

Appendix Table F96. Clinical outcomes after electrical intravaginal stimulation compared to no active treatment (results from RCTs pooled with random effects models)

Outcome	Reference	Active events/ randomized	Control events/ randomized	Relative risk (95% CII)	Weight, %	Absolute risk difference (95% CI)	Weight %	Inclusion of mixed UI
Continence	Yamanishi, 1997 ⁶²⁰	2/20	0/13	3.33 (0.17; 64.33)	4	0.10 (-0.07; 0.27)	17	Yes
Continence	Luber, 1997 ⁵⁶³	3/20	3/24	1.20 (0.27; 5.30)	16	0.03 (-0.18; 0.23)	14	No
Continence	⁴⁹¹	6/7	1/6	5.14 (0.84; 31.57)	11	0.69 (0.30; 1.09)	5	No
Continence	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	7/35	2/17	1.70 (0.39; 7.33)	17	0.08 (-0.12; 0.28)	14	No
Continence	Bo, 1999 ⁴⁹³	7/32	2/32	3.50 (0.79; 15.58)	16	0.16 (-0.01; 0.32)	17	No
Continence	Yamanishi, 2000 ⁶²¹	7/37	1/31	5.86 (0.76; 45.11)	9	0.16 (0.02; 0.30)	20	Not reported
Continence	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	11/30	3/30	3.67 (1.14; 11.84)	26	0.27 (0.04; 0.47)	14	Not reported
Continence				4.38 (1.02; 18.84)				No
Pooled		43/188	12/159	2.86 (1.57; 5.23)	100	0.16 (0.06; 0.26)	100	
Heterogeneity p value, I squared				0.82	0.00	0.100	43.70	
Improved UI	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	13/35	2/17	3.16 (0.80; 12.44)	9	0.25 (0.03; 0.48)	9	No
Improved UI	Brubaker, 1997 ⁵⁰³	21/60	10/61	2.14 (1.10; 4.14)	23	0.19 (0.03; 0.34)	16	Yes
Improved UI	Luber, 1997 ⁵⁶³	3/20	3/24	1.20 (0.27; 5.30)	8	0.03 (-0.18; 0.23)	10	No
Improved UI	Yamanishi, 1997 ⁶²⁰	3/20	0/13	4.67 (0.26; 83.55)	2	0.15 (-0.04; 0.34)	12	Yes
Improved UI	Bo, 1999 ⁴⁹³	3/32	1/32	3.00 (0.33; 27.33)	4	0.06 (-0.06; 0.18)	22	No
Improved UI	Yamanishi, 2000 ⁶²¹	8/37	2/31	3.35 (0.77; 14.64)	8	0.15 (-0.01; 0.31)	15	Not reported
Improved UI	Amaro, 2006 ⁴⁸¹	17/20	14/20	1.21 (0.86; 1.71)	38	0.15 (-0.11; 0.40)	7	Yes

Appendix Table F96. Clinical outcomes after electrical intravaginal stimulation compared to no active treatment (results from RCTs pooled with random effects models) (continued)

Outcome	Reference	Active events/ randomized	Control events/ randomized	Relative risk (95% CII)	Weight, %	Absolute risk difference (95% CI)	Weight %	Inclusion of mixed UI
Improved UI	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	13/30	2/30	6.50 (1.60; 26.36)	9	0.37 (0.17; 0.57)	10	Not reported
Pooled		81/254	34/228	2.01 (1.28; 3.15)	100	0.16 (0.08; 0.23)	100	
Heterogeneity p value, I squared				0.19	30.00	0.239	23.800	
Treatment discontinuation	Jeyaseelan, 2000 ⁵⁴⁵	1/13	2/14	0.54 (0.06; 5.26)	46	-0.07 (-0.30; 0.17)	43	
Treatment discontinuation	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	7/35	1/17	3.40 (0.45; 25.47)	54	0.14 (-0.03; 0.31)	57	No
Pooled		8/48	3/31	1.47 (0.24; 8.86)	100	0.05 (-0.15; 0.25)	100	
Heterogeneity p value, I squared				0.24	29.00	0.16	48.60	
Treatment failure		2/7	1/6	1.71 (0.20; 14.55)	6	0.12 (-0.33; 0.57)	35	No
Treatment failure	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	12/30	19/30	0.63 (0.38; 1.06)	95	-0.23 (-0.48; 0.01)	65	Not reported
Pooled		14/37	20/36	0.67 (0.40; 1.10)	100	-0.11 (-0.44; 0.22)	100	
Heterogeneity p value, I squared				0.37	0.00	0.18	45.20	
Adherence	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	28/35	15/17	0.91 (0.71; 1.15)		-0.08 (-0.29; 0.12)		No
Adverse effects	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	1/35	2/17	0.24 (0.02; 2.49)		-0.09 (-0.25; 0.07)		No
Adverse effects	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	3/35	1/17	1.46 (0.16; 12.99)		0.03 (-0.12; 0.17)		No
Adverse effects	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	4/35	2/17	0.97 (0.20; 4.79)		-0.00 (-0.19; 0.18)		No
Adverse effects	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	5/35	2/17	1.21 (0.26; 5.63)		0.03 (-0.17; 0.22)		No
Treatment discontinuation Adverse effects	Sand, 1995 ⁵⁹¹	2/35	0/17	2.50 (0.13; 49.38)		0.06 (-0.06; 0.17)		No

Appendix Table F96. Clinical outcomes after electrical intravaginal stimulation compared to no active treatment (results from RCTs pooled with random effects models) (continued)

Outcome	Reference	Active events/ randomized	Control events/ randomized	Relative risk (95% CI)	Weight, %	Absolute risk difference (95% CI)	Weight %	Inclusion of mixed UI
Treatment discontinuation Treatment failure	Castro, 2008 ²⁵³	1/30	2/30	0.50 (0.05; 5.22)		-0.03 (-0.14; 0.08)		Not reported