. | <b>Details</b><br><br>Cystoscopy was performed during<br>the procedures in all patients and<br>the catheter removed in the<br>recovery room before the patients<br>were discharged.<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br><br>Not applicable<br><br><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br><br>Not applicable | <b>Results</b><br><br><u>Patient satisfaction with<br/>           treatment</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Self reported rate of<br/>           absolute symptom<br/>           reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 24<br/>           months</u><br>Cure was defined<br>"negative cough test on<br>physical examination<br>after 24 months."<br>Cured = 42/52 (80%)<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific<br/>           quality of life</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Adverse effects of<br/>           treatment</u><br>Tape erosion<br>0/52 (0%)<br><br>Retention<br>2/52 (3.8%) | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>Critical Appraisal Skills<br>Programme. Cohort study<br>checklist. Items 1-7<br>1. Did the study address a<br>clearly focused issue? yes<br>2. Did the authors use an<br>appropriate method to<br>answer their question?<br>yes<br>3. Was the cohort<br>recruited in an appropriate<br>way? yes - consecutive<br>women<br>4. Was the exposure<br>accurately measured to<br>minimise bias? yes<br>5. Was the outcome<br>accurately measured to<br>minimise bias? continence<br>status - measure as<br>described in study likely to<br>overestimate number of<br>women continent<br>6a. Have the authors<br>identified all important<br>confounding factors?<br>unclear<br>6b. Have the authors<br>taken account of |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2004 to January 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p>  | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] urge incontinence<br/>2] pure intrinsic sphincter</p>  |   |  | <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>4/52 (7.7%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p>     | <p>confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough?<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Detection bias: high risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Serati,M., Ghezzi,F., Cattoni,E., Braga,A., Siesto,G., Torella,M., Cromi,A., Vitobello,D., Salvatore,S., Tension-free vaginal tape for the treatment of urodynamic stress incontinence: efficacy and adverse effects at 10-year</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 63</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender -Female/N (% female)</u><br/>63/63 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Median</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>All retropubic tension-free vaginal tape procedure (TVT; Gynecare, Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA) was performed by the same surgeon according to the technique described by</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>207 consecutive women were assessed for SUI, 144 were excluded from the study: 53 had mixed urinary incontinence and 91 had evidence of pelvic organ prolapse. 63 women with proven SUI underwent TVT. Anaesthesia was general or spinal in accordance with the</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Subjective cure using 3-point symptom assessment scale (0 = failure, 1 = improved, 2 = cured). [Data for 'cured' only]</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7 only<br/>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes<br/>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p>   |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions       | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------------|---|---|---|
| <p>follow-up, European Urology, 61, 939-946, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>176957</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Italy</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To report the long-term subjective, objective and urodynamic outcomes of women with TVT with a follow-up of at least 10 years to assess the efficacy for SUI and the safety of this procedure.</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2000 to June 2001</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p>(<u>interquartile range</u>)<br/>58 (48-69)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Women with symptoms of pure SUI with urodynamic stress incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>1] Previous history of anti-incontinence or radical pelvic surgery<br/>2] Psychiatric disorder<br/>3] Neurologic disorder<br/>4] Concomitant vaginal prolapse higher than stage 1 according to POP-Q system<br/>5] Overactive bladder symptoms<br/>6] Urodynamically proven detrusor overactivity<br/>7] Postvoid residual volume &gt;100 ml</p> | Ulmsten et al. 1996 | <p>anaesthesiologic requirements and/or the patient's preference.</p> <p>Follow-up evaluations were scheduled at 3 and 12 months, and once per year thereafter, including anamnestic and physical examination, cough test and evaluation of subjective satisfaction. All women received urodynamics only at the 10-year follow-up visit. Additional urodynamics at other follow-up examinations was performed only in the case of de novo overactive bladder symptoms. De novo overactive bladder was treated with 2mg tolterodine BID.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>Authors report last observation carried forward analysis and 'worst case scenario' analysis (where all losses to follow up were considered treatment failures)</p> | <p>Assuming losses to follow up were failures - n/N (%):<br/>2 years= 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>3 years= 55/63 (87.3%)<br/>4 years = 55/63 (87.3%)<br/>5 years= 54/63 (85.7%)<br/>6 years= 54/63 (85.7%)<br/>7 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/>8 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/>9 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/>10 years = 52/63 (82.5%)</p> <p>Last observation carried forward - n/N (%):<br/>2 years= 59/63 (93.7%)<br/>3 years= 59/63 (93.7%)<br/>4 years = 59/63 (93.7%)<br/>5 years= 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>6 years= 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>7 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>8 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>9 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/>10 years = 56/63 (88.9%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status</u><br/>Objective cure defined as absence of leakage during cough stress test</p> <p>Assuming losses to follow up were failures -</p> | <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 5/63 (8%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Risk of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Doe sthe study match the review protocol in terms of<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|---|---|
|               |              |               |         | <p>n/N(%):<br/> 2 years= 59/63 (93.7%)<br/> 3 years= 55/63 (87.3%)<br/> 4 years = 55/63 (87.3%)<br/> 5 years= 54/63 (85.7%)<br/> 6 years= 54/63 (85.7%)<br/> 7 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/> 8 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/> 9 years = 54/63 (85.7%)<br/> 10 years = 54/63 (85.7%)</p> <p>Last observation carried forward - n/N (%):<br/> 2 years= 60/63 (95.2%)<br/> 3 years= 59/63 (93.7%)<br/> 4 years = 59/63 (93.7%)<br/> 5 years= 58/63 (92.1%)<br/> 6 years= 58/63 (92.1%)<br/> 7 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/> 8 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/> 9 years = 58/63 (92.1%)<br/> 10 years =58/63 (92.1%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 10 years</u><br/> Tape erosion<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/> Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction</p> | <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>207 women were assessed for SUI, 144 were excluded from the study: 53 had mixed urinary incontinence and 91 had evidence of pelvic organ prolapse.</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  |  |  | De novo OAB symptoms = 11/58 (18.9%)<br><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br>Not reported<br><u>Clinical measures</u><br>Not reported   |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Shin,Y.S., Cha,J.S., Cheon,M.W., Kim,Y.G., Kim,M.K., Efficacy and safety of the TVT-SECUR[REGISTERED] and impact on quality of life in women with stress urinary incontinence: a 2-year follow-up, Korean Journal of Urology, 52, 335-339, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188144</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Cohort study [unclear whether prospective or retrospective]</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 51</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>51/51 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean (range)<br/>57.89 ± (41-77)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI (years) - Mean (range)<br/>5.09 (1-15)</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Mixed urinary incontinence -</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Surgical approach of TVT-SECUR® was through the U approach.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Surgery was done under general or spinal anaesthesia by one experienced surgery.</p> <p>Preoperative evaluation included history, cough stress test, urodynamic study and incontinence quality of life (I-QOL) questionnaire. All women underwent pelvic examination. Surgical management for pelvic organ prolapse was not performed.</p> <p>Postoperative evaluation was through physical examination and the I-QOL questionnaire completed in an outpatient setting or by telephone.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 24 months</u><br/>Objective cure defined as absence of any episodes of involuntary urine leakage during stressful activities and stress test<br/>Cured = 35/46 (76%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 24 months</u><br/>Scale used - Incontinence-Quality of Life questionnaire</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7 only</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</li> <li>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</li> <li>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? unclear whether consecutive women were enrolled in to the study, unclear whether cohort were identified prospectively or retrospectively</li> <li>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</li> <li>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</li> <li>6a. Have the authors</li> </ol> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the long-term results of TVT-SECUR® in women with stress urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2008 to February 2009</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p>n/N (%)<br/>5/46 (10.8%)</p> <p>Previous anti-incontinence surgery - n/N (%)<br/>2/46 (4.3%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life at baseline<br/>Scale used - Incontinence-Quality of Life questionnaire [higher score = higher QOL]<br/>Mean total I-QOL score = 35.44 (SD not reported), N = 46</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Clinical and urodynamically diagnosis of stress urinary incontinence needing anti-incontinence surgery [including stress-predominant mixed urinary incontinence]</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urinary tract infection<br/>2] Urogynaecological malignancy<br/>3] Neurogenic bladder</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>[higher score = higher QOL]<br/>Mean total I-QOL score = 67.57 (SD not reported), N = 46</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 24 months</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>identified all important confounding factors? unclear<br/>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear<br/>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 5/51 (10%) loss to follow up<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Possible selection bias - Some</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 10.8% of women had mixed urinary incontinence, 4.3% of women had previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Five women were lost to follow up - results and baseline data reported for women only completing 24</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
|   |   |  |   |   | months follow up.   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Groutz,A., Rosen,G., Gold,R., Lessing,J.B., Gordon,D., Long-term outcome of transobturator tension-free vaginal tape: Efficacy and risk factors for surgical failure, Journal of Women's Health, 20, 1525-1528, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188198</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Israel</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To assess the 5-year efficacy of TVT-O for the treatment of stress urinary incontinence and to explore predictors for long-term failure</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N=65</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p><u>Gender -Female/N (% female)</u><br/>65/65 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years) - Mean ± SD</u><br/>56.6 ± 10.2</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI - Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)</u><br/>22/61 (36.0%)</p> <p><u>Concomitant overactive bladder - n/N (%)</u><br/>44/61 (72.1%)</p> <p><u>Concomitant urge urinary continence - n/N (%)</u><br/>41/61 (67.2%)</p> <p><u>Previous incontinence surgery - n/N (%)</u></p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Inside-out transobturator tension-free vaginal tape (TVT-O; Gynecare TVT Obturator System, Somerville, NJ, USA)</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All procedures were carried out in one university-affiliated tertiary medical centre.</p> <p>Postoperatively women were evaluated at 1, 3, 6, 12 months and annually thereafter. Each visit comprised medical history, focused questioning about occurrence and severity of lower urinary tract symptoms, pelvic examination with full bladder, stress test and uroflow and sonographic measurement of postvoid residual volume. Women were also asked about their global satisfaction (cure, improvement or failure) and whether or not they would recommend surgery to a friend.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 5 years</u><br/>Cured was defined as negative stress test, no episodes of SUI and positive (cured) global satisfaction<br/>Cured = 45/61 (74%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 5 years</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Retention<br/>Voiding dysfunction<br/>De novo OAB symptoms</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? yes - 4/65 (6.2%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results                                | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---------|---|---|
| <p>2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p>5/61 (8.3%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamically confirmed overt stress urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Concomitant anterior or apical pelvic organ prolapse repair<br/>2] Urodynamically occult stress urinary incontinence</p> |               |         | <p><u>Clinical measures</u></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>subjects long enough? yes<br/>Risk of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 72.1% of women had concomitant overactive bladder and 8.3% of women had previous incontinence surgery<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Women with urodynamic SUI or mixed incontinence with SUI as the predominant symptom were offered TVT-O only after conservative treatment failed (lifestyle changes, behaviour modification, antimuscarinic drugs, and pelvic floor physiotherapy).</p> <p>Four women were lost to follow up - results and baseline data reported for women only completing 5-</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |   | year follow up.   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Groutz,A., Rosen,G., Cohen,A., Gold,R., Lessing,J.B., Gordon,D., Ten-Year Subjective Outcome Results of the Retropubic Tension-Free Vaginal Tape for Treatment of Stress Urinary Incontinence, Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology, 18, 726-729, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188373</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Israel</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To assess the 10-year subjective outcome of retropubic TVT for treatment of SUI and to explore possible predictors of long-term</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 60</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender -Female/N (% female)<br/>60/60 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>62.4 ± 9.3</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Concomitant urge urinary incontinence - n/N (%)<br/>28/52 (53.8%)</p> <p>Previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/>5/52 (10%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Retropubic tension-free vaginal tape (TVT; manufacturer not described) in accordance with the technique described by Ulmsten et al 1996.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All surgical procedures were performed under general or spinal anaesthesia.</p> <p>Postoperatively women were evaluated at 1, 3, 6, 12 months and annually thereafter for up to 5 years. Each visit comprised medical history, focused questioning about occurrence and severity of lower urinary tract symptoms, pelvic examination with full bladder, stress test and uroflow and sonographic measurement of postvoid residual volume.</p> <p>The 10-year subjective outcome of TVT was assessed using a structured telephone interview conducted by a research nurse. Women were asked about frequency and severity of lower urinary tract symptoms and episodes of incontinence, long-term postoperative complications such as recurrent UTIs and vaginal erosions, whether they received further treatments and what their global satisfaction was (cured, improved, failed).</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 10 years</u><br/>Subjective cure defined as 'cured' on global satisfaction question (cured, improved, failed)<br/>Cured = 34/52 (65.4%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 10 years</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 10 years</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</li> <li>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</li> <li>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</li> <li>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</li> <li>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? no - subjective cure data and subjective report of adverse events collected at 10 years (no clinical evaluation)</li> </ol> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis?</p> |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---|---|---|
| <p>success</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>2000</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Urodynamically confirmed stress urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Concomitant anterior or apical pelvic organ prolapse repair<br/>2] Urodynamically occult stress urinary incontinence</p> |               | <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>9/52 (17.3%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? yes - 8/60 (8.7%)<br/>loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 53.8% of women had urge urinary incontinence and 10% of women had previous incontinence surgery<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Eight women were lost to follow up - results and baseline data reported for women only completing 10-year follow up.</p> <p>All procedures were performed by two surgeons</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Cheng,D., Liu,C., Tension-free vaginal tape-obturator in the treatment of stress urinary incontinence: a prospective study with five-year follow-up, European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Biology, , 228-231, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188378</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>China</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To assess the objective success rate of the TVT-O with inside-out modification procedure, and to determine the safety and efficacy of the procedure, including complications, patient satisfaction with surgery and the impact on the patients' quality of life.</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 103</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>103/103(100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>52.4 ± 11.1</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urge incontinence symptoms - n/N (%)<br/>59/103 (57%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Scale used - short Urinary Distress Inventory (SDUI) [lower scores are better]<br/>Mean score = 46.21 ± 20.3 (103)</p> <p>Scale used - short Incontinence Impact</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Inside-out transobutator tension-free vaginal tape (TVT-O; Johnson &amp; Johnson) in accordance with the technique described by de Leval 2005.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Follow-up evaluations were performed at 1 and 5 years, consisting of physical examination with postvoid residual volume, uroflow study and urinary stress tests. Quality of life was assessed with the short urogenital distress inventory, short incontinence impact questionnaire, and European quality of life questionnaire. A urogenital history and verbal analogue score about patient satisfaction were also obtained</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment at 5 years</u><br/>Women reporting high satisfaction ['high satisfaction' not defined] - n/N (%)<br/>Satisfied = 69/100 (69%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 5 years</u><br/>Objective cure defined as negative urinary stress test - n/N (%)<br/>Cured = 92/100 (92%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Scale used - short Urinary Distress Inventory (SDUI) [lower scores are better]<br/>Mean score = 12.21 ± 22.3 (100)</p> <p>Scale used - short Incontinence Impact Questionnaire (SIIQ) [lower scores are better]<br/>Mean score = 10.72 ± 24.6 (100)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7</p> <p>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? measurement and definition of patient satisfaction unclear</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? yes - 3/103 (2.9%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2004 to November 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p>                       | <p>Questionnaire (SIIQ) [lower scores are better]<br/>Mean score = 50.72 ± 24.3 (103)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Diagnosis of urinary stress incontinence, based on subjective complaints and objective clinical signs and confirmed with urodynamic diagnosis including a stress test and uroflowmetry</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Detrusor overactivity<br/>2] Impaired bladder contractility<br/>3] Postvoid residual volume ≥ 100 ml<br/>4] Contraindication to anaesthesia<br/>5] Pregnancy<br/>6] Neurogenic bladder<br/>7] Active urinary or vaginal infection</p> |   |  | <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 5 years</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Risk of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 57% of women has urge urinary incontinence symptoms<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Three women were lost to follow up - baseline data reported for all 103 women, those lost to follow up were excluded from the analysis</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Neuman,M., Sosnovski,V., Kais,M., Ophir,E., Bornstein,J., Transobturator vs Single-Incision Suburethral</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N =152<br/>TVT-SECUR (single incision) = 79</p>   | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Inside-out transobturator tension-free vaginal tape (TVT-O; manufacturer not</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All patients were given 1g cefonicid intravenously 1 hour before surgery. All underwent an iodine antiseptic vaginal wash</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p>   | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br/>1. Did the study address a</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Mini-slings for Treatment of Female Stress Urinary Incontinence: Early Postoperative Pain and 3-Year Follow-up, Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology, 18, 769-773, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>188428</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Israel</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Cohort study [unclear whether prospective or retrospective]</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To analyse and compare the midterm outcomes of TVT-O and TVT-SECUR procedures</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported - women were recruited over a period of 17 months</p> | <p>TVT-O (transobturator inside out) = 73</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (%)<br/>152/152 (100%)</p> <p>Age- Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>TVT-SECUR = 53 <math>\pm</math> 10.6<br/>TVT-O = 54 <math>\pm</math> 11.8</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean <math>\pm</math> SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency - n/N (%)<br/>TVT-SECUR = 42/79 (54.5%)<br/>TVT-O = 28/73 (37.8%)</p> <p>Frequency - n/N (%)<br/>TVT-SECUR = 33/79 (42.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 24/73 (32.4%)</p> <p>Previous stress incontinence corrective surgery - n/N (%)<br/>TVT-SECUR = 3/79 (3.9%)<br/>TVT-O = 3/73 (4.2%)</p> | <p>reported) using the technique described by de Leval 2003 and TVT-SECUR with the hammock method (single incision approach; Gynecare, Ethicon, Somerville, NJ, USA) using the technique described by Neuman 2008</p> | <p>before surgery. The mode of anaesthesia was per patient request. Urinary bladder catheterisation or diagnostic cystoscopy were not routinely performed. Patients with vaginal wall relaxation underwent anterior and/or posterior colporrhaphy.</p> <p>Patients were followed up at 1, 6 and 12 months after surgery and yearly thereafter.</p> <p>Subjective data were collected using a visual analogue scale, Urinary Distress Inventory-6 and Incontinence Impact Questionnaire-7 at each visit. Objective outcome was assessed via pelvic examination and cough stress test with a filled bladder.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>Sample size calculation was based on reports that demonstrated an incidence of significant postoperative pain of 25% with TVT-O and 5% with TVT-SECUR. 160 patients were required in the TVT-O and TVT-SECUR arms to detect a 20% increase in postoperative pain rate, with 80% power and 95% confidence (0.05 significance).</p> | <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status at 3 years<br/>Objective cure defined as "no leakage at all" - n/N (%)<br/>TVT-O = 60/69 (86.9%)<br/>TVT-SECUR = 70/77 (90.9%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment at 3 years<br/>Tape erosion<br/>Retention<br/>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Denovo OAB symptoms</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>clearly focused issue? yes</p> <p>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p> <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? unclear whether consecutive women were enrolled in to the study</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? unclear how women chose their preferred surgical approach</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? unclear whether "cure" was defined purely by a positive or negative cough stress test</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear - twice as many losses to follow up in TVT-O group; higher occurrence of urgency at baseline in the TVT-SECUR group</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---|----------------------|--|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Diagnosis of SUI based on patient's personal history and a positive cough test with bladder holding 300 to 400 ml.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Refusal to participate<br/>2] Presence of connective tissue disorder<br/>3] Need for concomitant surgery other than colporrhaphy</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> |                      | <p>enough? yes - 6/152 (3.9%) loss to follow up; TVT-SECUR=2/79 (2.5%), TVT-O = 5.5%)<br/>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes<br/>Performance bias: high</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes - 4% of women had undergone previous anti-incontinence surgery<br/>Intervention: No - concomitant anterior colporrhaphy was performed in 75% of women, concomitant posterior colporrhaphy was performed in 56% of women.<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>162 women with SUI were referred for corrective surgery; 3 women who received TVT-SECUR and 7 women who received TVT-O were excluded from the study in</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
|  |   |   |  |   | <p>accordance with the study exclusion criteria.</p> <p>Women were asked to choose either TVT-SECUR or TVT-O, respecting the woman's right to make an informed decision about the operative method.</p> <p>All study participants either failed or refused pelvic floor rehabilitation physical therapy.</p>  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Bernasconi,F., Napolitano,V., Natale,F., Leone,V., Lijoi,D., Cervigni,M., TVT SECUR System: Final results of a prospective, observational, multicentric study, International Urogynecology Journal, 23, 93-98, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188442</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Italy</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 136</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender -Female/N (% female)<br/>136/136 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>59.50 ± 9.66</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day- Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI - Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>All women were treated with TVT SECUR™ in either the U- or H- position depending on the preferred method of the particular centre.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Complete urodynamic examination was carried out in all women according to ICS recommendations. A gynaecological examination was carried out to exclude possible associated pelvic pathologies.</p> <p>SUI was evaluated subjectively using the bladder stress test (at 200ml and 400ml) in both standing and lying positions. Subjective evaluation was made using a visual analogue scale and Patient Global Impression of Severity questionnaire with a score ranging from 1-4. A micturition diary and Women</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Scale used - subjective cure = Patient Global Impression of Severity Score ≤2 (1=absence of any urine leakage on exertion 4=daily leakage of urine)<br/>Cured = 113/123 (91.8%)</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Continence status at 24</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7 only</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes</li> <li>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</li> <li>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? unclear whether consecutive women were enrolled in to the study, unclear whether cohort were identified prospectively or retrospectively</li> </ol> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>A multicentre prospective study into the complications and therapeutic effectiveness of TVT SECUR™ over a follow-up of 24 months</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>1 March to 31 December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Urgency - n/N (%)<br/>50/136 (36.8%)</p> <p>Urge urinary incontinence - n/N (%)<br/>25/136 (18.4%)</p> <p>Urodynamic SUI - n/N (%)<br/>95/136 (69.9%)</p> <p>Occult SUI - n/N (%)<br/>41/136 (30.1%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Previous pelvic surgery<br/>2] Intrinsic sphincter deficiency, defined as maximum urethral closure pressure ≤ 20 cm of water</p> |               | <p>Irritative Prostate Symptoms Score (W-IPSS) questionnaire was used to assess symptoms of overactive bladder.</p> <p>Follow-up was carried out at 6, 12, and 24 months.</p> <p><b>Power calculation</b></p> <p>The authors aimed to include 120 patients in the final analysis of outcomes. Assuming a 10% drop-out rate during the study period, the authors sought to enrol at least 132 patients in the study.</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>months</u><br/>Scale used - objective cure rate = stress test [negative stress test not defined]<br/>Cured = 110/123 (89.4%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment at 24 months</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>2/123 (1.62%)</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 3/136 (10%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? Possible selection bias - difficult to assess from study report</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes- 18.4% of women had urge urinary incontinence and 36.8% had urgency. 30.1% of women had occult SUI, 69.9% had urodynamic SUI.<br/>Intervention: Yes</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |   |  |   |  | <p>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Study centres used TVT SECUR™ in either U- or H-position depending on the preferred method of that centre. Authors state it would have been preferable to randomise treatment but asking centres to practice a less familiar technique would have led to different results.</p> <p>Transobturator H position was most common approach (80.9% of cases compared to 19.1% of retropubic U position cases).</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Kennelly,M.J., Moore,R., Nguyen,J.N., Lukban,J., Siegel,S., Miniarc single-incision sling for treatment of stress urinary incontinence: 2-year clinical outcomes, International Urogynecology Journal, 23, 1285-1291, 2012</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 188</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender - Female/N (% female)<br/>188/188 (100%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>The MiniArc single-incision sling system (American Medical Systems, Minnetonka, MN, USA) was used. Self-fixating tips were attached to the obturator internus muscles via a small (1.5 cm) incision</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Participants were evaluated at 1 week, 6 weeks 12 and 24 months after surgery. Cough stress test, 1-hour pad test, Urogenital Distress Inventory -Short form (UDI-6), Incontinence Impact Questionnaire-Short form (11Q-7) and safety were assessed.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br/>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes<br/>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes</p>   |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions       | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>215779</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>United States</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Prospective cohort study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>September 2007 to June 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Study sponsored by American Medical Systems</p> | <p>Age (years)-Median (range)<br/>50.3 (25.9 - 79.6)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day-<br/>Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI-Mean ± SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity - n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Mixed incontinence - n/N (%)<br/>127/188 (67.6%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] age &gt; 18 years<br/>2] desire for surgical correction of stress urinary incontinence<br/>3] objective demonstration of stress urinary incontinence by one of the follow a/ urodynamic documentation of stress urinary incontinence b/ a 1-hour pad test &gt; 2g c/ a positive cough stress test</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] previous synthetic sling<br/>2] pelvic organ prolapse greater than stage 3<br/>3] any coexisting pelvic</p> | at the mid-urethra. | <p><b>Power calculation</b><br/>N/A</p> <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b><br/>N/A</p> | <p><u>Continence status at 36 months</u><br/>Cure was defined as a negative cough stress test or 1-hour pad weight &lt; 1g<br/>Cured = 120/188 (63.8%)</p> <p><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u><br/>Tape erosion<br/>3/188 (2.1%)</p> <p>Retention<br/>6/188 (4.2%)</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>8/67 (11.9%)</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? yes - consecutive women</p> <p>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes</p> <p>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis? unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? - 46/188 (24.5%) loss to follow up</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p>Detection bias: low risk</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
|   | pathology<br>4] pregnancy<br>5] primary urgency incontinence or detrusor overactivity<br>6] renal insufficiency and/or upper urinary tract obstruction<br>7] elevated post-void residual volume > 100 ml<br>8] blood coagulation disorder<br>9] morbid obesity (BMI > 40)   |  |   |  | <b>Other information</b><br><br>None   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br><br>Nwabinehi, N.J., Mittal, S., Russell, M., Coleman, S., Long-term results of urinary stress incontinence treated with mid-urethral tape as a standalone operation or in combination with pelvic floor reconstruction, Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 32, 773-777, 2012<br><br><b>Ref Id</b><br><br>215882<br><br><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br><br>UK<br><br><b>Study type</b><br><br>Prospective cohort study | <b>Sample size</b><br><br>N = 124<br><br>Stand-alone TVT = 81<br>TVT with other procedures = 38<br><br><b>Characteristics</b><br><br><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br>124/124 (100%)<br><br><u>Age (years)- Mean (range)</u><br>Stand-alone TVT = 54.6 (28 -76)<br>TVT with other procedures = 59.5 (30 - 83)<br><br><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean ± SD</u><br>Not reported | <b>Interventions</b><br><br>TVT was performed using Gynecare kit (Ulmset et al., 1996) | <b>Details</b><br><br>All surgeries were performed by the same surgeon<br><br>Stand-alone TVT was performed under local anaesthetic with sedation in 78 women and spinal anaesthesia in the remaining 7 women. All TVT in combination with pelvic floor surgery was carried out under spinal anaesthesia. Pelvic floor operations were performed only if women had grade 2 prolapse or worse and were symptomatic.<br><br>All patients were seen at 6 weeks, 6 months and then yearly for 5 years<br><br><b>Power calculation</b><br><br>Not reported | <b>Results</b><br><br><u>Patient satisfaction with treatment</u><br>90/124 (72.58%)<br><br><u>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Continence status at 24 months</u><br>Objective cure rate = no urodynamic stress incontinence on cystometry<br>92/124 (74.19%)<br><br><u>Incontinence-specific quality of life</u><br>Not reported<br><br><u>Adverse effects of treatment</u> | <b>Limitations</b><br><br>Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Cohort study checklist. Items 1-7<br>1. Did the study address a clearly focused issue? yes<br>2. Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question? yes<br>3. Was the cohort recruited in an appropriate way? unclear whether consecutive women were included<br>4. Was the exposure accurately measured to minimise bias? yes<br>5. Was the outcome accurately measured to minimise bias? yes<br>6a. Have the authors identified all important confounding factors? |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To compare the outcome of TVT in women as a standalone or in combination with other pelvic floor reconstructive procedure at 2 years and 5 years postoperatively</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>June 1998 to May 2003</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean ± SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Mixed urinary incontinence - n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Pelvic organ prolapse -n/N (%)</u><br/>39/124 (31%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Stress urinary incontinence on cystometry or 1-h pad test</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> |               | <p><b>Intention to treat analysis</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Tape erosion<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Retention<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Not reported</p> <p>De novo OAB symptoms<br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Psychological outcomes</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Clinical measures</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>unclear</p> <p>6b. Have the authors taken account of confounding factors in the design and or/analysis?<br/>unclear</p> <p>7a. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough? yes - 21/124 (17%) at 2 years</p> <p>7b. Was the follow up of subjects long enough? yes</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: 15/124 (12%) of women had previous incontinence surgery<br/>Intervention: none<br/>Outcome: none</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Five year outcomes not extracted as loss to follow up &gt;25%</p> |

What is the comparative effectiveness of interventions for women with failure of the primary tape procedure?

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>de Cuyper, E.M., Ismail, R., Maher, C.F., Laparoscopic Burch colposuspension after failed sub-urethral tape procedures: a retrospective audit, International Urogynecology Journal, 19, 681-685, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124233</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective chart review</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To report on the cure rates and complications of laparoscopic Burch colposuspension after failed sub-urethral tapes"</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 16</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>16/16 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean SD<br/>51.88 ± 8.9</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 8/16 (50%)<br/>TVT-O = 2/16 (12.5%)<br/>IVS = 6/16 (37.5%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women who present with recurrent stress urinary incontinence after previous sub-urethral tape procedure.</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Laparoscopic Burch colposuspension using three trocar sites. The cave of Retzius was exposed through careful sharp dissection close to the pubic bone to minimise bladder and urethral injury. Once identified, tape arms were divided bilaterally at the level of the pubic bone and mobilised with sharp dissection from the peri-urethral and vesical region. The tapes were not removed, and the bladder was reflected medially. Two non-absorbable sutures (No 1 ethibond: Ethicon) were placed bilaterally at the level of the bladder neck and used to suspend the vaginal fornices to the ipsilateral iliopectineal ligament without under tension. The surgeons fingers were in the vagina while inserting sutures to ensure the placement was accurate.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Median follow-up = 24.5 months</p> <p>Two women lost to follow up</p> <p>11 women underwent post-operative urodynamic studies - Three women were diagnosed with a co-existing overactive bladder pre-operatively</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment using a 0 - 10 scale<br/>Laparoscopic Burch Colposuspension = 9.36 ± 1.08</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Laparoscopic Burch Colposuspension = 6/11 (54.6%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>De-novo urge incontinence<br/>Laparoscopic Burch Colposuspension = 1/11 (9.1%)</p> <p>Recurrent urinary tract infections<br/>Laparoscopic Burch Colposuspension =</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 2002 - August 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> |               |         | <p>3/14 (21.4%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: NA<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>No information on women lost to follow up</p> <p>Objective cure used - defined as inability to</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
|   |  |   |   |  | <p>demonstrate urinary incontinence on provocative urodynamics.</p> <p>No information on cure rate of Laparoscopic Burch colposuspension after the different MUS procedures.</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Populations: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcomes: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Eandi,J.A., Tanaka,S.T., Hellenthal,N.J., O'Connor,R.C., Stone,A.R., Self-reported urinary continence outcomes for repeat midurethral synthetic sling placement, International Braz J Urol, 34, 336-342,</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 10</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female) 10/10 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean SD</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Retropubic midurethral synthetic sling placement was performed using the Gynecare (Ethicon) device, No attempt to locate or alter the previously placed-sling was made at the time of surgery.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Followed up after a median of 16 months (6 to 33 months)</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p>2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>124266</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Retrospective chart review</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2004 - June 2006</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None declared</p> | <p>65.1 ± 12.4</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Primary surgery<br/>TVT = 5/10 (50%)<br/>TOT = 4/10 (40%)<br/>TVT-O = 1/10 (10%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Women who underwent placement of a TVT due to primary or recurrent failure of a MUS surgery for the management of SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>None reported</p> |               |         | <p>Continence status at 12 months<br/>TVT then TVT = 3/5 (60%)<br/>TOT then TVT = 4/5 (80%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>TVT = 0/10 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>confounding factors: NA</p> <p>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA</p> <p>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: No</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No</p> <p>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA</p> <p>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|---|
|               |              |               |         |                      | <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely:<br/>Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome:<br/>Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No</p> <p>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No</p> <p>Level of bias: High</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Cure was defined as a sum score of 0 on the ICIQ (Patient was required to self-report total absence of urinary leakage to quality as completely continent)</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcome: Subjective cure used</p> |



| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
|   |   |   |   |  | Indirectness: Some   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Kuhn,A., Eggeman,C., Burkhard,F., Mueller,M.D., Correction of erosion after suburethral sling insertion for stress incontinence: results and related sexual function, European Urology, 56, 371-376, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124398</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective case series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To determine the outcome after reclosure of the vaginal epithelium for sling erosion"</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 21</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female) 21/21 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Median range 52 (43 - 79)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%) Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery TVT-O = 5 TOT = 6 Unspecified = 1 TVT = 5 SPARC = 4</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Female patients referred for</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>All women give local estrogen daily and were reviewed after 6 weeks.</p> <p>Those who had not healed after 6 weeks underwent surgical intervention. The edge of the vaginal epithelium was trimmed, mobilized and closed with interrupted vertical mattress sutures in a single layer using Vicryl 2-0 (Ethicon). The free edges of the tape were buried under the vaginal epithelium and, in cases in which needle like polypropylene filaments were sticking out of the vaginal epithelium, these were cut off.</p> <p>Women were advised to avoid sexual intercourse / insertion of any foreign bodies and to continue using topical estrogens.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Follow up at a median of 6 months (range 3 - 12)</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day Not reported</p> <p>Continence status at 12 months Healed with estrogen = 3/21 (14.3%) Healed with surgery = 16/18 (88.9%) Total healed 19/21 (76.2%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: NA<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results                      | Comments  |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---|---|
| <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2005 -<br/>December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None</p> | <p>vaginal erosion after suburethral sling insertion for urinary stress incontinence.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Inability to communicate in one of the local languages or English and/or an unwillingness or inability to fill the FSFI questionnaire.<br/>2] Patient clinically too unwell to participate</p> |               |         | <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: No duration &lt; 1 year<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: NA<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
|  |   |  |  |   | <b>Indirectness</b><br>Population: As specified in protocol<br>Intervention: As specified in protocol<br>Outcomes: As specified in protocol<br>Indirectness: None   |
| <b>Full citation</b><br>Lee,H.N., Lee,Y.S., Han,J.Y., Jeong,J.Y., Choo,M.S., Lee,K.S., Transurethral injection of bulking agent for treatment of failed mid-urethral sling procedures, International Urogynecology Journal, 21, 1479-1483, 2010<br><b>Ref Id</b><br>124412<br><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br>South Korea<br><b>Study type</b><br>Retrospective chart review | <b>Sample size</b><br>n = 23<br><b>Characteristics</b><br>Gender – Female/N (% female) 23/23 (100%)<br>Age (years)- Median (range) 74 (44 - 77)<br>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD Not reported<br>Duration of SUI – Mean SD Not reported<br>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%) Not reported<br>Previous surgery | <b>Interventions</b><br>Transurethral injection of a bulking agent.<br>This was given with local anesthesia under direct urethroscopic guidance, Bulking agents were injected into the submucosa through the urethra using a 20 G needle. Three or four deposits were placed at positions 0.5-1cm distal to the bladder neck. After proper coaptation was achieved, we evacuated the bladder using a 4-Fr catheter to avoid molding of the bulks.<br>Patients were discharged after successful voiding without significant post-void residual urine (less than 100ml). | <b>Details</b><br>Primary outcome was subjective cure based on Sandvik questionnaire (no experience of SUI in the past 7 days)<br>Other outcomes include Subjective Symptom Visual Analogue Scale used to measure severity of symptoms. Incontinence Quality of Life Benefit, Satisfaction and Willingness to Continue Questionnaire flow rate and postvoid residual volume Adverse events<br>Median follow-up was 10 months (range 6 - 34 months) | <b>Results</b><br>Patient satisfaction with treatment 18/23 (77%) satisfied with treatment<br>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day Not reported<br>Continence status 8/23 (34.6%)<br>Incontinence-specific quality of life Improved by 19.2 (SD not calculable)<br>Adverse effects of treatment | <b>Limitations</b><br>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies<br><u>A Selection bias</u><br>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br>Level of bias: NA<br><u>B Performance bias</u> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|--|---------------|---------|--|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To examine the 'efficacy of TUI of bulking agent for the treatment of recurrent or persistent SUI after MUS'</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>August 2003 - October 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None</p> | <p>TVT = 8<br/>TVT-O = 7<br/>IRIS-TOT = 6<br/>Anterior IVS = 2</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women with stress urinary incontinence who wanted retreatment of recurrent or persistent SUI after a mid-urethral procedure</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> |               |         | <p>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Postvoid residual decreased from 31.0 ± 50.7 (pre-op) to 30.8 ± 41.8 (post-op)</p> | <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: No &lt; median &lt; 1 year<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |   |  |   |  | <p>to confounding factors: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><b>Other information</b><br/>N/A</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b><br/>Population: As specified in protocol<br/>Intervention: As specified in protocol<br/>Outcome: Study reported subjective cure not objective cure<br/>Indirectness: Some</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b><br/>Lee,K.S., Doo,C.K., Han,D.H., Jung,B.J., Han,J.Y., Choo,M.S., Outcomes following repeat mid urethral synthetic sling after failure of the initial sling procedure: rediscovery of the tension-free vaginal tape procedure, Journal of</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b><br/>n = 29</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b><br/>Gender – Female/N (% female) 29/29 (100%)<br/>Age (years)- Mean SD 54.1 ± 10.8 years</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b><br/>Repeat of original procedure</p> | <p><b>Details</b><br/>A search was made for previously positioned MUS tape. If found, it remained and the second tape was introduced.<br/><br/>No indwelling catheter was used. In the absence of urinary retention or other complications patients were discharged on the afternoon of the day of surgery.</p> | <p><b>Results</b><br/>Patient satisfaction with treatment Not reported<br/><br/>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day Not reported<br/><br/>Continence status</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b><br/>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies<br/><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| <p>Urology, 178, 1370-1374, 2007</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124416</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>South Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective study</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 1999 - October 2005</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 19<br/>TOT = 8<br/>TVT-0 = 8</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women who experienced persistent SUI (early leakage with stress events causing increased intra-abdominal pressure for less than 6 weeks) despite the first MUS procedure or recurrent SUI (later leakage more than 6 weeks after initial MUS success) during postoperative follow-up</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None</p> |               | <p>Patients were followed for 1, 6 and 12 months postoperatively.</p> <p>Cure defined as the absence of any episodes of involuntary urine leakage during stressful activities and the cough stress test.</p> | <p>TVT 12/13 (92.3%)<br/>TOT = 4/8 (50.0%)<br/>TVT-O = 6/8 (75.0%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely:</p> |

| Study details   | Participants                            | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
|   |   |   |  |  | <p>Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: NA<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/> Level of bias: High</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol<br/> Intervention: As specified in protocol<br/> Outcome: As specified in protocol<br/> Indirectness: None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Liapis,A., Bakas,P., Creatsas,G., Tension-free</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 31</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT under epidural anesthesia. TVT adjustment was done using</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Patients were assessed with physical examination, urinalysis,</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E:</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>vaginal tape in the management of recurrent urodynamic stress incontinence after previous failed midurethral tape, European Urology, 55, 1450-1455, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124428</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Greece</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective case series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To assess the efficacy, complications, and indications associated with the TVT procedure on patients who had failed previous anti-incontinence surgery with the use of MUSP"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>31/31 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean SD<br/>57.26 ± 11.47 years</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 6<br/>TOT = 7<br/>TVT-O = 6<br/>TVT-Secur = 10</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Women who continued to have symptoms of SUI after surgery or developed symptoms 1 - 34 months after surgery.<br/>2] BMI &lt; 30</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] necessity for concomitant</p> | <p>the cough stress test with 350-400ml in the bladder or up to maximum cystometric capacity until no leakage was noted after repeated coughing. The patient was placed in the anti-Trendelenburg position.</p> | <p>urine culture, voiding diary for 2-3 days, Q-tip test, uroflow, filling and voiding cystometry, urethral profilometry, an 1-hour pad test at 12 months.</p> | <p>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>TVT then TVT = 5/6 (83%)<br/>TVT-O then TVT = 6/8 (75%)<br/>TOT then TVT = 5/7 (72%)<br/>TVT-Secur then TVT = 7/10 (70%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Bladder perforation 1/31 (3.2%)<br/>De novo urgency 3/31 (9.6%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures increased from 13.22 ± 16.8 (pre-op) to 22.58 ± 20.8</p> | <p>Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for</p> |



| Study details                               | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---------|----------------------|---|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None</p> | <p>pelvic floor surgery<br/>           2] presence of mixed incontinence<br/>           3] presence of immobile urethra (fixed pipelike)<br/>           4] presence of urodynamic dysuria (defined as peak flow rate &gt; 15ml/s)</p> |               |         |                      | <p>missing data: NA<br/>           Level of bias: NA</p> <p><b>D Detection bias</b><br/>           D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/>           D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>           D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/>           D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>           D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/>           Level of bias: Medium</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specifid in protocol</p> <p>Outcome: As</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
|  |   |  |  |   | specified in protocol<br>Indirectness: None   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Lo,T.S., Wang,A.C., Liang,C.C., Long,C.Y., Lee,S.J., Treatment for unsuccessful tension-free vaginal tape operation by shortening pre-implanted tape, Journal of Urology, 175, 2196-2199, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref id</b></p> <p>124439</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Taiwan, Republic of China</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Case series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>Septembber 1998 - January 2004</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 14</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>14/14 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean (range)<br/>48.7 (41 - 57)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 14</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women with recurrent or persistent urinary leakage after initial TVT procedure and who requested a second anti-</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT shortening</p> <p>Local anesthesia was injected suburethrally and paraurethrally with the patient in the lithotomy position and local anesthesia were injected. A sagittal vaginal incision was made, The paraurethral area around the vaginal tape was dissected bilaterally. The tape was identified and grasped with 2 clamps at approximately 1 cm from the midline bilaterally. A 1-zero polypropylene figure-of-8 suture was placed between the clamp and midline of the tape bilaterally. After tightening the stitches the tape was shortened with a double-fold of approximately 0.5cm bilaterally.</p> <p>Continence was verified with the patient straining and the bladder filled with 250ml normal saline, The vaginal mucosa was then closed.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Women were followed up at 1 week, 1 month, 6 months and 1 year with pelvic examinations and post-void residual urine.</p> <p>Subjective cure was defined as patient self-report of no urinary incontinence.</p> <p>Objective cure was defined as a pad weight of less than 2g/hour and without any leakage on urethral pressure profilometry.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status at 12 months<br/>TVT then shortening 10/14 (71.4%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life at 12 months<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> |

| Study details                                       | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|---|---|---------------|---------|----------------------|--|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>incontinence operation due to unsatisfactory results of conservative treatments,</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> |               |         |                      | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/> C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/> C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/> Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/> Level of bias: Medium</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  |   |  | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcomes: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p>  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Palva,K., Nilsson,C.G., Effectiveness of the TVT procedure as a repeat mid-urethra operation for treatment of stress incontinence, International Urogynecology Journal, 20, 769-774, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124529</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Finland</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective case-series</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 20</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>20/20 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean SD<br/>61 ± 9</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed according to Ulmsten under local anesthesia using 0.25% prilocaine with adrenaline, Cystoscopy was performed twice during the operation after each retropubic pass of the TVT needle to detect possible bladder injury. Adjustment of the tape was performed by using the cough test allowing for a few drops of saline to escape on vigorous coughing in order to avoid retention. The repeat TVT operations were performed by an experienced urogynecologist.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Evaluation during the follow-up visit after the repeat TVT operation included a 24-h pad weighing test, a cough stress test performed in a semilithotomy position with a comfortably filled bladder (200 - 300 ml), A careful gynecological examination to detect possible tape erosions or other adverse effects of the tape material, and a postvoid residual urine volume measurement.</p> <p>Subjective outcome was assessed by Incontinence Impact Questionnaire - Short-form (IIQ-7), urogenital distress inventory (UDI-6), urinary incontinence severity score</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status TVT then TVT:<br/>11/20 (55.0%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>UISS changed from a median (range) 60 (15 - 85) preoperatively to 5</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions | Methods  | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---------------|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the long-term effect of performing a retropubic TVT Operation on women that have a prior failed mid-urethra sling procedure"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>1999 - 2004</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Finnish Medical Association</p> | <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 20</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women who had a repeat mid-urethral sling procedure at least 3 years earlier</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None</p> |               | <p>(UISS), the DIS and a visual analogue score (0 - 100)</p> <p>Overall cure was defined as a negative stress test and a negative pad test (<math>\leq 8/24h</math>) and a VAS <math>\leq 15</math>)</p> | <p>(0 - 60) at last follow-up</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: No</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No</p> <p>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA</p> <p>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No</p> <p>D5 - Were</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
|   |  |  |   |   | <p>investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcome: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Schmid,C., Bloch,E., Amann,E., Mueller,M.D., Kuhn,A., An adjustable sling in the management of recurrent urodynamic stress incontinence after previous failed midurethral tape, Neurourology and Urodynamics, 29, 573-</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 25</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>25/25 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Median (range)<br/>64 (43 - 85)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>AMI adjustable sling (made of macroporous monofilament) that can be adjusted postoperatively by pulling or loosening</p> <p>Polypropylene sutures that go through the sling retropubically to tighten and paravaginally to loosen the sling in case of retention.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Women had a gynecological exam and urodynamic cystometry before the procedure and 12 months later.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors:</p>  |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---|---------|---|--|
| <p>577, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124603</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective case-series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>"To evaluate the feasibility, clinical, subjective and urodynamic outcome after the insertion of an adjustable suburethral sling system in patients with recurrent urinary incontinence"</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>December 2003 - March 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 18<br/>TOT = 7<br/>Collagen Injections = 1</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women with recurrent urinary stress incontinence with<br/>1] at least one failed surgical intervention for urinary stress incontinence and<br/>2] a positive cough stress test</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p>Sling insertion was performed under spinal or general anaesthetic and intraoperatively cystoscopy was performed to exclude bladder and urethral perforation. Intraoperatively, a prophylactic antibiotic antibiotic was initiated and continued until sling adjustment was complete.</p> |         | <p>at 12 months<br/>MUS 21/25 (84.0%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>NA</p> <p>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: No</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments  |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|---|
|               |              |               |         |                      | <p>defined precisely:<br/>Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome:<br/>No<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/>Level of bias:<br/>Medium</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Information on outcome of AMI after failed collagen injections was not used in the results.</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcomes: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods  | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
|  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Van Baelen,A.A., Delaere,K.P., Repeat transobturator tape after failed mid-urethral sling procedure: follow-up with questionnaire-based assessment, Urologia Internationalis, 83, 399-403, 2009</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>124683</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>The Netherlands</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective case-series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>February 2005 - February 2008</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 21</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>21/21 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean (range)<br/>56 (33 - 77)</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TOT = 16<br/>TVT = 5</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women undergoing a repeat TOT procedure</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>None reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>The TOT procedure was performed as described by Delorme under spinal or general anesthesia. A search was not performed for the previously positioned tape.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>All women had postoperative clinical evaluation at 6 weeks, 3 months and on a 6-monthly basis until final discharge.</p> <p>Physician determined cure was defined as absence of urinary incontinence during stressful activities.</p> <p>Questionnaire-deduced cure was defined as leakage of urine ≤ 1 per week.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>MUS: 12/21 (57%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Assessed by the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire (ICIQ)<br/>Improved for a median of 18 to 6</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: Medium</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> |

| Study details                                       | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|---|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|--|
| <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> |              |               |         |                      | <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/> C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/> C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/> Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: no - ranged for 3 to 16 months<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: No<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: No<br/> Level of bias: High</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>N/A</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |   |   |   |   | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Population: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcomes: Indirectness due to timing of outcome assessment</p> <p>Indirectness: Some</p>  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Molden,S., Bracken,J., Nguyen,A., Harvie,H.S., White,A., Hammil,S.L., Patterson,D., Tarr,M., Sansas,T., Murphy,M., Rogers,R.G., A retrospective multicenter study on outcomes after midurethral polypropylene sling revision for voiding dysfunction, Female Pelvic Medicine and Reconstructive Surgery, 16, 340-344, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188055</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the</b></p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>n = 197</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>197/197 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean SD<br/>57.7 ± 13.7</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Surgical revision including:<br/>1] sling cut/transected in midline or laterally<br/>2] sling pulled, loosened or stretched<br/>3] sling excised (any portion)<br/>4] any combination of the above</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Revision type<br/>Sling cut = 96/178 (53.9%)<br/>Sling excised = 50/178 (28.1%)<br/>Sling pulled down = 32/178 (18.0%)</p> <p>Timing of revision after primary surgery<br/>&lt; 15 days later = 38/178 (21.3%)<br/>15 - 90 days = 69/178 (38.8%)<br/>&gt; 90 days = 71/178 (39.9%)</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Sling revision: 144/178 (80.9%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p><b>study was carried out</b></p> <p>United States of America</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective chart review</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>'To perform a multicenter retrospective analysis of patients undergoing sling revision for persistent voiding dysfunction'</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>January 1999 - December 2007</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Society of Gynecologic Surgeons</p> | <p>Previous surgery</p> <p>Retropubic: 133/189 (30%)*</p> <p>Obturator: 56/189 (30%)</p> <p>* data on type of primary surgery given for 189 women, baseline data given for all 197 women</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Women who had undergone a procedure (identified by Current Procedural Terminology code = 57287 or 53500) with any of the following ICD-9 diagnoses:</p> <p>596.0 - Bladder neck obstruction, 599.6 - urinary obstruction; 788.2 - retention of urine; 788.21 - incomplete bladder emptying; 788.29 - other specified retention of urine; 788.62 - slowing of urine stream; 788.38 - overflow incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] sling placement not utilizing mesh or midurethral placement</p> <p>2] cases missing preoperative or postoperative data</p> <p>3] cases of revision for reason other than voiding dysfunction</p> <p>4] cases of multiple sclerosis, Parkinson disease or other neuropathic bladder disorders</p> |               |         | <p>De-novo urge incontinence</p> <p>Sling revision = 13/108 (12.3%)**</p> <p>Urinary tract infections</p> <p>Sling revision: 19/103 (18.4%)**</p> <p>Psychological outcomes</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>** data on adverse effects on sling revision only counted women who had new symptoms after the sling revision</p> | <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: No</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No</p> <p>Level of bias: High</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA</p> <p>Level of bias: NA</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: No - Not reported</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: No - Unclear what outcomes were used and why</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Unclear</p> <p>D4 - Were investigators blinded</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
|  |  |   |   |   | <p>to interventions: NA<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Populations- As specified in protocol</p> <p>Intervention: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Outcomes: As specified in protocol</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Sabadell,J., Poza,J.L., Esgueva,A., Morales,J.C., Sanchez-Iglesias,J.L., Xercavins,J., Usefulness of retropubic tape for recurrent stress incontinence after transobturator tape failure, International urogynecology journal and</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 22</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>22/22 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Median range<br/>64 (49 - 77)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996 using either TVT (Gynecare, Johnson &amp; Johnson) or Uretex Sup/Align R (Bard) based on surgeons discretion.</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>The primary tape was not routinely removed. Cystoscopy was performed twice during surgery to detect any bladder injury. The tape was placed in a tension-free manner without the aid of a cough test. Surgery for pelvic organ prolapse correction was associated when needed.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p>  |

| Study details   | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments  |
|---|---|---------------|---------|---|---|
| <p>pelvic floor dysfunction, 22, 1543-1547, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>188459</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Spain</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Retrospective case series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To evaluate the efficacy and safety of TVT in the treatment of recurrent or persistent SUI after a TOT failure in a cohort with 3 years follow up</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>January 2004 to December 2008</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>Incontinence episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TOT = 22</p> <p>Mixed incontinence<br/>2/22 (6.8%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>1] women who had a failed TOT procedure for SUI</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>Not reported</p> |               |         | <p>12 months - TVT= 13/22 (59.1%)<br/>24 months - TVT = 13/22 (59.1%)<br/>36 months - TVT = 9/16 (56.3%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>Bladder injury<br/>TVT = 2/22 (9.1%)</p> <p>De-novo urge incontinence<br/>TVT = 5/22 (22.7%)</p> <p>Mesh exposure<br/>TVT = 1/22 (4.5%)</p> <p>Cystitis<br/>TVT = 5/22 (22.7%)</p> <p>Voiding difficulty requiring intermittent self-catheterization<br/>TVT = 2/22 (9.1%)</p> <p>Pubic bruise<br/>TVT = 1/22 (4.5%)</p> <p>Thigh numbness<br/>TVT = 1/22 (4.5%)</p> | <p>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |  |   | Short-term pubic/thigh pain<br>TVT = 2/22 (9.1%)<br><br>Psychological outcomes<br>Not reported<br><br>Clinical measures<br>Not reported   |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Giarenis,I., Mastoroudes,H., Cardozo,L., Robinson,D., What do we do when a midurethral tape fails? Rediscovery of open colposuspension as a salvage continence operation, International Urogynecology Journal, 23, 1117-1122, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>188552</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>UK</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Retrospective case series</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 13</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>16/16 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years) - Mean ± SD<br/>55.3 ± 9.61</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity<br/>3/13 (23%)</p> <p>Previous midurethral tape<br/>TVT: 8/13 (61%)<br/>TVT-O: 5/13 (39%)</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Modified Burch open colposuspension was performed under general anaesthesia. Women were placed in the Lloyd-Davius position. A low transverse incision was made, the rectus sheath was opened and a hysterectomy was performed if clinically indicated. The cave of Retzius was entered by a combination of sharp and blunt incisions. The midurethral tapes were identified and excised only if required to allow adequate mobilization of the bladder neck and the paravaginal tissues. The paravaginal tissues were sutured to the ipoepectineal ligament on each side, without undue tension, with four number 1 polydioxanone sutures, 1cm apart. The surgeon's fingers were in the vagina while the sutures were inserted to ensue that placement</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>A suprapubic catheter was inserted into the bladder at the end of the procedure to facilitate the voiding trial with a clamping regime. It was left on free drainage until the second postoperative day when clamping was commenced. When the residual urine was &lt; 100ml and the woman was passing good volumes, the catheter was removed and she was allowed home. If the voiding trial was unsuccessful, the woman was discharged home with the suprapubic catheter on free drainage and re-admitted 7 days later for re-clamping. Women with persisting residuals &gt; 100m were taught clean intermittent self-catheterization.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Open Burch<br/>Colposuspension<br/>Subjective cure: 11/13 (85%)<br/>Objective cure: 10/13 (77%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcomes: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions   | Methods   | Outcomes and Results   | Comments   |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Aim of the study</b></p> <p>To evaluate the outcome of open colposuspension for women with urodynamic stress incontinence who has previously undergone a failed midurethral tape</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>June 2005 to June 2010</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>        | <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] women who underwent colposuspension after a failed midurethral tape procedure</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p>  | <p>was accurate and care was taken not to over-elevate the bladder neck.</p>  |   | <p>Open Burch colposuspension<br/>De novo detrusor overactivity 3/10 (30%)</p> <p>Recurrent urinary tract infections<br/>Open Burch Colposuspension = 0/13 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> |  |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Agnew,G., Dwyer,P.L., Rosamilia,A., Edwards,G., Lee,J.K., Functional outcomes for surgical revision of synthetic slings performed for voiding dysfunction: a retrospective study, European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Biology, 163, 113-116, 2012</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 63</p> <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>63/63 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Three approaches to tape revision were used<br/>1] tape division (either under or lateral to the urethra)<br/>2] partial tape excision<br/>3] either division or excision with an immediate concomitant procedure to prevent recurrent SUI</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>Success of revision was defined as persistent post-void residual volumes of &lt; 150ml</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Tape revision = 55/63 (87.3%)</p> <p>Incontinence-</p>           | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p> <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups</p> |



| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|---------------|---------|---|--|
| <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>215651</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Australia</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Retrospective case series</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To evaluate the outcomes of primary tape revision after failure due to voiding dysfunction</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Review of cases between 2000 and 2010 inclusive</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>TVT = 42/63 (66.7%)<br/>TVT-O = 4/63 (6.3%)<br/>Advantage = 2/63 (3.2%)<br/>Dacron = 1/63 (1.6%)<br/>InFast = 1/63 (1.6%)<br/>IVS = 4/63 (6.3%)<br/>Monarc = 7/63 (11.1%)<br/>Prolene = 2/63 (3.2%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Women who underwent tape revision surgery for voiding dysfunction (defined as persistently raised [immediate] post-void residual of &gt; 150ml)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>Women whose symptoms resolved with simple loosening of the tape</p> |               |         | <p>specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>De-novo urgency<br/>Tape revision = 8/63 (12.7%)</p> <p>Persistent voiding dysfunction<br/>Tape revision = 8/63 (12.7%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures<br/>Not reported</p> | <p>for potential confounders: NA<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: NA<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: NA<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: NA<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: NA</p> <p>D Detection bias<br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Unclear<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Interventions  | Methods   | Outcomes and Results  | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |  |   |   | <p>to assess outcome:<br/>Yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: NA<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Unclear of length of follow-up after tape revision</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Intervention: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Han,J.Y., Moon,K.H., Park,C.M., Choo,M.S., Management of recurrent stress urinary incontinence after failed midurethral sling: tape tightening or</p> | <p><b>Sample size</b></p> <p>N = 66<br/>Repeat tape = 36<br/>Tape shortening = 30</p> | <p><b>Interventions</b></p> <p>Repeat TVT was performed as described by Ulmsten 1996 and the repeat TOT was performed as described by Delorme 2001. A search for the primary tape was not carried out and the second</p> | <p><b>Details</b></p> <p>No indwelling catheter was used. Intraoperative cystoscopy was routinely performed for all retropubic and transobturator procedures.</p> | <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Patient satisfaction with treatment<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Self reported rate of absolute symptom</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</p>   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Interventions  | Methods | Outcomes and Results   | Comments  |
|---|--|--|---------|--|---|
| <p>repeat sling?, International Urogynecology Journal, 23, 1279-1284, 2012</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>215746</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Retrospective chart review</p> <p><b>Aim of the study</b><br/>To compare outcomes of repeat midurethral tapes with those of tape shortening in women who underwent failed a primary midurethral tape</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Source of funding</b><br/>None reported</p> | <p><b>Characteristics</b></p> <p>Gender – Female/N (% female)<br/>66/66 (100%)</p> <p>Age (years)- Mean ± SD<br/>Repeat tape 54.7 ± 11.4<br/>Tape shortening 53.4 ± 7.6</p> <p>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Duration of SUI – Mean SD<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Previous surgery<br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>Not reported</p> | <p>tape was placed without the removal of the primary tape, if found.</p> <p>Tape shortening was performed under local anaesthesia. The suburethral field was dissected to identify the tape; dissection was continued toward the lower retropubic space on both sides. The loosened tape was directly retracted and the clamp was applied to the plicated tape at its midpoint. A nonabsorbable 2-0 Prolene suture was then placed beneath the clamp as the tape (which was tightly attached to the urethra and the vaginal mucosa) was closed with an absorbable suture.</p> |         | <p>reduction per day<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Continence status<br/>Repeat tape: 26/36 (72.2%)<br/>Tape shortening: 14/30 (46.7%)</p> <p>Incontinence-specific quality of life<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Adverse effects of treatment<br/>De-novo urge incontinence<br/>Repeat tape: 2/22 (9.1%)<br/>Tape shortening: 3/19 (15.8%)<br/>Erosion<br/>Repeat tape: 0/36 (0%)<br/>Tape shortening: 1/30 (3.3%)</p> <p>Voiding dysfunction<br/>Repeat tape: 1/36 (2.8%)<br/>Tape shortening: 0/30 (0%)</p> <p>Psychological outcomes<br/>Not reported</p> <p>Clinical measures</p> | <p>A Selection bias<br/>A1 – Allocation unrelated to potential confounding factors: NA<br/>A2 – Were attempts made to balance comparison groups for potential confounders: Unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: Yes<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> <p>B Performance bias<br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: Yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: No<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: No<br/>Level of bias: High</p> <p>C Attrition bias<br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: Yes<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: Yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: NA<br/>Level of bias: Low</p> |

| Study details | Participants | Interventions | Methods | Outcomes and Results | Comments   |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------|----------------------|--|
|               |              |               |         | Not reported         | <p>D Detection bias<br/> D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: Yes<br/> D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: Yes<br/> D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: Yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: NA<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: NA<br/> Level of bias: Low</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>Women were followed up after 12 months</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Intervention: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> |

## What patient characteristics are predictors of primary tape failure

| Study details  | Participants  | Factors  | Results   | Comments   |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Barber,M.D., Kleeman,S., Karram,M.M., Paraiso,M.F., Ellerkmann,M., Vasavada,S., Walters,M.D., Risk factors associated with failure 1 year after retropubic or transobturator midurethral slings, American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 199, 666-667, 2008</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>100119</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Ancillary analysis of data from a RCT</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>November 2004 to January 2006</p> <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>This study was supported in part</p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT/TOT surgery failed</p> <p>Treatment failure defined as either;</p> <p>1) 'any recurrent incontinence' defined as an ISI score greater than zero 1 year after surgery or any retreatment of urinary incontinence since the index surgery</p> <p>2) 'recurrent SUI' defined as either an affirmative response to the question 'Do you experience urine leakage related to physical activity, coughing, or sneezing?' on the PFDI-20 at the 12-month visit or any retreatment for SUI.</p> <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b></p> <p>Urodynamic stress urinary incontinence on multichannel urodynamic testing</p> <p><b>Controls</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT/TOT was successful.</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] subjects demonstrating</p> | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <p>Independent factors assessed</p> <p>Treatment group (TVT vs TOT)</p> <p>Age (per decade)</p> <p>Current smoking</p> <p>Pre-operative anticholinergic medication use</p> <p>Functional capacity (metabolic unit, METs)</p> <p>Concurrent pelvic organ prolapse (POP) surgery</p> <p>Number of vaginal deliveries</p> <p>Presence of urge urinary incontinence symptoms at baseline</p> <p>Lowest abdominal leak point pressure</p> <p>Baseline incontinence severity</p> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>ODDS RATIOS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANY URINARY INCONTINENCE</u></p> <p><u>Treatment group (TVT vs TOT)</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 1.1 (0.5 to 2.5)</p> <p><u>Age (per decade)</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 1.3 (0.5 to 2.7)</p> <p><u>Current smoking</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 0.4 (0.1 to 1.3)</p> <p><u>Preoperative anticholinergic medication use</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 6.7 (1.6 to 22)</p> <p><u>Functional capacity (metabolic unit, METs)</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 2.4 (0.4 to 15)</p> <p><u>Concurrent (pelvic organ prolapse) POP surgery</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 2.7 (1.1 to 6.7)</p> <p><u>Number of vaginal deliveries</u><br/>OR (95%CI): 0.3 (0.03 to 2.4)</p> <p><u>ODDS RATIOS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF RECURRENT</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: unclear</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: unclear</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: unclear</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes</p> <p>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes</p> <p>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Factors | Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---------|---|--|
| <p>by a research grant from American Medical Systems, Minnetonka, MN, which had no role in the design, implementation, or analysis of this study or in the writing of this manuscript.</p> | <p>urodynamic stress urinary incontinence on multichannel urodynamic testing<br/> 2] At least 21 years of age<br/> 3] desiring surgical correction of incontinence<br/> 4] requiring concurrent surgery for pelvic organ prolapse were also eligible</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>1] Subjects demonstrating detrusor overactivity on urodynamic testing</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b></p> <p>Multivariate logistic regression analysis.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/> 162/162 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean SD</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean SD</u><br/> Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u></p> |         | <p><u>SUI</u><br/> <u>Age (per decade)</u> (adjusted for treatment group and other selected covariates)<br/> OR (95%CI): 1.7 (1.1 to 2.6)</p> | <p>used to assess outcome: yes<br/> D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/> D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/> Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p>ISI: Incontinence Severity Index questionnaire</p> <p>PFDI-20: Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory short form</p> <p><u>Time at which treatment success/failure determined:</u><br/> 12 months after surgery</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u><br/> unclear</p> <p><u>Sample size:</u> 170 randomised, 162 followed 1 year or longer after surgery (subject of this report). Any recurrent incontinence i.e failure in 68 subjects (42%) and recurrent SUI in 26 subjects</p> |

| Study details  | Participants   | Factors   | Results   | Comments   |
|--|--|---|---|--|
|  | Not reported   |   |   | (16.5%).   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Abdel-Fattah,M., Familusi,A., Ramsay,I., Ayansina,D., Mostafa,A., Preoperative determinants for failure of transobturator tapes in the management of female urodynamic stress incontinence, International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, 110, 18-22, 2010</p> <p><b>Ref id</b></p> <p>100561</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>United Kingdom</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Secondary analysis of data from a randomised prospective single-blinded study, the Evaluation of Transobturator Tapes study (E-TOT)</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 2005 - April 2007</p> <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b></p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TOT ARIS/TVT-O failed.</p> <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Controls</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TOT ARIS/TVT-O was successful.</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Women with USI or with mixed incontinence but with a predominantly bothersome SI</p> <p>- Women with previous incontinence surgery were included</p> <p>- All women had failed or declined pelvic floor muscle training (PFMT)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Women unwilling to be randomised</p> <p>- Women with predominant</p> | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <p>- Age</p> <p>- BMI</p> <p>- MUCP</p> <p>- Type of incontinence</p> <p>- Primary/secondary surgery</p> <p>- Type of procedure</p> <p>- Nocturia</p> <p>- Frequency <math>\geq 8</math> per day</p> <p>- Urgency</p> <p>- Urgency incontinence</p> <p>- Dribbling incontinence</p> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>PATIENT REPORTED OUTCOMES</u></p> <p><u>Age</u></p> <p><math>\leq 45</math>:REFERENCE</p> <p>45-65 OR (95% CI): 1.99 (0.82 to 4.87)</p> <p><math>&gt;65</math> OR (95% CI): 1.85 (0.57 to 5.94)</p> <p><u>BMI</u></p> <p><math>\leq 30</math>:REFERENCE</p> <p>31-35 OR (95% CI): 1.91 (0.95 to 3.87)</p> <p><math>&gt;35</math> OR (95% CI): 6.37 (1.73 to 23.44)</p> <p><u>MUCP, cm H2O</u></p> <p><math>\leq 30</math>: OR (95% CI): 2.26 (0.996 to 5.124)</p> <p><math>\geq 31</math>: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Type of incontinence</u></p> <p>Mixed group: OR (95% CI): 1.06 (0.5 to 2.24)</p> <p>USI group: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Primary/secondary surgery</u></p> <p>Secondary surgery OR (95% CI): 2.33 (1.1 to 5.478)</p> <p>Primary surgery: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Type of procedure</u></p> <p>TOT OR (95% CI): 1.46 (0.75 to 2.82)</p> <p>TVT-O: REFERENCE</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1 - Was there appropriate randomisation: yes (computer generated random allocation)</p> <p>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: yes (Allocation was concealed using opaque sealed envelopes which were opened by the nursing staff on the morning of the operation)</p> <p>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes (Table 1 in paper)</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes</p> <p>B2 - Were participants blinded: no</p> <p>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: yes</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes</p> <p>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: unclear</p> <p>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear</p> <p>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Factors | Results  | Comments   |
|---|---|---------|--|--|
| <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>overactive bladder symptoms</p> <p>- Women with specific comorbidities such as known neurological conditions (eg: multiple sclerosis) diabetes, pelvic organ prolapse (&gt;=stage 2 POP-Q) and/or concomitant surgery</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b></p> <p>Variables that had a statistically significant association with outcome on univariate analysis and other variables considered to be clinically significant were entered into multivariate logistic regression models.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>341/341 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean SD</u><br/>Mean not reported.<br/>&lt;45: n = 75 (25.9%)<br/>45-65: n = 177 (61%)<br/>&gt;65: n = 38 (13.1)<br/>N = 290</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> |         | <p><u>Nocturia</u><br/>Yes OR (95% CI): 2.18 (1.04 to 4.58)<br/>No: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Urgency</u><br/>Yes OR (95% CI): 3.26 (0.87 to 12.26)<br/>No: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Urgency incontinence</u><br/>Yes OR(95%CI): 3.35 (1.07 to 10.51)<br/>No: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Dribbling incontinence</u><br/>Yes OR (95% CI): 0.77 (0.37 to 1.61)<br/>No: REFERENCE</p> <p><b>OBJECTIVE OUTCOMES</b></p> <p><u>Age</u><br/>≤ 45 REFERENCE<br/>45-65 OR (95% CI): 0.80 (0.30 to 2.09)<br/>&gt; 65 OR (95% CI): 1.32 (0.37 to 4.74)</p> <p><u>BMI</u><br/>≤ 30 REFERENCE<br/>31-35 OR (95% CI): 1.84 (0.81 to 4.17)<br/>&gt; 35 OR (95% CI): 3.46 (0.78 to 15.32)</p> <p><u>MUCP, cm H2O</u><br/>≤ 30 REFERENCE<br/>≥31 OR (95% CI): 7.06 (2.85 to 17.48)</p> <p><u>Type of incontinence</u><br/>Mixed group<br/>USI group OR (95% CI): 0.72 (0.28 to 1.85)</p> | <p>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes (6-months)<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: yes<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><u>Time at which treatment success/failure determined:</u> 6 months after surgery</p> <p><u>Randomisation method:</u> Random allocation (computer generated)</p> <p><u>Patient reported outcome:</u> Patient reported outcome was based on responses to the Patient Global Impression of Improvement (PFI-I) questionnaire where success was defined as 'very much improved' or 'much improved'.</p> <p><u>Objective outcome:</u> Objective outcome was based on urodynamic assessment</p> |



| Study details   | Participants  | Factors  | Results   | Comments   |
|---|---|--|---|--|
|   | <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p>  |  | <p><u>Primary/secondary surgery</u><br/>Secondary surgery<br/>Primary surgery OR (95% CI): 6.22 (2.34 to 16.52)</p> <p><u>Type of procedure</u><br/>TOT<br/>TVT-O OR (95% CI): 1.48 (0.68 to 3.22)</p> <p><u>Nocturia</u><br/>Yes<br/>No OR (95% CI): 1.23 (0.52 to 2.89)</p> <p><u>Urgency</u><br/>Yes<br/>No OR (95% CI): 0.45 (0.08 to 2.67)</p> <p><u>Urgency incontinence</u><br/>Yes<br/>No OR (95% CI): 1.18 (0.33 to 4.31)</p> <p><u>Dribbling incontinence</u><br/>Yes<br/>No OR (95% CI): 0.63 (0.25 to 1.58)</p> | <p>carried out by an independent clinician at 6 months: failure was defined as presence of USI.</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u> Variables that had a statistically significant association with outcome on univariate analysis and other variables thought to be clinically significant. For patient-reported outcomes- BMI, MUCP, preoperative diagnosis of mixed urinary incontinence and presence of the preoperative urinary symptoms of nocturia, urgency, urgency incontinence and dribbling incontinence plus other variables thought to be clinically significant.</p> <p>For objective outcomes- BMI, MUCP, and a history of previous incontinence procedures plus other variables thought to be clinically significant.</p> <p><u>Sample size:</u> 341 recruited, 317 completed 6 month follow-up. (See table 2 of paper for number of subjects included for each predictive factor's analysis).</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Paick,J.S., Kim,S.W., Ku,J.H., Oh,S.J., Son,H., Park,J.Y., Preoperative maximal flow rate may be a predictive factor for the outcome of tension-free vaginal tape procedure for stress urinary incontinence, International Urogynecology Journal, 15, 413-</p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom primary TVT had failed (n = 10). Cure of incontinence was defined as the absence of a subjective complaint of leakage and the absence of objective leakage on stress testing. Improvement was defined as no urine loss on stress test plus patient report of some</p> | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Age</li> <li>- Parity</li> <li>- BMI</li> <li>- Hysterectomy</li> <li>- Symptom severity</li> </ul> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>Q-tip test</u><br/>&lt; 30 degrees OR (95%CI): 0.55 (0.09 to 3.17)<br/>≥ 30 degrees: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Maximal flow rate</u><br/>OR (95% CI): 0.90 (0.82 to 0.99)<br/>REFERENCE not reported</p>  | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual: Appendix E: Methodology checklist: cohort studies</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1: Method of allocation to treatment groups unrelated to potential confounding factors- N/A (only one treatment group)<br/>A2: Any attempts made within the design</p>   |

| Study details   | Participants   | Factors   | Results  | Comments  |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>417, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>110133</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective observational</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>April 1999 to August 2000</p> <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>leakage but overall satisfaction. All cases except cure were considered failure.</p> <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b></p> <p>Patients underwent history and physical examination, urinalysis, urine culture, 3-day frequency-volume chart, uroflowmetry, postvoid residual urine measurement, and multichannel video urodynamic studies with maximum urethral closure pressure and Valsalva leak point pressure measurements. The severity of urinary incontinence was classified using the Ingelman-Sundberg scale.</p> <p><b>Controls</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT was successful (n=50)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Women with complaints of stress urinary incontinence</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Mixed or only urge incontinence</p> <p>- Valsalva voider</p> <p>- Postoperative follow-up of less</p> | <p>- Duration of incontinence (months)</p> <p>- Urge symptoms</p> <p>- Cystocele grade</p> <p>- Postvoid residual (ml)</p> <p>- Maximal urethral closure pressure (cmH20)</p> <p>- Duration of follow-up</p> <p>- Q-tip test (Used to assess urethral hypermobility-defined as a maximal straining angle of more than 30 degrees).</p> <p>- Maximal flow rate (ml/s)</p> <p>- Maximal cystometric capacity (ml)</p> <p>- Valsalva leak point pressure (cmH20)</p> | <p><u>Maximal cystometric capacity</u><br/>OR (95% CI): 1.00 (1.00 to 1.02)<br/>REFERENCE not reported</p> <p><u>Valsalva leak point pressure</u><br/>&lt; 60cm H20 OR (95% CI): 2.34 (0.42 to 12.89)<br/>≥ 60cm REFERENCE</p> | <p>or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders - N/A (only one treatment group but have adjusted for confounders using MV analysis)</p> <p>A3: Groups comparable at baseline-yes (no significant differences between those who failed treatment and those who didn't: table 1 in paper)<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1: Comparison groups receive same care apart from intervention studied-Yes<br/>B2: Participants blinded- N/A<br/>B3: Individuals administering care blinded- N/A<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: Groups followed up for an equal length of time- yes (cure: 35 mths, failure: 36 mths p=0.937)<br/>C2: Groups comparable for treatment completion- unclear<br/>C3: Groups comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data- unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1: Appropriate length of follow-up- yes (1, 6 and 12 months, annually thereafter)<br/>D2: Precise definition of outcome- yes (see other information)<br/>D3: Valid and reliable method to determine outcome- Yes<br/>D4: Investigators blinded to participants' intervention-N/A<br/>D5: Investigators blinded to confounding/prognostic factors- N/A</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Factors  | Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|--|---|---|
|   | <p>than 2 years</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b></p> <p>Multivariate logistic regression: only those variables with a P value less than 0.25 on the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate logistic model.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>60/60 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (Range)</u><br/>57.2 /-8.6 (35-71)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean (Range)</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean (Range)</u><br/>Cases: 7 months (3-10)<br/>Controls: 10 months (1-30)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> |  |   | <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><u>Time at which treatment failure determined:</u> unclear, but patients followed up at 1,6 and 12 months and annually thereafter.</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u> Adjusted for all variables with a P value less than 0.25 on the univariate analysis (Q-tip test, maximal flow rate, maximal cystometric capacity, Valsalva leak point pressure).</p> <p><u>Sample size:</u> 60, cure = 50, failure = 10</p> |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Richter,H.E., Litman,H.J., Lukacz,E.S., Sirls,L.T., Rickey,L., Norton,P., Lemack,G.E., Kraus,S., Moalli,P., FitzGerald,M.P., Dandreo,K.J., Huang,L., Kusek,J.W., Urinary</p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT/TVT-O/TOT surgery failed (n=260, 46%)</p>   | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <p>- Treatment group: Retropubic midurethral sling, Transobturator midurethral sling</p> <p>- Previous UI surgery,</p> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>ODDS RATIOS FOR POTENTIAL PREDICTORS OF OVERALL FAILURE COMPARED WITH OVERALL SUCCESS, CONTROLLING FOR TREATMENT GROUP AND SITE</u></p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix D: Methodology checklist: Randomised controlled trials</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1 - Was there appropriate</p>   |

| Study details  | Participants   | Factors   | Results  | Comments   |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Inc, Demographic and clinical predictors of treatment failure one year after midurethral sling surgery, Obstetrics and Gynecology, 117, 913-921, 2011</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b><br/>143699</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b><br/>USA</p> <p><b>Study type</b><br/>Two arm randomised equivalence trial</p> <p><b>Study dates</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b><br/>Supported by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases U01 DK58231, UO1 DK60379, UO1 DK60380, UO1 DK60401, UO1 DK60397, UO1 DK58225, UO1 DK60395, UO1 DK58234, UO1 DK60393, UO1 DK58229 and 2K24-DK068389 to Dr Richter.</p> | <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b><br/>Pure or predominant stress incontinence symptoms for at least 3 months and a positive urinary stress test at a bladder volume of 300ml or less.</p> <p><b>Controls</b><br/>Subjects in whom TVT/TVT-O/TOT surgery was successful (n=305, 54%)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b><br/>- Women aged 21 years or older planning stress incontinence surgery.<br/><br/>- Pure or predominant stress incontinence symptoms for at least 3 months and a positive urinary stress test at a bladder volume of 300mL or less.</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b><br/>Not reported</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b><br/>Based on significance at the 0.05 level from the univariable logistic regression models and clinical relevance, multivariable logistic regression models were fit for each</p> | <p>yes</p> <p>- Q-tip maximum straining less than 30 degrees, yes</p> <p>- Urge score (10 per unit)</p> <p>- Pad weight (10 per g)</p> <p>- Race</p> <p>- Marital status</p> <p>- Education</p> <p>- Smoking</p> <p>- Hormone therapy</p> <p>- Fecal incontinence symptoms</p> <p>- Concomitant surgery</p> <p>- Vaginal deliveries</p> <p>- Postvoid residual discharge more than 100ml.</p> <p>- Number of comorbidities</p> <p>- Q-tip delta less than 30 degrees</p> <p>- Empty bladder stress test</p> | <p><u>Treatment group: Retropubic midurethral sling, Transobturator midurethral sling</u></p> <p>Retropubic midurethral sling- Reference<br/>Transobturator midurethral sling- OR(95%CI): 1.15(0.81-1.63)</p> <p><u>Previous UI surgery, yes</u><br/>OR(95%CI): 1.99(1.14-3.47)</p> <p><u>Q-tip maximum straining less than 30 degrees, yes</u><br/>OR(95%CI): 1.89 (1.16-3.05)</p> <p><u>Urge score (10 per unit)</u><br/>OR(95%CI): 1.97 (1.21-3.21)</p> <p><u>Pad weight (10 per g)</u><br/>OR(95%CI): 1.06 (1.02-1.10)</p> | <p>randomisation: yes (permuted block randomisation stratified according to clinical site)<br/>A2 - Was there adequate concealment: unclear<br/>A3 - Were groups comparable at baseline: yes (Table 1)<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1 - Did groups get same level of care: yes<br/>B2 - Were participants blinded: unclear<br/>B3 - Were clinical staff blinded: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1 - Was follow-up equal for both groups: yes (12 months)<br/>C2 - Were groups comparable for dropout: yes<br/>C3 - Were groups comparable for missing data: unclear<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/>D1 - Was follow-up appropriate length: yes<br/>D2 - Were outcomes defined precisely: yes<br/>D3 - Was a valid and reliable method used to assess outcome: yes<br/>D4 - Were investigators blinded to interventions: unclear<br/>D5 - Were investigators blinded to confounding factors: unclear<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> |

| Study details | Participants   | Factors   | Results | Comments   |
|---------------|--|---|---------|--|
|               | <p>defined outcome.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>565/565 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean SD</u><br/>Cases: 54.4 /-11.4<br/>Controls: 52.2 /-10.2</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u><br/>Cases: 3.9 /-3.2<br/>Controls: 2.9 /-2.7</p> <p>(reported as 'leaks per day')</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Age</li> <li>- BMI</li> <li>- Estimated blood loss during sling</li> <li>- Brink score</li> <li>- UDI total</li> <li>- IIQ total</li> <li>- Stress score</li> <li>- Leaks per day</li> </ul> |         | <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/>Population: Yes<br/>Outcome: Yes<br/>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><u>Randomisation method:</u> Permuted-block randomisation stratified according to clinical site.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Objective failure, subjective failure, overall failure</p> <p><u>Outcome definition:</u> Objective failure defined as a positive provocative stress test at 300mL or a positive 24-hour pad test (at least 15mL leakage over 24 hours) or retreatment for stress incontinence. Subjective failure included a self-reported stress-type UI symptoms on the Medical Epidemiological and Social Aspects of Aging questionnaire or leakage on a 3-day voiding diary or retreatment (behavioural, pharmacologic, or surgical) for stress incontinence. Overall failure defined as women who experienced either objective or subjective failure or both.</p> <p><u>Time at which treatment success/failure determined:</u> 12 months after randomisation</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u> Based on significance at the 0.05 level from the</p> |

| Study details  | Participants  | Factors  | Results  | Comments  |
|--|---|--|--|---|
|  |   |  |  | <p>univariable models and clinical relevance: Treatment group, clinical site. <u>Sample size</u>: 565 (retropubic arm: 280, transobturator arm: 285), overall failure=260, treatment success=305.</p> <p>Note: multivariate associations of potential predictors of objective failure compared with subjective failure and objective success controlling for treatment group and site also reported in paper.</p>   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Paick,J.S., Ku,J.H., Shin,J.W., Son,H., Oh,S.J., Kim,S.W., Tension-free vaginal tape procedure for urinary incontinence with low Valsalva leak point pressure, Journal of Urology, 172, 1370-1373, 2004</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>144189</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>Korea</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective observational</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT surgery failed. Cure of incontinence after the procedure was defined as an absent subjective complaint of leakage and absent objective leakage on stress testing.</p> <p>Improvement was defined as no urine loss on stress test plus a patient report of some leakage but overall satisfaction and it was considered failure.</p> <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b></p> <p>History and physical examination, urinalysis, urine culture, uroflowmetry, post-void residual urine measurement, 1-hour pad test and multichannel videourodynamic studies. The severity of SUI was classified using the Ingelman-Sundberg</p> | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Age</li> <li>- Parity</li> <li>- BMI</li> <li>- Comorbid diseases</li> <li>- Hysterectomy</li> <li>- Previous anti-incontinence surgery</li> <li>- Duration of incontinence</li> <li>- Symptom severity</li> <li>- Cystocele grade</li> <li>- 1 hr pad test</li> <li>- Maximal flow rate</li> </ul> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>Urge symptoms</u> (defined as complaints of a sudden compelling desire to pass urine that were difficult to defer)<br/>OR (95% CI): 5.703 (1.232 to 26.404)<br/>REFERENCE: no urge symptoms</p> <p><u>MUCP</u> (defined as the difference between maximal urethral pressure and bladder pressure)<br/>OR (95%CI): 0.944 (0.895 to 0.996)<br/>REFERENCE not stated.</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u></p> <p>A1: Method of allocation to treatment groups unrelated to potential confounding factors: yes (low VLPP vs high VLPP group)<br/>A2: Any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders: yes (only one treatment group but have adjusted for potential confounders)<br/>A3: Groups comparable at baseline: no<br/>Level of bias: high</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u></p> <p>B1: Comparison groups receive same care apart from intervention studied: N/A<br/>B2: Participants blinded: N/A<br/>B3: Individuals administering care blinded: N/A<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> |

| Study details   | Participants   | Factors   | Results | Comments  |
|---|--|---|---------|---|
| <p>January 2000 - December 2002</p> <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> | <p>scale.</p> <p><b>Controls</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT surgery was successful.</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Women with complaints of SUI with low VLPP (&lt;60cm H20)</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Postoperative followup of less than 6 months</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b></p> <p>Multivariate logistic regression-only variables with p&lt;0.05 on univariate analysis were included in the multivariate model.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/>221/221 (100%)</p> <p><u>Age (years)- Mean (Range)</u><br/>55.2 (29-80)</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u></p> | <p>- Post-void residual urine</p> <p>- Maximal bladder capacity</p> <p>- Uninhibited detrusor contraction</p> <p>- VLPP</p> <p>- MUCP</p> <p>- Anesthesia type</p> <p>- Bladder injury</p> <p>- Urge symptoms</p> |         | <p><u>C Attrition bias</u></p> <p>C1: Groups followed up for an equal length of time: yes</p> <p>C2: Groups comparable for treatment completion: yes</p> <p>C3: Groups comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data: yes</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u></p> <p>D1: Appropriate length of follow-up: yes (1,6,12 months and annually thereafter)</p> <p>D2: Precise definition of outcome: yes</p> <p>D3: Valid and reliable method to determine outcome: yes</p> <p>D4: Investigators blinded to participants' intervention: N/A</p> <p>D5: Investigators blinded to confounding/prognostic factors: N/A</p> <p>Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:</p> <p>Population: Yes</p> <p>Outcome: Yes</p> <p>Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><u>Time at which treatment failure determined:</u> unclear but participants followed at 1,6 and 12 months and annually thereafter.</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u> those with a p</p> |

| Study details   | Participants  | Factors   | Results   | Comments  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | <p>Not reported</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean (Range)</u><br/>103 months (2-480)</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>Not reported</p>  |   |   | <p>value less than 0.05 on univariate analysis-urge symptoms, MUCP</p> <p><u>Sample size:</u> 221</p>   |
| <p><b>Full citation</b></p> <p>Schraffordt,KoopsS, Bisseling,T.M., Van,BrummenH, Heintz,A.P.M., Vervest,H.A.M., What determines a successful tension-free vaginal tape? A prospective multicenter cohort study: Results from the Netherlands TVT database, American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 194, 65-74, 2006</p> <p><b>Ref Id</b></p> <p>144404</p> <p><b>Country/ies where the study was carried out</b></p> <p>The Netherlands</p> <p><b>Study type</b></p> <p>Prospective observational</p> <p><b>Study dates</b></p> <p>March 2000 - September 2001</p> | <p><b>Cases</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT failed. (n = 209 for outcome 1, n = 133 for outcome 2)</p> <p><b>Diagnostic criteria</b></p> <p>Urodynamic proven stress incontinence or SUI at history/physical examination.</p> <p><b>Controls</b></p> <p>Subjects in whom TVT was successful. (n=408 for outcome 1, n=478 for outcome 2)</p> <p><b>Inclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Urodynamic proven stress incontinence or SUI at history/physical examination</p> <p><b>Exclusion criteria</b></p> <p>- Recurrent and difficult-to-treat</p> | <p><b>Factors</b></p> <p>- Previous incontinence surgery</p> <p>- Incontinence episodes</p> <p>- More than 20 procedures for each surgeon</p> <p>- Stress incontinence</p> <p>- No prolapse of cervix of vaginal vault</p> <p>- General anesthesia</p> <p>- Age</p> <p>- Parity</p> <p>- Menopausal status</p> <p>- Urogynecological history</p> <p>- Previous prolapse surgery</p> | <p><b>Adjusted odds ratio</b></p> <p><u>Outcome 1: The question 'Do you experience urinary leakage during physical activity, coughing or sneezing?' was selected from the Urogenital Distress Inventory questionnaire completed at 2,6,12 and 24 months after surgery</u></p> <p>- Previous incontinence surgery OR (95% CI): 0.510 (0.243 to 1.071)<br/>No previous urogynecological surgery: REFERENCE</p> <p>- Weekly incontinence episodes OR(95% CI): 3.01 (0.87 to 10.49)<br/>Daily episodes: REFERENCE</p> <p>- More than 20 procedures for each surgeon OR (95%CI): 1.918 (1.24 to 2.97)<br/>First 10 procedures for each surgeon: REFERENCE</p> <p><u>Outcome 2: Answer to the doctor's question 'Do you leak during physical activity, coughing or sneezing?' asked at the 2-year follow-up</u></p> <p>- Stress incontinence OR (95% CI): 1.84 (0.96 to 3.54)</p> | <p><b>Limitations</b></p> <p><u>NICE guidelines manual. Appendix E: Methodology checklist: Cohort studies</u></p> <p><u>A Selection bias</u><br/>A1: Method of allocation to treatment groups unrelated to potential confounding factors: N/A (only one treatment group)<br/>A2: Any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders: N/A (only one treatment group but have adjusted using multivariate analysis)<br/>A3: Groups comparable at baseline: N/A (only one treatment group)<br/>Level of bias: low</p> <p><u>B Performance bias</u><br/>B1: Comparison groups receive same care apart from intervention studied: N/A (only one treatment group)<br/>B2: Participants blinded: N/A<br/>B3: Individuals administering care blinded: N/A<br/>Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>C Attrition bias</u><br/>C1: Groups followed up for an equal</p> |



| Study details   | Participants   | Factors  | Results  | Comments   |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Consecutive recruitment</b></p> <p>Not reported</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>Supported by an unrestricted grant from the Foundation for Scientific Research of the Gynecology Associates Tilburg.</p> | <p>urinary tract infection</p> <p>- Predominant symptoms of urge urinary incontinence (defined as urge incontinence being more prevailing than the stress incontinence)</p> <p>- Detrusor overactivity at cystometry</p> <p>- Postvoiding bladder retention (more than 150ml)</p> <p>- Bladder capacity less than 200mL</p> <p>- Physical or mental impairment</p> <p><b>Statistical method</b></p> <p>Multivariate logistic regression analysis including all variables with a P value less than 0.05 in the univariate analysis.</p> <p><b>Demographics</b></p> <p><u>Gender – Female/N (% female)</u><br/> <u>Outcome 1:</u><br/> Cases = 209/209 (100%)<br/> Controls = 408/408 (100%)</p> <p><u>Outcome 2:</u><br/> Cases= 133/133 (100%)<br/> Controls= 478/478 (100%)</p> | <p>- Previous incontinence and prolapse surgery</p> <p>- Mixed incontinence</p> <p>- Urodynamic investigation performed</p> <p>- Stress incontinence at urodynamics</p> <p>- Detrusor overactivity at urodynamics</p> <p>- Intrinsic sphincter deficiency</p> <p>- Flow pattern preoperative</p> <p>- Simultaneous procedures</p> <p>- Pelvic floor status prior to TVT</p> <p>- Type of hospital settings</p> <p>- Type of anesthesia</p> <p>- Surgeon's experience</p> <p>- Loss at cough test</p> | <p>Mixed: REFERENCE</p> <p>- No prolapse of cervix of vaginal vault OR (95% CI): 1.25 (0.66 to 2.37)<br/> Prolapse: REFERENCE</p> <p>- General anesthesia OR (95% CI): 2.21 (1.07 to 4.55)<br/> Local anaesthesia: REFERENCE</p> <p>- More than 20 procedures for each surgeon OR (95% CI): 0.55 (0.32 to 0.96)<br/> First 10 procedures for each surgeon: REFERENCE</p> | <p>length of time: yes (24 months)<br/> C2: Groups comparable for treatment completion: unclear<br/> C3: Groups comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data: unclear<br/> Level of bias: unclear</p> <p><u>D Detection bias</u><br/> D1: Appropriate length of follow-up: yes<br/> D2: Precise definition of outcome: yes<br/> D3: Valid and reliable method to determine outcome: yes<br/> D4: Investigators blinded to participants' intervention: N/A<br/> D5: Investigators blinded to confounding/prognostic factors: N/A<br/> Level of bias: low</p> <p><b>Indirectness</b></p> <p>Does the study match the review protocol in terms of:<br/> Population: Yes<br/> Outcome: Yes<br/> Indirectness: None</p> <p><b>Other information</b></p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> Success rate</p> <p><u>Outcome definition:</u><br/> - The question 'Do you experience urinary leakage during physical activity, coughing or sneezing?' was selected from the Urogenital Distress Inventory questionnaire as primary outcome measure to define success or failure for SUI. Success was defined as the answer</p> |

| Study details | Participants  | Factors | Results | Comments   |
|---------------|---|---------|---------|--|
|               | <p><u>Age (years)- Mean SD</u><br/>51.3 (20-82) - missing data for 6 out of the total of 809 in the study</p> <p><u>Incontinence episodes/day – Mean SD</u><br/>Mean not reported.<br/>Daytime frequency less than 8 voids per day: 300<br/>Daytime frequency more than 8 voids per day: 298<br/>Nighttime frequency no nocturnal micturition: 237<br/>Nighttime frequency once or more per night: 396</p> <p><u>Duration of SUI – Mean SD</u><br/>Not reported</p> <p><u>Detrusor overactivity – n/N (%)</u><br/>41/652 (6.3%) -missing data for 187 out of the total 809 in the study</p> |         |         | <p>'no'.</p> <p>- The secondary outcome measure was the answer to the doctor's question 'Do you leak during physical activity, coughing or sneezing?' asked at 2-year follow-up. The answer 'no' was defined as success. All other answers as well as 'improved' were considered as failure.</p> <p>- Women who had answered to be dry in the written questionnaire as well as to the oral question at 2-year follow-up were defined to be a success.</p> <p><u>Time at which treatment success/failure determined:</u> 24 months</p> <p><u>Confounders adjusted for:</u> Adjusted for all variables with a P value less than 0.05 in the univariate analysis (previous incontinence surgery, weekly incontinence episodes and more than 20 procedures for each surgeon for the 1st outcome, mixed incontinence, number of prolapse of cervix of vaginal vault, general anesthesia and more than 20 procedures for each surgeon for the secondary outcome).</p> <p><u>Sample size:</u> 809, outcome 1 results: success = 408, failure=209, outcome 2 results: success = 478, failure = 133</p> |