

**Forest plots for review question: What is the effectiveness of pelvic floor muscle training (including Kegel exercises, biofeedback, weighted vaginal cones, and electrical stimulation) for improving symptoms of pelvic floor dysfunction?**

No meta-analysis was conducted for this review question and so there are no forest plots.

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I2
PFMT versus no treatment (or inactive control) for POP	Hagen 2011	POP-Q stage not improved	2	RR 0.83 (0.71 to 0.96)	60.22%
	Ge 2020	Self-reported change in symptoms (better)	5	RR 2.90 (1.72 to 4.89)	76.6%
		Self-reported change in symptoms (same)	4	RR 0.7 (0.45 to 1.09)	87.9%
		Self-reported change in symptoms (worse)	4	RR 0.67 (0.22 to 2.03)	77.4%
		POP-SS	5	SMD -0.24 (-0.71 to 0.22)	88.7%
		POPDI-6	4	SMD -0.14 (-0.43 to 0.15)	76.9%
		CRADI-8	4	SMD -0.03 (-0.16 to 0.11)	40.2%
		UDI-6	4	SMD -0.17 (-0.43 to 0.1)	72.2%
PFMT versus no treatment (or inactive control) for SUI	Dumoulin 2018	Patient perceived cure after treatment	4	RR 8.38 (3.68 to 19.07)	0%
		Patient perceived cure or improvement after treatment	3	RR 6.33 (3.88 to 10.33)	43.18%
		Quality of life (King's Health Questionnaire/general health score)	3	MD 1.81 (-3.4 to 7.03)	0%
		Participant perceived satisfaction	2	RR 5.32 (2.63 to 10.74)	74.03%
	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	8	OR 5.41 (1.64 to 17.82)	68.3%
		Improvement rate	11	OR 11.75 (3.49 to 39.55)	85.5%
	Moroni 2016	Incontinence specific QoL	2	MD -1.24 (-1.77 to -0.71)	0%
PFMT versus no treatment (or inactive control) for UI (SUI or MUI/not	Dumoulin 2018	Patient perceived cure after treatment	3	RR 5.34 (2.78 to 10.26)	73.55%
		Patient perceived cure or improvement after treatment	2	RR 2.39 (1.64 to 3.47)	0%

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I2
reported/UI or OAB)	Nie 2017	IIQ7	2	SMD -2.20 (-4.12 to -0.27)	94%
		UDI	2	MD -7.5 (-10.41 to -4.58)	34%
		Quality of life (The General QoL Questionnaire; Incontinence Quality of Life Questionnaire)	2	SMD 1.67 (0.41 to 2.94)	87%
Magnetic stimulation versus placebo/sham for SUI	Peng 2019	Quality of life	3	MD 0.42 (0.02 to 0.82)	41%
Magnetic stimulation versus placebo/sham for UI	Lim 2015	Improved continence	3	RR 2.29 (1.60 to 3.29)	0%
Vaginal cones versus no treatment for SUI	Imamura 2010	Improvement rate	2	OR 5.43 (0.07 to 396.77)	93.2%
	Herbinson 2013	No subjective improvement or cure	2	RR 0.72 (0.52 to 0.99)	89.5%
		No subjective cure	4	RR 0.84 (0.76 to 0.94)	79.82%
Electrical stimulation versus no treatment for SUI	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	6	OR 1.10 (0.41 to 2.94)	0%
		Improvement rate	7	OR 3.93 (1.43 to 10.8)	58.8%
		Incontinence specific QoL (Social Activity Index; IIQ)	2	SMD 0.19 (-0.65 to 1.03)	0% <sup>1</sup>
	Stewart 2017	Subjective cure	2	RR 2.31 (1.06 to 5.02)	0%
		Subjective cure or improvement	5	RR 1.73 (1.41 to 2.11)	83%
		Quality of life (KHQ; ICIQ)	6	SMD -0.72 (-0.99 to -0.46)	83%
	Moroni 2016	Incontinence-specific QoL - KHQ; IQoL (intravaginal stimulation)	2	SMD -1.44 (-1.94 to -0.95)	53%
		Incontinence-specific QoL - KHQ (superficial stimulation)	2	MD -50.1 (-66.77 to -34.25)	0%
	Electrical stimulation versus sham for SUI	Stewart 20107	Subjective cure	3	RR 2.21 (0.38 to 12.73)
		Subjective cure or improvement	5	RR 2.03 (1.02 to 4.07)	42%
PFMT versus electrical	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	5	OR 2.65 (0.82 to 8.6)	8.7%

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I2
stimulation for SUI		Improvement rate	6	OR 2.18 (0.76 to 6.28)	50.9%
	Stewart 2017	Subjective cure	4	RR 0.51 (0.16 to 1.63)	71%
		Subjective cure or improvement	7	RR 0.85 (0.7 to 1.03)	60%
	Liang 2018	Life quality score	17	MD -6.96 (-10.2 to -3.72)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>
PFMT versus vaginal cones for SUI	Herbison 2013	No subjective improvement or cure	6	RR 1.03 (0.8 to 1.33)	24.72%
		No subjective cure	5	RR 0.99 (0.88 to 1.12)	57.65%
	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	3	OR 0.61 (0.09 to 3.95)	47.1%
		Improvement rate	5	OR 1.01 (0.52 to 1.95)	37.1%
		Incontinence specific QoL (Social Activity Index; KHQ)	2	SMD 0.32 (-0.08 to 0.73)	0% <sup>1</sup>
	Moroni 2016	Incontinence-specific QoL (KHQ; IQoL)	2	MD -0.56 (-8.4 to 7.28)	0%
	Liang 2018	Life quality score	17	MD 0.01 (-2.62 to 2.64)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>
PFMT + biofeedback versus electrical stimulation for SUI	Liang 2018	Life quality score	17	MD -7.12 (-11.08 to -3.16)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>
Electrical stimulation versus vaginal cones for SUI	Herbison 2013	No subjective cure or improvement after treatment	3	RR 0.8 (0.54 to 1.18)	28.93%
		No subjective cure or improvement after 6 months	3	RR 0.77 (0.59 to 1.01)	82.12%
	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	2	OR 1 (0.26 to 3.91)	0%
		Improvement rate	3	OR 1.3 (0.59 to 2.84)	0%
	Moroni 2016	Incontinence-specific QoL	2	MD 9.31 (2.77 to 15.86)	90%
	Stewart 2017	Subjective cure	3	RR 1.04 (0.7 to 1.54)	0%
		Subjective cure or improvement	5	RR 1.09 (0.97 to 1.21)	0%
		I-QoL	2	MD 1.59 (-3.72 to 6.9)	0%
	Liang 2018	Life quality score	17	MD 6.97 (3.74 to 10.21)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>
Vaginal cones versus PFMT + biofeedback for SUI	Liang 2018	Life quality score	17	MD 0.14 (-3.34 to 3.62)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I2
PFMT (more) versus PFMT (less) for UI (SUI/MUI)	Hay-Smith 2011	Patients' perception of change - not cured (more vs less contact with health professionals: additional group supervision)	2	RR 0.89 (0.78 to 1.03)	0%
		Patients' perception of change - not improved (more vs less contact with health professionals: additional group supervision)	4	RR 0.29 (0.15 to 0.55)	4.59%
PFMT (more) versus PFMT (less) for SUI	Imamura 2010	Cure rate	3	OR 8.81 (2.33 to 33.27)	0%
		Improvement rate	3	OR 20.74 (3.58 to 120.25)	4.7%
		Incontinence specific quality of life (Social Activity Index; quality of life index)	2	SMD 1.07 (0.15 to 1.98)	93% <sup>1</sup>
PFMT (group) versus PFMT (individual) for SUI	Moroni 2016	Incontinence-specific QoL (KHQ)	2	MD 7.96 (-2.69 to 18.60)	0%
PFMT (group) vs PFMT (individual) for UI (SUI/MUI) – individual supervision only vs individual and group supervision	Hay-Smith 2011	Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not cured	2	RR 0.89 (0.78 to 1.03)	0%
		Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not improved	3	RR 0.16 (0.05 to 0.46)	9.46%
PFMT (direct) versus PFMT (indirect) for UI (SUI or MUI)	Hay-Smith 2011	Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not improved	2	RR 0.69 (0.47 to 1.02)	18.03%
PFMT (more intensive) vs PFMT (less intensive) for UI (SUI/MUI)	Hay-Smith 2011	Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not cured (high contrast)	3	RR 0.89 (0.8 to 0.98)	0%
		Patients' perception of	5	RR 1.06 (1 to 1.13)	0%

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I2
		change in incontinence - not cured (low contrast)			
		Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not improved (high contrast)	6	RR 0.37 (0.17 to 0.84)	61.2%
		Patients' perception of change in incontinence - not improved (low contrast)	7	RR 0.75 (0.59 to 0.95)	0%
PFMT + BF vs PFMT for SUI	Liang 2018	Life quality	17	MD -0.15 (-2.43 to 2.12)	Not reported <sup>2</sup>
	Imanura 2010	Cure rate	8	OR 1.88 (1.23 to 2.86)	0%
		Improvement rate	7	OR 1.83 (1.01 to 3.34)	18.6%
PFMT + BF vs PFMT for UI (UUI/MUI/SUI)	Herdersche 2011	Perception of change - not cured or improved (No difference in PFMT)	2	RR 0.87 (0.72 to 1.05)	0%
		Perception of change - not cured or improved (difference in PFMT)	5	RR 0.69 (0.58 to 0.83)	46.87%
		Perception of change - not cured (combined no difference in PFMT and difference in PFMT)	5	RR 0.92 (0.81 to 1.05)	6%
		Women's satisfaction with progress - not satisfied (combined no difference in PFMT and difference in PFMT)	3	RR 0.65 (0.49 to 0.9)	0%
PFMT + ES vs PFMT for SUI	Imanura 2010	Cure rate	4	OR 0.95 (0.49 to 1.85)	55.8%
		Improvement rate	3	OR 1.13 (0.49 to 2.58)	0%
	Stewart 2017	Subjective cure	3	RR 0.76 (0.38 to 1.52)	36%
		Subjective cure or improvement	8	RR 1.10 (0.95 to 1.28)	19%
		Quality of life	4	SMD -0.35 (-0.64 to -0.05)	87%

Comparison	Systematic review	Outcome	N studies	Pooled value	I <sup>2</sup>
		Subjective assessment (VAS)	3	SMD -0.57 (-0.9 to -0.24)	45%
PFMT + intravaginal device vs PFMT for UI (SUI/MUI)	Hay-Smith 2011	Patients' perception of change - not cured	2	RR 1.07 (0.96 to 1.2)	0%
		Patients' perception of change - not improved	2	RR 0.86 (0.62 to 1.2)	0%

<sup>1</sup> Calculated in Review manager, not combined in review

<sup>2</sup> This was a network meta-analysis,