

**Appendix Table F132. Clinical outcomes after PFMT compared to vaginal cones (results from RCTs pooled with random effects models)**

Outcome	Reference	Active n/N	Control n/N	Rate active/control	Relative risk (95% CI)	Weight, %	Absolute risk difference (95% CI)	Weight, %
Continence	Castro, 2008 <sup>253</sup>	10/31	9/27	32/33	0.97 (0.46; 2.02)	16.99	-0.011 (-0.253; 0.232)	37.49
Continence	Williams, 2006 <sup>615</sup>	0/79	0/80	0/0				
Continence	Gameiro, 2010 <sup>532</sup>	26/52	34/51	50/67	0.75 (0.54; 1.05)	83.01	-0.167 (-0.354; 0.021)	62.51
Pooled		36/162	43/158	22/27	0.78 (0.58; 1.06)	100	-0.108 (-0.257; 0.04)	100
Heterogeneity P value, I squared,%					0.54	0.00%	0.319	0.00%
Improved Urinary incontinence	Seo, 2004 <sup>594</sup>	55/60	53/60	92/88	1.04 (0.92; 1.17)	89.16	0.033 (-0.074; 0.141)	67.1
Improved Urinary incontinence	Castro, 2008 <sup>253</sup>	12/31	11/27	39/41	0.95 (0.50; 1.79)	3.16	-0.02 (-0.273; 0.232)	12.09
Improved Urinary incontinence	Williams, 2006 <sup>615</sup>	0/79	0/80					
Improved Urinary incontinence	Gameiro, 2010 <sup>532</sup>	23/52	26/51	44/51	0.87 (0.58; 1.30)	7.69	-0.067 (-0.26; 0.125)	20.81
Pooled		0/222	0/218	0/0	1.02 (0.91; 1.14)	100	0.006 (-0.082; 0.094)	100
Heterogeneity P value, I squared,%					0.69	0.00%	0.653	0.00%