

#568 Lack of scientific evidence for pelvic floor devices

te Brummelstroete GH², Loohuis AMM¹, Wessels NJ¹, van Summeren J¹, Westers H¹, Blanker MH¹.

1. University Medical Center Groningen, dept of General Practice & Elderly Medicine, the Netherlands

2. Martini Hospital Groningen, dept of Urology, the Netherlands

Introduction:

Numerous gadgets or devices are available for patients with pelvic floor problems and their caregivers.

We aimed to evaluate the scientific evidence for pelvic floor devices.

Methods:

We manually searched abstracts of the 2016 & 2017 meetings of ICS, IUGA, EAU & AUA, and visited the exhibition floor at ICS 2017. Next, we performed a PubMed & EMBASE-search for publications about each selected device.

Results:

We selected 11 eligible devices from 10,399 abstracts. Nearly all devices were presented at ICS meetings; none were presented at AUA meetings. Anonymous results are presented in table I.

Device	Condition	Purpose	Available for	Full text publications
A	PFMD	Both	Caregivers	Reliability study (diagnostic) and RCT (treatment)
B	SUI	Therapeutic	Patients	Phase III trial
C	SUI	Therapeutic	Patients	Pilot study
D	PFMD	Therapeutic	Caregivers	Pilot study
E	Other	Diagnostic	Not yet available	Reliability study (diagnostic)
F	SUI	Therapeutic	Patients	Case report, case study
G	SUI	Therapeutic	Patients	None
H	SUI	Therapeutic	Not yet available	None
I	PFMD	Therapeutic	Patients	None
J	SUI	Therapeutic	Both	None
K	PFMD	Diagnostic	Not yet available	None

Table I: selected devices and scientific background. PFMD: pelvic floor muscle dysfunction, SUI: stress urinary incontinence, RCT: randomised controlled trial

Conclusions

- The ICS annual meetings appear to be the most important venue to report on these issues.
- There is little to no scientific evidence for the effectiveness of pelvic floor devices.
- Despite this, most of these devices are commercially available for caregivers or patients with pelvic floor dysfunction.

