Treatment	Reference sample length of treatment	Intention to treat allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Pelvic floor muscle training (PFMT) and/or other lifestyle interventions	Aksac, 2003 ⁴⁷⁸ Sample: 50 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with choosing closed letters (patients had to pick up closed letters)	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Alewijnse, 2003 ⁴⁷⁹ Sample: 129 14-22 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Arvonen, 2001 ⁴⁸⁴ Sample: 37 16 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Aukee, 2002 ⁴⁸⁵ Sample: 30 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with random numbers table with permuted blocks of four	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Aukee, 2004 ⁴⁸⁶ Sample: 35 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization was performed by a random numbers table, in blocks of four	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Berghmans,1996 489 Sample: 40 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer generated randomization stratified by seriousness of incontinence (grade 1 and 2) and by referral (general practitioner or urologist) with permuted blocks of 4	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Bo, 2000 ⁴⁹⁴ Sample: 59 24 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer generated randomization stratified by degree of leakage	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Bo, 2005 ⁴⁹⁵ Sample: 52 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Borello-France, 2006 ⁴⁹⁷ Sample: 44 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Block randomization schedule with a random number table	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Borrie, 2002 ⁴⁹⁹ Sample: 421 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer generated randomization with random permuted blocks, block size of 4	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Boyington, 2005 ⁵⁰¹ Sample: 71 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Quasi- experimental trial with random assignment of participants to intervention and control groups. The minimization technique for balancing age (50-59 years, 60-69 years, and 70 years and older), ethnicity, and presence of the symptom of involuntary urine loss in the 2 groups	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Brown, 2006 ⁵⁰² Sample: 2191 2.9 years	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization was stratified by clinical center	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Bryant, 2002 ⁵⁰⁴ Sample: 95 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Burgio, 2002 ⁵⁰⁵ Sample: 222 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: stratified randomization; Randomization stratified by race, type, and severity of incontinence	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Burns,1990 ⁵⁰⁶ Sample: 128 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with permuted blocks of 10.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Burns, 1993 ⁵⁰⁷ Sample: 135 24 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate Adjustment for clinical site and study treatment, fluid intake, patient reported diagnosis of congestive heart failure, patient reported diagnosis of diabetes, body mass index, age, urge and stress scores from the medical, epidemiological and social aspects

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	de Oliveira Camargo, 2009 ⁵¹⁰ Sample: 61 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: computer- generated random number table	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Cammu,1998 ⁵¹¹ Sample: 60 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computerized randomization with random numbers tables	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³ Sample: 118	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization No
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Chadha, 2000 ⁵¹² Sample: 449 48 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization stratified by hospital size and location. 2 x 2 balanced incomplete block controlled before and after study.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Coleman,1999 ⁶²⁷ Sample: 169 Length of treatment 48 weeks	Intention to treat: Modified intention-to-treat: patients with followup data were included in the followup analysis irrespective of level of exposure to the intervention Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Simple random numbers table; The unit of randomization was the physician practice	Randomization: Adequate Possible because the authors modified intention to treat analysis
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Demain, 2001 ⁵¹⁴ Sample: 44 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Stratified randomization using the method of minimization; Stratification by body mass index and age	Randomization: Adequate
Group intervention	Diokno, 2010 ⁵¹⁷ Sample: 44 6-8 weeks	Intention to treat: NR Allocation concealment NR Sample size justified: No	Randomization: NR	Randomization: Not adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Diokno, 2004 ⁵¹⁶ Sample: 359 48 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomizations in blocks of 16 women to provide balanced recruitment between groups	Randomization: Adequate.
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Dougherty, 2002 ⁵¹⁸ Sample: 218 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with minimization to balance by severity, age, bacteriuria ethnicity, and caregiver	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Dowd,1996 ⁵¹⁹ Sample: 58 5 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization Baseline data not provided but some differences at baseline reported.

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Dowd, 2000 ⁵²⁰ Sample: 40 6 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Elser, 1999 ⁵²² Sample: 204 Length of treatment 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization stratified by severity of urinary incontinence, urodynamic diagnosis, and treatment site randomization.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Engberg, 2002 ⁵²⁴ Sample: 19 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer- generated stratified by cognitive ability, toileting skills, and severity of urinary incontinence randomization.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Fantl,1991 ⁵²⁵ Sample: 13 6 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization stratified by urodynamic incontinence. Randomization stratified by urodynamic incontinence.	Randomization: Adequate
Supervised Pelvic Floor Muscle Training	Felicissimo, 2010 ⁵²⁶ Sample: 62 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer generated random number generator	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Gallo,1997 ⁵³¹ Sample: 86 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: States as adequate, baseline characteristics not reported.
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Gameiro, 2010 ⁵³² Sample: 103	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Patients were systematically allocated, in a single-blind study, into two groups. The odd numbers were included in group 1 (n=51) and submitted to VWC associated to standardized general exercise; the even numbers were included in group G2 (n=52) and treated with assisted PFMT	Randomization Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Gilling, 2009 ⁵³⁴ Sample: 70 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Random permuted blocks of 10	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Glavind,1997 ⁵³⁶ Sample: 6 0.5 weeks	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Cross over trial

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Glavind,1996 ⁵³⁵ Sample: 40 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Stated as adequate, no data provided
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Goode,2003 ⁶²⁶ Sample: 200 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer- generated stratified by types and severity of incontinence and race randomization with block size of 6.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Goode, 2002 ²⁹⁴ Sample: 105 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Gorman,1995 ⁵³⁷ Sample: 60 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Hahn, 1991 ⁵³⁸ Sample: 20	Intention to treat: Not reported Allocation concealment Not reported Sample size justified: Not reported	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Harvey, 2002 ⁵³⁹ Sample: 44	Intention to treat: NR Allocation concealment NR Sample size justified: NR	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Hu, 1989 ⁵⁴⁰ Sample: 143 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Huang, 2009 ⁵⁴¹ Sample: 338 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Reported previously Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Random permuted blocks; 2:1 ratio	Randomization: No, women in control group had slightly higher average Beck Depression Inventory score
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Hui, 2006 ⁵⁴² Sample: 32 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with a table of random numbers	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Hung, 2010 ⁵⁴³ Sample: 70 Length of treatment 16 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment Not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Block randomization with a maximum of 6 was used	Randomization Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Janssen, 2001 ⁵⁴⁴ Sample: 530 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization stratified by type, severity and duration of incontinence frequency sampling randomization	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Kim, 2009 ⁵⁴⁶ Sample: 147	Intention to treat: NR Allocation concealment NR Sample size justified: NR	Randomization: NR	Randomization NR
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Kim, 2007 ⁵⁴⁸ Sample: 70 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer- generated random numbers; randomization was repeated until there was no significant difference between the two groups	Randomization: Adequate unclear because the authors stated that "The participants were divided into two groups based on the frequency of urine leakage and functional fitness measurements"
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Kim, 2001 ⁵⁴⁷ Sample: 48 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization by the order of coming to the clinic.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Kincade, 2007 ⁵⁵⁰ Sample: 224 3 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: The minimization technique; to balance those in the two study groups on age (18–39, 40–64, 65+), estrogen status (pre menopausal/ hormone replacement versus post menopausal/no hormone replacement), severity of urine loss (<50 g vs. more than 50 g), and race	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Konstantinidou, 2007 ⁵⁵¹ Sample: 30 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Unclear consecutive order according to women hospital administration sequence; Not reported	Randomization: Adequate Unclear because described methods of treatment assignment was not random
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Kumari, 2008 ⁵⁵² Sample: 198 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Block randomization; Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Lagro- Janssen,1992 ⁵⁵³ Sample: 110 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Lagro- Janssen,1991 ⁵⁵⁴ Sample: 66 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Lamb, 2009 ⁵⁵⁵ Sample: 174	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomized in a ratio of 2:1 (group: individual)	Randomization Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Liebergall- Wischnitzer, 2009 ⁵⁵⁹ Sample: 245 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate: by a biostatistician and blinded research coordinator Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization stratified with a table of random numbers, permuted blocks; block size of 4 and stratified by age (20–50 and 51–65) and place of residence (three towns).	Randomization: No, a significant difference in the prevalence of uterine prolapse
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Liebergall- Wischnitzer, 2005 ⁵⁶⁰ Sample: 59 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer generated randomization with block of 4 stratified by age.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	MacDiarmid, 2010 ³⁶⁰ Sample: 33	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: NA
Urodynamics	Majumdar, 2010 ⁵⁶⁴ Sample: 99 23–26 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization was done with the help of a Clinical Trial Simulator, a web-based program	Randomization: NR
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Manonai, 2006 ⁵⁶⁶ Sample: 42 Two 12-week diet periods and two 4-week washout periods.	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data provided with no analysis for incontinence rate.
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	McDowell, 2006 ⁵⁶⁸ Sample: 30 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer generated randomization list.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	McDowell,1999 ⁵⁶ 9 Sample: 105 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer- generated stratified by cognitive ability, toileting skills, and severity of urinary incontinence randomization with permuted blocks.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	McFall, 2000 ⁵⁷⁰ Sample: 145 Length of treatment 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Miller,1998 ⁵⁷² Sample: 27 1 week	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported

	Reference sample	Intention to treat allocation concealment		
Treatment	length of treatment	justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Moore, 2003 ⁵⁷³ Sample: 145 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer- generated randomization stratified with respect to mild and moderate leakage with permuted blocks of 20.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Morkved, 2002 ⁵⁷⁴ Sample: 103 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Centralized but no computerized randomization stratified by results of a pad test with standardized bladder volume (20g or less and more than 20g of leakage).	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Du Moulin, 2007 ⁵⁷⁵ Sample: 38 24 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Random numbers table; general practitioners were randomized	Randomization No, mixed incontinence was more frequent in the intervention group, whereas stress incontinence was more frequent in the control group. Randomization did not provide balance between treatment groups
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Nager, 2009 ⁵⁷⁶ Sample: 445 Not reported	Intention to treat: No Previously reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Previously reported; Randomization ignored in the article	Randomization: Adequate The outcome - pessary fitting reported in total sample not by randomization status.
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Ng, 2008 ⁵⁷⁷ Sample: 88 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Nygaard,1996 ⁵⁸⁰ Sample: 71 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization with random numbers table, in blocks of 4	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	O'Brien, 1991 ⁵⁸¹ Sample: 561 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer based randomization.	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	O'Brien,1996 ⁵⁸² Sample: 292 4 years of followup	Intention to treat: No Reported previously Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization Not relevant because the authors reported long term outcomes among all treated. The results reported ignoring randomization as non controlled study.
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	O'Sullivan, 2003 ⁵⁸⁴ Sample: 150 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate Sample size justified:	Randomization: Stratified randomization; randomization was stratified by mild and moderate incontinence	Randomization: Adequate The authors reported outcomes by baseline severity status pooling active and control groups because they did not differ after interventions
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Pages, 2001 ⁵⁸⁵ Sample: 51 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization Baseline data is not reported
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Richter, 2010 ³⁶³ Sample: 446	Sample size justified: No Intention to treat: Yes Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Previously reported	Randomization Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Sherman,1997 ⁵⁹⁵ Sample: 39 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization stratified by diagnosis of physical stress incontinence or mixed urge/stress incontinence.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Subak, 2005 ⁶⁰⁰ Sample: 48 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization was stratified by type of incontinence, with randomly permuted blocks of 4.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Subak, 2009 ⁶⁰¹ Sample: 338 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization stratified random permuted blocks; 2:1 ratio with randomly permuted blocks of three or six, stratified according to clinical center	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Subak, 2002 ⁵⁹⁹ Sample: 152 6 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer based randomization.	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Sung, 2000 ⁶⁰³ Sample: 60 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: The authors stated that they randomly selected patients for treatment. Unclear was it invitation for the study or treatment assignment	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Swithinbank, 2005 ⁶⁰⁴ Sample: 69 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Tibaek, 2007 ⁶⁰⁵ Sample: 24 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Reported previously Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Stated as adequate (no data provided)
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Theofrastous, 2002 ⁶⁰⁶ Sample: 137 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Thornburn,1997 ⁶⁰⁷ Sample: 20 1 week	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization Baseline data is not reported Unclear because baseline characteristics of women were not reported
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Tibaek, 2004 ⁶⁰⁹ Sample: 26 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Simple random numbers table	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Tibaek, 2005 ⁶¹⁰ Sample: 26 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization with a table of random numbers; Randomization with a table of random numbers	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Tsai, 2009 ⁶¹¹ Sample: 108 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Random permuted blocks; block size 2	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wang, 2004 ⁶¹² Sample: 120 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Central computer-generated randomization in blocks of 6.	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wells,1991 ⁶¹³ Sample: 157 24 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Williams, 2005 ⁶¹⁴ Sample: 3746 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization by household, at a ratio of 4:1 in favor of the continence nurse practitioner.	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Williams, 2006 ⁶¹⁵ Sample: 238 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wing, 2010 ⁶¹⁶ Sample: 338	Intention to treat: Yes Reported previously Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomly allocated in a 2:1 ratio	Randomization Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wong, 2001 ⁸¹⁷ Sample: 38 4 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Permuted block randomization; blocks of 2	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wyman,1997 ⁶¹⁸ Sample: 131 6 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Stratified by type of incontinence	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Wyman,1998 ⁶¹⁹ Sample: 204 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Stratified on the basis of their urodynamic diagnostic categorization (genuine stress incontinence or detrusor instability with or without genuine stress incontinence), baseline incontinence severity (1 to 9 incontinent episodes, 10 to 25 episodes, or 26 or greater episodes per week), and treatment site	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Yoon, 2003 ⁶²² Sample: 50 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Zanetti, 2007 ⁶²³ Sample: 44 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Stratified randomized computer-generated random number table; Stratified by the satisfaction with the previous therapy	Randomization: Adequate
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Tomlinson,1999 ⁶²⁵ Sample: 135 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate The results are reported after active treatment only

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
PFMT and/or other lifestyle interventions	Clarke-O'Neill, 2002 ⁶²⁴ Sample: 72 1 week	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization using Latin squares; Not reported	Randomization Cross over trial differences in quality of life were calculated adjusting for baseline level, number of days practiced the intervention or in wait list group, age, hormone status, and race
Electro- stimulation	Finazzi Agro, 2005 ⁵²⁷ Sample: 35 2-8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Electro- stimulation	Amaro, 2005 ⁴⁸⁰ Sample: 40 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Amaro, 2006 ⁴⁸¹ Sample: 40 7 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Barroso,2004 ⁴⁸⁸ Sample: 36 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization before the study by drawing lots	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Berghmans, 2002 ⁴⁹⁰ Sample: 98 9 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Randomization using blocks of 4.	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Blowman, 1991 ⁴⁹¹ Sample: 14	Intention to treat: Not reported Sample size justified: Not reported	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Not reported
Electro- stimulation	Bo,1997 ⁴⁹² Sample: 12 1 day experiment	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization Baseline data is not reported
Electro- stimulation	Bo,1999 ⁴⁹³ Sample: 122 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer generated random numbers stratified by baseline leakage	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Borawski, 2007 ⁴⁹⁶ Sample: 30 2 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: No

Treatment	Reference sample length of treatment	Intention to treat allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Electro- stimulation	Borello-France, 2008 ⁴⁹⁸ Sample: 28 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Randomization stratified random permuted blocks Four blocks with 12 assignments each stratified by age (within 5 years) and incontinence severity minimal (<5 urine leakage episodes per week), moderate (5–10 urine leakage episodes per week), or severe (>10 urine leakage episodes per week).	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Bower,1998 ⁵⁰⁰ Sample: 48 Unclear	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Brubaker,1997 ⁵⁰³ Sample: 121 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear but centralized data manager blinded for treatment status analyzed the data. Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer generated randomization stratified by incontinence type.	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	But, 2003 ⁵⁰⁸ Sample: 55 Length of treatment 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	But, 2005 ⁵⁰⁹ Sample: 39 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Electro- stimulation	Demirturk, 2008 ⁵¹⁵ Sample: 41 5 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization by application order; Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Dumoulin, 2004 ⁵²¹ Sample: 64 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Stratified randomization by the results from pad test using a balanced block randomization schedule generated from a table of random numbers.	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Emmons, 2005 ⁵²³ Sample: 85 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer- generated randomization with random numbers table.	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Fujishiro, 2000 ⁵²⁹ Sample: 62 1 week	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate

	Reference	Intention to treat		
Treatment	sample length of treatment	allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Electro- stimulation	Fujishiro, 2002 ⁵³⁰ Sample: 37 1 week	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Jeyaseelan, 2000 ⁵⁴⁵ Sample: 27 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: computer- generated table of random numbers	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Karademir, 2005 ³²³ Sample: 43 8 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data reported for age only.
Electro- stimulation	Kim, 2008 ⁵⁴⁹ Sample: 52 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Lappin, 2003 ⁵⁵⁶ Sample: 145 10 weeks, 2 weeks washout period.	Intention to treat: No Adequate Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Central computer generated randomization.	Randomization: Adequate
Electrostimula tion	Luber,1997 ⁵⁶³ Sample: 57 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization using the table of random numbers	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Manganotti, 2007 ⁵⁶⁵ Sample: 20 2 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Electro- stimulation	Oldham, 2010 ⁵⁸³ Sample: 128	Intention to treat: NR Randomly allocated by a computer-generated randomization list Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization NR
Electro- stimulation	Peters, 2010 ⁵⁸⁷ Sample: 150	Intention to treat: Not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Subjects were randomized 1:1 at the first intervention visit to PTNS or sham using a random block design stratified by investigational site	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Ramsay, ⁵⁸⁸ Sample: 74 1 week	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: computer- generated random number	Randomization: Adequate Multiple- imputation with missing data

	Reference			
Treatment	sample length of treatment	Intention to treat allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Electro- stimulation	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹ Sample: 52 15 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer- generated random numbers with blocks at a 2:1 rate favoring active over placebo devices.	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Smith,1996 ⁵⁹⁶ Sample: 57 16 weeks	Intention to treat: Intention to treat not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Spruijt, 2003 ⁵⁹⁷ Sample: 51 8 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Blocked randomization (Pocock).	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Sung, 2000 ⁶⁰² Sample: 90 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Electro- stimulation	Yamanishi,1997 ⁶²⁰ Sample: 35 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Electro- stimulation	Yamanishi, 2000 ⁶²¹ Sample: 68 4 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Appell, 2006 ⁴⁸³ Sample: 173 48 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computer generated randomization with ratio 2:1	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Bano, 2005 ⁴⁸⁷ Sample: 50 Length of treatment 6 months	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Corcos, 2005 ⁵¹³ Sample: 133 48 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Centralized randomization stratified by center with randomly distributed blocks 4 and 6 in size.	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Ghoniem, 2009 ⁵³³ Sample: 260 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Not reported 1:1 ratio	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Lee, 2001 ⁵⁵⁸ Sample: 68 Duration of followup: 24 months	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Computerized randomization with random number tables	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Lightner, 2001 ⁵⁶¹ Sample: 355 48 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported

Treatment	Reference sample length of treatment	Intention to treat allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Bulking agents or medical devices	Lightner, 2009 ⁵⁶² Sample: 344 12 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Random permuted blocks; 2:1 allocation ratio of Zuidex to Contigen	Randomization: Adequate adjustment for age, race, partner status, parity, hysterectomy, oophorectomy, menopausal status, general health, depression symptoms, systemic estrogen use, SSRI use, clinical severity of incontinence, clinical type of incontinence, BMI and clinical site
Bulking agents or medical devices	Mayer, 2007 ⁵⁶⁷ Sample: 296 24 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Adequate - central computerized tables generated by Statistical Analysis Systems Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Random numbers tables generated by Statistical Analysis Systems	Randomization: Adequate Not relevant
Bulking agents or medical devices	Schulz, 2004 ⁵⁹³ Sample: 40 Duration of followup: 12 months	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer generated block randomization scheme.	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Strasser, 2007 ⁵⁹⁸ Sample: 63 48 weeks	Intention to treat: Yes Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Computer- generated randomization list with permuted blocks and ratio of 2:1.	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Andersen, 2002 ⁴⁸² Sample: 52 Single injection	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment unclear Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Laycock, 2001 ⁵⁵⁷ Sample: 101 12 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Permuted block randomization in ratio 2:2:1	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Bulking agents or medical devices	Nielsen, 1993 ⁵⁷⁸ Sample: 40 2 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Bulking agents or medical devices	Nygaard, 1995 ⁵⁷⁹ Sample: 20 Three exercise sessions	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Block randomization	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported

Treatment	Reference sample length of treatment	Intention to treat allocation concealment justification of the sample Size	Randomization	Bias
Bulking agents or medical devices	Robinson, 2003 ⁵⁹⁰ Sample: 24 Duration of followup: 4 months	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Adequate
Bulking agents or medical devices	Seo, 2004 ⁵⁹⁴ Sample: 120 6 weeks	Intention to treat: Not stated Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Not reported	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Bulking agents or medical devices	Thyssen, 2001 ⁶⁰⁸ Sample: 94 5 weeks	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment not reported Sample size justified: No	Randomization: Block randomization;	Randomization: Baseline data is not reported
Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation	Finazzi-Agro, 2010 ⁵²⁸ Sample: 35	Intention to treat: No Allocation concealment Not reported Sample size justified: Yes	Randomization: Patients were randomly assigned to PTNS or a placebo group following a computer generated randomization list	Randomization: Adequate
Trans- cutaneous electrical tibial nerve stimulation + bladder training	Schreiner, 2010 ⁵⁹² Sample: 52 12 weeks	Intention to Treat: No Allocation Concealment: Not reported Justification of the Sample Size: No	Randomization: The patients were randomly divided into two groups through simple random number generator	Randomization: Not adequate