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1. Introduction

Urinary incontinence (UI) is one of the most common side effects of radical prostatectomy (RP) and can substantially affect a man’s quality of life (QoL). The rates of UI vary with the type of procedure or surgical technique [1]. Reported rates of UI after RP vary and depend on definition but have been reported up to 87% at 1 mo postoperatively [2]; however, UI generally improves by the 1-yr postoperative mark [3]. The cause of UI is considered to be multifactorial.
and the result of urethral sphincter deficiency or laxity and the destruction of support mechanisms through surgical injury; detrusor overactivity, impaired bladder sensation, and low bladder compliance can occur [4,5]. There are many preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative interventions in current practice for the prevention and treatment of UI for after RP. One of these interventions is pelvic floor muscle exercise (PFME) with or without biofeedback. PFME is often guided by a physiotherapist and can be performed with or without biofeedback. Biofeedback may be given to the patient via auditory, tactile, or visual feedback of their pelvic muscle function.

A Cochrane Review evaluating postoperative PFME reported that the evidence is conflicting, and the value of postoperative PFME following prostatectomy remains uncertain [6]. We aimed to determine the effectiveness of preoperative PFME for improving postoperative UI following RP.

2. Evidence acquisition

2.1. Search strategy

A systematic Medline, Embase, and Cochrane Library search was conducted 4 October 2014. The search strategy keywords used were selected to be as sensitive as possible; iterations and suggested terms were included and used if possible (Supplementary Table 1 and 2). Cited references
from selected studies were also retrieved. A total of 44 articles were retrieved from the literature search. One related article that fit the selection criteria was also identified and added to the pool of articles for further review [7]. We then eliminated 34 articles (inclusive of 3 duplicates) by reading abstracts and the full articles, as necessary. Eleven articles were included in this systematic review [7–17] (Fig. 1).

### 2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria and outcome measures

Included studies focused on men of all ages undergoing RP. The inclusion criteria for selected articles are outlined in Table 1. The intervention had to involve a form of preoperative PFME with or without guidance (physiotherapist or nurse) and with or without biofeedback (auditory, visual, or tactile). Studies that did not have a comparator (no preoperative PFME) were excluded. Studies that were not published in the English language and that were editorials, commentaries, or review articles were also excluded.

The main outcome measures were continence rates, 24-h pad weight, and standardised QoL measures (American Urological Association Symptom Index, King’s Health Questionnaire [KHQ], University of California Los Angeles Prostate Cancer Index [UCLA-PCI], International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire [ICIQ], International Prostate Symptom Score [IPSS]).

### 2.3. Data collection and analysis

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) process [18] for reporting both included and excluded studies, with the recommended flow chart showing numbers of papers identified and included or excluded at each stage (Fig. 1). Titles and abstracts were reviewed for relevance to the defined review question. If it was not clear from the abstract whether the paper might contain relevant data, the full paper was assessed. References cited in full-text articles were also assessed for relevant articles. The search was carried out by two reviewers (J.I.C. and M.I.P.), and discrepancies were resolved by discussion. Articles of interest were tabulated, and meta-analysis was performed by V.I.

Seven studies [7,8,10,13–15,17] contained sufficient quantitative data on postoperative incontinence suitable for meta-analysis. To synthesise the results, we compared the intervention of preoperative PFME with the standard of no preoperative PFME prior to RP. UI at 1, 3, and 6 mo was analysed using the random-effects methods of DerSimonian and Laird [19]. We expressed results as odds ratios (ORs) for incontinence, with values <1 favouring continence.

### 3. Evidence synthesis

#### 3.1. Included trials

We included 11 studies in this systematic review; however, only 7 studies [7,8,10,13–15,17] had sufficient quantitative data on postoperative incontinence available for meta-analysis. Table 2 depicts the characteristics of the studies included. The data on this topic are quite recent because more than half of these studies were published in the past 5 yr.

#### 3.2. Quality of included trials

We assessed the risk of bias for each study as per the guidelines of the Cochrane handbook [20] (Table 3). Of the 11 papers selected, all but 1 study [7] were prospective trials. Of these 10 trials [8–17], 9 were randomised controlled trials; however, 3 trials [8,11,15] did not describe how patients were randomised. Of the 11 papers, only 3 had both surgeons and assessors blinded [9,14,17]. In the study by Centemero et al [10], only the surgeon was blinded. In two studies [12,13], only the physiotherapists were mentioned as blinded. Most studies did not mention blinding or were nonblinded [7,8,11,15,16].

Most papers mentioned and explained the reasons for dropouts [7–11,13,14,17]. Only Dijkstra-Eshuis et al did not explain the reason for incomplete data [12]. Two studies did not mention any dropouts [15,16].

All trials excluded men who had incontinence preoperatively, except for one study that included men with UI as evident in the preoperative incontinent results [14] and one study that did not mention this issue [16].

#### 3.3. Definition of continence

There was no consensus on the definition of continence. Some studies incorporated more than one method of defining continence. Two studies [8,15] defined continence as one pad or fewer used per day. Four studies used weight of pads at specified timed intervals as the definition of continence; two studies [13,14] used <1 g at 1 h and the other two [7,12] used <2 g at 24 h as the definition of continence. Three studies [10,12,17] based the definition on patients’ self-reporting and continence questionnaires. Burgio et al [9] used their own definition of three consecutive weekly 1-d diaries with no leakage or 7 d with no leakage. Two studies [11,16] did not describe the definition of urinary continence.

There was heterogeneity among the QoL tools used, which included the ICIQ–Urinary Incontinence (ICIQ–UI), the ICIQ–Overactive Bladder (ICIQ–OAB), the UCLA-PCI, the IPSS, visual analogue scales, the KHQ, Pelvic Floor Inventories Leiden, Hopkins symptoms checklist, and a medical outcomes study short form. Some studies used a combination of these QoL

### Table 1 – Study inclusion criteria

| Types of radical prostatectomy | Open, laparoscopic, robotic assisted |
| Prostate cancer stage | Lower than T3 |
| Types of study | Prospective and retrospective |
| Type of intervention | Pelvic floor muscle training with or without biofeedback |
| Timing of first PFME session | Had to occur preoperatively |
| Outcome measures | Continence and QoL measures |

PFME = pelvic floor muscle exercise; QoL = quality of life.
started at least 4 wk preoperatively. At the other extreme, prior to the operation. Most studies carried out the first session 2–4 wk preoperative PFME session. In addition, there was variation summarised in each study. The exercise regimens are differences in the amount of detail with which the regimens were described in.

### 3.4. Pelvic floor muscle exercise regimen

There was a variety of different pelvic floor muscle training tools Although there was no consensus on a preferred tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition of continence</th>
<th>Pelvic floor muscle training regimen</th>
<th>Length and timing of preoperative PFME</th>
<th>Outcomes measurements</th>
<th>Length of follow-up, mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patel et al [7]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>&lt;2 g on 24-h pad weight test</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, verbal and visual feedback</td>
<td>First session ≥4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>Pads per day or week or 24-h pad test weight</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraerts et al [14]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Urine loss of &lt; 1 g at 1 h</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, visual feedback, digital palpation and EMG rectal probes</td>
<td>First session 2–4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>Objective measurements and questionnaires</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collado et al [11]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Surface electrode, incorporates abdominal hypopressive techniques</td>
<td>First session 2–4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>Objective measurements and questionnaires</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijkstra-Eshuis et al [12]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>&lt;2 g on 24-h pad weight test, based on self-reports and continence questionnaire</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, visual feedback, digital palpation and EMG rectal probes</td>
<td>First session 2–4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>Objective measurements and questionnaires</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tienforti et al [17]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Based on self-reports and continence questionnaire</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, verbal and visual feedback</td>
<td>First session 1 d preoperatively</td>
<td>ICIQ, KHQ, IPSS, PGI, VAS, UCLA-PCI, or self-reported continence rates</td>
<td>≤6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenero et al [10]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Based on self-reports and continence questionnaire</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, verbal and visual feedback</td>
<td>First session 2–4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>ICIQ, KHQ, IPSS, PGI, VAS, UCLA-PCI, or self-reported continence rates</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbelman et al [13]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Urine loss of &lt; 1 g at 1 h</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, verbal and visual feedback</td>
<td>First session 1 d preoperatively</td>
<td>Pads per day or week or 24-h pad test weight</td>
<td>≤6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgio et al [9]</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3 consecutive weekly 1-d diaries with no leakage or 7 d with no leakage</td>
<td>Visual biofeedback and rectal probes</td>
<td>1–3 sessions preoperatively, not stated when</td>
<td>ICIQ, KHQ, IPSS, PGI, VAS, UCLA-PCI, or self-reported continence rates</td>
<td>≤6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parekh et al [15]</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>≤1 pad per day</td>
<td>Physiotherapist guided, visual feedback, digital palpation and EMG rectal probes</td>
<td>1–3 sessions preoperatively, not stated when</td>
<td>Pads per day or week or 24-h pad test weight</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sueppel et al [16]</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Visual feedback and rectal probes</td>
<td>2 sessions, “several weeks” preoperatively</td>
<td>Objective measurements and questionnaires</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bales et al [8]</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>≤1 pad per day</td>
<td>Nurse guided, surface electrode</td>
<td>First session 2–4 wk preoperatively</td>
<td>Pads per day or week or 24-h pad test weight</td>
<td>≤6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMG = electromyography; ICIQ = International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire; IPSS = International Prostate Symptom Score; KHQ = King’s Health Questionnaire; PFME = pelvic floor muscle exercise; UCLA-PCI = University of California Los Angeles Prostate Cancer Index; VAS = visual analogue scale.

Two studies had their first session 1 d preoperatively. The remaining studies did not clearly state the timing of the first PFME session. The PFME sessions ranged from 20 min to 1 h in length and from twice a week to weekly in frequency.

### 3.5. Continence outcomes

In this meta-analysis, we found that there were significantly lower rates of postoperative incontinence at 3 mo in the preoperative PFME group compared with the control group, with an OR of being incontinent of 0.64 (p = 0.005). There was no significant difference in postoperative incontinence rates at 1 mo (OR: 0.68; p = 0.07) or 6 mo (OR: 0.60; p = 0.12) (Fig. 2).

Seven studies measured secondary outcomes with QoL tools. Four studies showed...
Table 3 – Risk of bias summary: review authors’ judgments about each risk-of-bias item for the included studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</th>
<th>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</th>
<th>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dijkstra-Eshuis et al [12]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraerts et al [14]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel et al [7]</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tienforti et al [17]</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centemero et al [10]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbelman et al [13]</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not applicable.

statistically significant improvements with PFME at 3 mo. In the study by Centemero et al [10], there were significant differences in score on the International Continence Society male short form at 3 mo (8.1 vs 12.2 for intervention and control, respectively; \( p = 0.002 \)). Tienforti et al [17] found differences in scores at 3 mo on the UCLA-PCI (403.81 vs 272.44; \( p = 0.006 \)) and the ICIQ-OAB (10.12 vs 13.19; \( p = 0.04 \)). The study by Geraerts et al [14] showed significant difference in favour of the intervention group for KHQ score for incontinence impact at 3 mo (\( p = 0.008 \)). The study by Collado et al [11] showed differences on the ICIQ-UI short form (9.2 vs 12.1) at 3 mo, with a \( p \) value of 0.008. Only two studies reported differences in KHQ, UCLA-PCI, and ICIQ-OAB scores at 6 mo [14,17]. Tienforti et al [17] showed significant difference at 6 mo for scores on the UCLA-PCI (422.5 vs 274.25; \( p = 0.003 \)) and the ICIQ-OAB (9.06 vs 12.62; \( p = 0.01 \)) in favour of preoperative PFME. Geraerts et al [14] showed better KHQ score for incontinence impact at 6 mo, with a \( p \) value of 0.024.

3.6. Discussion

3.6.1. Summary of findings

The meta-analysis demonstrated a significant 36% reduced risk of postoperative incontinence at 3 mo after RP if preoperative PFME was undertaken. Preoperative PFME, however, did not make a significant difference at 1 mo and 6 mo. This suggests that preoperative PFME may help early continence recovery but may not influence long-term incontinence rates beyond 6 mo. This is supported by the literature, as >90% of patients recover urinary continence in the long term [21,22]. Preoperative PFME could be potentially beneficial at 1 mo following operation; however, because only four studies (417 men) measured this outcome in this meta-analysis, it may well be underpowered.

UI after RP is multifactorial. Essentially, two anatomic systems maintain continence in men: the sphincteric system and a supportive system [23]. The sphincteric system is composed of an inner smooth muscle and a striated rhabdosphincter that contribute to the maintenance of urethral closure pressure. The interactions of the rhabdosphincter and the pelvic floor are interrelated but are not well understood in men [24]. Muscle fibres and innervation of the sphincter can be damaged as a result of surgery. The supportive system in the male patient includes Denonvilliers fascia, puboprostatic ligament, endopelvic fascia, levator ani muscles, and arcus tendineus fascia [23]. Although they may not be important in healthy men, after prostate removal, they become essential and may be compromised at the time of surgery.

The theoretical basis of PFME is that repeated volitional contraction of selected pelvic floor muscles may improve their strength and efficiency [25]. How PFME improves postoperative incontinence in men has not been fully elucidated; it may well improve the sphincteric mechanism through enhancing rhabdosphincter function and/or the supportive system thorough its effect on levator ani. The multifactorial aetiology of incontinence after RP can explain the varied results of PFME on an individual basis and in reported studies [25], as PFME will not correct all possible causes of postsurgery UI.

Current published literature on preoperative PFME is conflicting. Six studies suggested benefit [7,9,10,15–17], whereas five studies failed to demonstrate benefit [8,11–14]. All of the studies had small numbers of patients; therefore, in this study, with the aid of meta-analysis, we have shown the benefit of preoperative PFME.

Although our results show definite benefit with preoperative PFME regarding post-RP incontinence, Campbell et al concluded in a Cochrane Review [6] that there is still controversy about whether postoperative PFME is effective for urinary continence following operation. In total, only 2 of the 21 studies from the Cochrane Review show that postoperative PFME has a statistically significant benefit.
aiding urinary continence recovery [26,27]. In the study by Manassero et al [26], UI rates were higher in the control group compared with the intervention group during follow-up at 1 mo (83.3% vs 97.5%; p = 0.04), 3 mo (53.7% vs 77.5%; p = 0.03), 6 mo (33.3% vs 60%; p = 0.01), and 1 yr (16.6% vs 52.5%; p ≤ 0.01). Van Kampen et al [27] showed similar outcomes with lower risk ratios for patients with UI at <3 mo (0.24; 95% CI, 0.10–0.57), 3–6 mo (0.18; 95% CI, 0.04–0.77), and 6–12 mo (0.23; 95% CI, 0.05–1). They concluded that there was not enough evidence to say whether postoperative PFME was effective treatment for UI after RP. The effectiveness of pre- versus postoperative PFME might be due to the timing of PFME. Preoperative PFME prior to RP allows men to learn to control their pelvic floor muscles earlier and the sensations normally associated with these actions. This is thought to allow them to regain earlier urinary continence. Consequently, the difference could be due to the timing and “priming” of pelvic floor muscles and the mind-set of these men prior to prostatectomy.

### 3.6.2. Limitations

This study is limited by the small number of studies and patients that were available for analysis. Larger numbers and sizes of studies would have made the results more robust and less likely to be influenced by future studies. The study is also limited by the heterogeneity of the studies included. All studies had different regimens of PFME, definitions of continence, and QoL tools used. Follow-up periods tended to be short, as more than half of the studies concluded follow-up after 6 mo. The small numbers of patients in these studies may limit the difference at 1 and 6 mo in our meta-analysis. The quality of the individual studies was also diverse, which would have affected our meta-analysis.

### 4. Conclusions

Based on this systematic review and meta-analysis, preoperative PFME may aid early UI recovery and increase the QoL of patients after RP.
Author contributions: Manish I. Patel had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: Patel.
Acquisition of data: Chang.
Analysis and interpretation of data: Patel, Lam, Chang.
Drafting of the manuscript: Patel, Chang.
Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Patel, Lam, Chang.
Statistical analysis: Lam.
Obtaining funding: None.
Administrative, technical, or material support: Chang.
Supervision: Patel, Lam.
Other (specify): None.

Financial disclosures: Manish I. Patel certifies that all conflicts of interest, including specific financial interests and relationships and affiliations relevant to the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript (eg, employment/affiliation, grants or funding, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, royalties, or patents filed, received, or pending), are the following: M.I. Patel was supported by a fellowship from the New South Wales Cancer Institute (10ECF 2-29).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2015.11.004.

References


