

**Non-surgical treatment for women with stress urinary incontinence (SUI)
Quality assessment checklist (Source: The Cochrane Incontinence Group¹⁰⁹)**

Question	Judgement (Y = Yes, U = Unclear, N = No)			A description that explains how the judgement was reached
	Y	U	N	
<p><i>Potential for selection bias at trial entry (quality of random allocation concealment)</i></p> <p>1. Was allocation adequately concealed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (Adequate, A) = Good attempt at concealment; method should not allow disclosure of assignment (telephone randomisation, third party involvement in allocation procedure etc. • Unclear (B) = States concealment but no description given • No (Inadequate, C) = Definitely not concealed (open random numbers tables or quasi-randomised, e.g. day of week, date of birth, alternation) or an attempt at concealment but real chance of disclosure of assignment prior to formal entry (envelopes without third party involvement, random numbers table but procedures not described) 				
<p><i>Potential for bias around time of treatment or during outcome assessment (blinding) (performance and detection bias)</i></p> <p>2.1. Were participants 'blind' to treatment status?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (A) = Action taken to blind participants to treatment likely to be effective (e.g. placebo) • Unclear (B) = Blinding stated but no description given • No = Attempt at blinding participants to intervention but reason to think it may not have been successful (e.g. placebo smells different) (C), no mention of blinding (D), or not blinded (E) 				
<p>2.2. Were health care providers 'blind' to treatment status? (performance bias)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (A), Unclear (B), No (C/D/E) as in 2.1 				
<p>2.3. Were outcome assessors 'blind' to treatment status? (detection bias)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (A), Unclear (B), No (C/D/E) as in 2.1 				
<p>2.4. Were the groups treated identically other than for the named interventions? (performance bias)</p>				
<p><i>Potential for selection bias in analysis (Attrition bias)</i></p> <p>3.1. Was there a description of withdrawals, dropouts and those lost to follow up?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (A) = States numbers and reasons for withdrawals • Unclear (B) = States numbers of withdrawals only (no reason given) • No = States withdrawals but no number given (C) or not mentioned (D) 				
<p>3.2. Was the analysis on intention to treat (or is it possible to do so on available data)? i.e. A) Are results reported for everyone who entered the trial?</p>				

Question	Judgement (Y = Yes, U = Unclear, N = No)			A description that explains how the judgement was reached
	Y	U	N	
B) Are participants analysed in the groups they were originally allocated to? If yes to both, an intention to treat has been performed.				
Appendix 1. Was the allocation sequence adequately generated? (RevMan 5, selection bias) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes = Adequate, e.g. random number table, use of computer random number generator, shuffling cards or envelopes • No = Inadequate, e.g. use of alternation, case record numbers, birth dates, date of admission • Unclear = Insufficient information to permit judgement of yes or no 				