

Appendix Table F36. Improvement in UI after duloxetine vs. placebo (random effects model)

Outcome	Reference	Active events/randomized	Control events/randomized	Relative risk (95% CI)	Weight	Absolute risk difference (95% CI)	Weight
Improvement in PGI rating	Schagen van Leeuwen, 2008 ³⁷⁸	18/131	14/134	1.32 (0.68; 2.53)	29.16	0.03 (-0.05; 0.11)	25.46
Improvement in PGI rating	Millard, 2004 ³⁵⁰	167/227	148/231	1.15 (1.01; 1.3)	45.4	0.10 (0.01; 0.18)	24.16
Improvement in PGI rating	Steers, 2007 ³⁸¹	5/153	1/153	5 (0.59; 42.30)	6.39	0.03 (-0.01; 0.06)	35.95
Improvement in PGI rating	Cardozo, 2004 ²⁵¹	17/55	4/54	4.17 (1.50; 11.60)	19.05	0.24 (0.09; 0.38)	14.43
Improvement in PGI rating: very much better, much better	Pooled estimate			1.68 (0.94; 3.00)	100	0.08 (0.01; 0.14)	100
I squared	I squared			62.10%		69.40%	
p value for heterogeneity	p value for heterogeneity			0.048		0.02	
Improvement in UI	Lin, 2008 ³³⁹	42/60	28/61	1.53 (1.11; 2.10)	12.7	0.24 (0.07; 0.41)	10.63
Improvement in UI	Yalcin, 2006 ⁴⁰⁸	198/433	152/425	1.28 (1.09; 1.51)	48.26	0.10 (0.03; 0.17)	34.27
Improvement in UI	Cardozo, 2004 ²⁵¹	4/55	1/54	3.93 (0.45; 34.02)	0.28	0.05 (-0.02; 0.13)	29.68
Improvement in UI	Millard, 2004 ³⁵⁰	135/227	100/231	1.37 (1.15; 1.65)	38.76	0.16 (0.07; 0.25)	25.42
Improvement in UI	Cardozo, 2010 ²⁴⁹	697/1378	431/1380	1.62 (1.47; 1.78)	37.29	0.19 (0.16; 0.23)	27.76
Improvement in UI: 50% or more reduction in urinary episode frequency	Pooled estimate			1.46 (1.28; 1.66)	100	0.14 (0.08; 0.21)	100
p value for heterogeneity	I squared			0.10		0.01	
I squared				49.20%		72.60%	