

Appendix Table F86. Subgroup analysis of continence with different nonpharmacological treatments by baseline type of UI (results from individual RCTs were pooled with random effects model)

Treatment	Type of UI	Reference pooled*	Relative risk	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	Absolute risk difference	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
PFMT	Not reported	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	3.23	0.98	10.59	0.22	0.03	0.42
PFMT	Not reported	Hung, 2010 ⁵⁴³	5.00	0.62	40.64	0.11	-0.01	0.24
PFMT	Not reported	Pooled	3.59	1.28	10.09	0.15	0.04	0.25
PFMT	Mixed	Kim, 2009 ⁵⁴⁶	3.35	1.79	6.28	0.32	0.18	0.46
PFMT	Mixed	Burns, 1993 ⁵⁰⁷	6.35	0.82	49.32	0.14	0.02	0.26
PFMT	Mixed	Pooled	3.54	1.95	6.45	0.23	0.05	0.41
PFMT	Stress UI	Lagro-Janssen, 1991 ⁵⁵⁴	7.00	0.91	53.78	0.18	0.03	0.33
PFMT	Stress UI	Bo, 1999 ⁴⁹³	6.07	1.47	25.12	0.32	0.12	0.51
PFMT	Stress UI	Aksac, 2003 ⁴⁷⁸	16.24	1.07	246.51	0.75	0.53	0.98
PFMT	Stress UI	Kim, 2007 ⁵⁴⁸	6.33	2.06	19.49	0.46	0.27	0.65
PFMT	Stress UI	Pooled	6.85	3.15	14.87	0.42	0.19	0.65
PFMT+BT	Not reported	Diokno, 2004 ⁵¹⁶	1.32	0.98	1.78	0.09	-0.01	0.19
PFMT+BT	Mixed	Lagro-Janssen, 1992 ⁵⁵³	10.37	1.37	78.28	0.17	0.06	0.28
PFMT+BT	Mixed	O'Brien, 1991 ⁵⁸¹	15.49	2.13	112.49	0.08	0.05	0.11
PFMT+BT	Mixed	McFall, 2000 ⁵⁷¹	1.69	0.97	2.93	0.14	0.00	0.29
PFMT+BT	Mixed	Kumari, 2008 ⁵⁵²	33.08	4.62	236.86	0.37	0.26	0.48
PFMT+BT	Mixed	Pooled	8.21	1.58	42.53	0.19	0.05	0.32
PFMT+BT	All	Pooled	3.79	1.55	9.27	0.17	0.06	0.27
PEM+EMG BFB	Mixed	Burns, 1993 ⁵⁰⁷	8.78	1.17	66.04	0.20	0.06	0.34
PEM+EMG BFB	Stress UI	Aksac, 2003 ⁴⁷⁸	17.29	1.14	261.69	0.80	0.59	1.01
PEM+EMG BFB	All	Pooled	11.17	2.21	56.44	0.49	-0.10	1.08
Continence service	Mixed	Moore, 2003 ⁵⁷³	1.32	0.90	1.91	0.12	-0.04	0.28
Continence service	Mixed	Williams, 2005 ⁶¹⁴	1.47	1.26	1.72	0.09	0.06	0.12
Continence service	Mixed	Pooled	1.45	1.25	1.67	0.09	0.06	0.12
Continence service	Stress UI	Kim, 2009 ⁵⁴⁶	6.56	1.78	24.16	0.74	0.51	0.98
Continence service	All	Pooled	1.58	1.07	2.34	0.30	-0.01	0.60
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Not reported	Yamanishi, 2000 ⁶²¹	5.87	0.76	45.11	0.16	0.02	0.30
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Not reported	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	3.67	1.14	11.84	0.27	0.06	0.47

Appendix Table F86. Subgroup analysis of continence with different nonpharmacological treatments by baseline type of UI (results from individual RCTs were pooled with random effects model) (continued)

Treatment	Type of UI	Reference pooled*	Relative risk	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	Absolute risk difference	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Not reported	Pooled	4.12	1.49	11.38	0.19	0.08	0.31
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Mixed	Yamanishi, 1997 ⁶²⁰	3.33	0.17	64.33	0.10	-0.07	0.27
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Stress UI	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	1.70	0.40	7.33	0.08	-0.12	0.29
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Stress UI	Luber, 1997 ⁵⁶³	1.20	0.27	5.30	0.03	-0.18	0.23
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Stress UI	Bo, 1999 ⁴⁹³	3.50	0.79	15.58	0.16	-0.01	0.32
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Stress UI	Blowman, 1991 ⁴⁹¹	5.14	0.84	31.57	0.69	0.30	1.09
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	Stress UI	Pooled	2.30	1.06	4.97	0.18	-0.01	0.37
Intravaginal electrical stimulation	All	Pooled	2.86	1.57	5.23	0.16	0.06	0.26
Magnetic stimulation	Mixed	But, 2005 ⁵⁰⁹	1.08	0.71	1.62	0.05	-0.24	0.34
Magnetic stimulation	Stress UI	Fujishiro, 2000 ⁵²⁹	4.00	0.47	33.80	0.10	-0.04	0.23
Magnetic stimulation	Stress UI	Gilling, 2009 ⁵³⁴	2.00	0.54	7.37	0.09	-0.07	0.24
Magnetic stimulation	Stress UI	Pooled	2.42	0.79	7.35	0.09	-0.01	0.19
Magnetic stimulation	All	Pooled	1.22	0.78	1.88	0.09	-0.01	0.18
Vaginal Cone	Not reported	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	3.33	1.01	11.05	0.23	0.03	0.44
Vaginal Cone	Stress UI	Bo, 1999 ⁴⁹³	2.21	0.44	11.17	0.08	-0.08	0.23
Vaginal Cone	All	Pooled	2.88	1.10	7.55	0.14	-0.01	0.29

PFMT- pelvic floor muscle exercise; BT- bladder training; BFB- biofeedback

* Der Simonian pooled estimate