

# Appendix 4 Identifying Continence Options after Stroke review: data abstraction form (version 2)

## ICONS REVIEW: DATA ABSTRACTION FORM V2

RefMan ID		Author & Year	
Reviewer initials		Title (first few words)	

Reference multiple publications if used for data extraction	
---	--

### Publication type

Published article	Book/book chapter	Thesis	Report	Abstract	Other (specify)

### Study focus

RCT/quasi RCT				Research study		
combined behavioural	enhanced behavioural	method of delivery (to client)	method to implement (with staff)	develop, test or process evaluate intervention	subjective experiences of clients, carers, staff	correlating moderators with outcomes

### FOR RCT/QUASI RCT OF COMBINED/ENHANCED BEHAVIOURAL UI INTERVENTIONS

#### RESEARCH AIM (copy and paste from paper)

--

#### RESEARCH DESIGN (copy and paste from paper)

Type of trial e.g. RCT, crossover	
Power calculation What outcome measure based on?	
Randomisation/stratification description	
Total number randomised	

#### RESEARCH ARMS/NUMBERS:

Main intervention	Comparison 1	Comparison 2
	Wait control, no treatment	Wait control, no treatment
	Placebo/attention control	Placebo/attention control
	Another treatment	Another treatment
	a) drugs	a) drugs
	b) physical therapy	b) physical therapy
	c) surgery	c) surgery
	d) other (specify)	d) other (specify)

#### Notes:

--

## CLIENT GROUP

<b>Recruitment/date of study</b>

<b>Clinical evaluation</b>

<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	<b>Exclusion criteria (copy and paste from paper)</b>

<b>Equivalence of groups results (copy and paste from paper)</b>

Description	Category (tick)					
Ethnic groups (% white)						
Age range (mean, SD)	18-44		45-65		>65	
Sex (% female)	All female		All male		Mixed	
UI type (% Stress, % urge/OAB, % mixed)	Stress		Mixed		Urge/OAB	
Severity of incontinence (how assessed, criteria)	Moderate/severe		Mild		Mixed	
Symptom duration (mean, SD)	1-2y		2-5y		>5y	
Cognitive incapacity (how assessed, criteria)	Excluded				Not excluded	
Diagnostic method	Urodynamic assessment				History only	
Equivalence check	Equivalence reported				Not reported	
Equivalence on UI parameters	Equivalent				Not equivalent	
Other criteria?						

Data relating to uptake/adherence		
	Rate	Factors affecting/reasons for failure (include source of data)
(Non) participation		
Treatment adherence		
Drop-out/follow up		
Long term sustainability		
Adverse effects		

## INTERVENTION DETAILS

### MAIN INTERVENTION CONTENT (copy and paste)

--

### INTERVENTION DELIVERY (copy and paste)

--

### CONTROL CONDITIONS (copy and paste)

--

### PRE-INTERVENTION TREATMENT (copy and paste) e.g. treatment of infection

--

DEFINITION OF INCONTINENCE	TYPES OF INCONTINENCE	SEVERITY OF INCONTINENCE

### MAIN INTERVENTION UI COMPONENTS

Category	Tick	Description/definition (copy/paste from paper)
BT	<input type="checkbox"/>	
PFMT	<input type="checkbox"/>	
PV	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Coping strategies for stress and urge UI to manage urgency/detrusor instability e.g. the Knack, urethral clamping	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Techniques to facilitate bladder emptying e.g, urethral milking, toilet behaviour, muscle relaxation, double voiding	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other UI strategy (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### UI CORE INTERVENTION QUALITY

PFMT	BT	PV
Confirm correct PFMC	Patient education	
Thorough individual instruction	Scheduled voiding	
Adherence check	Positive reinforcement	
Close follow up (i.e. every 2w)	Self monitoring/charting	
Longer training (i.e. 12 w or more)	Urge suppression techniques	

### POTENTIAL CONFOUNDERS included in the INTERVENTION GROUP ONLY (after randomisation)

Category	Tick	Description/definition (copy/paste from paper)
Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Medication review (for UI related side effects)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Treatment of infection	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Medication prescription (other)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Referral to specialist	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### INTERVENTION CONTEXT

Clients home	Acute care	Outpatient/ community clinic	Residential or subacute care	Other (specify)

### CLIENT GROUP allocation to intervention

Intervention component	Who got this? - client subgroup
1.	
2.	
3.	

## ADHERENCE STRATEGIES

Free text description (copy and paste from paper)			
<b>Category</b>		<b>Subcategories</b>	<b>Note</b>
INFORMATION PROVISION		General information on health	
		Information on consequences	
		Information on others approval	
		Provision of instruction	
		Model/demonstrate behaviour	
SELF-MONITORING			
ADHERENCE REMINDERS			
TAILORING/GOAL-SETTING		Prompt intention formation	
		Prompt barrier identification	
		Relapse prevention	
		Set graded tasks	
		Prompt specific goal setting	
		Prompt review of goals	
		Agree behavioural contract	
EXTERNAL MONITORING		Provide feedback	
EXTERNAL MOTIVATION/REINFORCEMENT		Provide general encouragement	
		Provide contingent rewards	
		Teach to use prompts or cues	
		Prompt practice	
		Use of follow up prompts	
COUNSELLING/COACHING		Prompt self talk	
		Prompt identification as role model	
		Plan social support/social change	
		Provide opportunity for comparison	
		Motivational interviewing	
		Stress management	
		Time management	
Other (describe)			

## INTERVENTION THEORIES

Free text description (copy and paste)				
Health Education	Social/cognitive learning	Social psychological	Behavioural	Muscle/exercise physiology

## INTERPRETATION OF INTERVENTION PURPOSE/LEVEL – what is the highest level this intervention could be interpreted as working at?

Classification	Tick	Justification
Increase knowledge		
Increase intention to practice		
Increase practice		
Increase consistency/quality of practice		
Increase effective/tailored practice		
Increase self-efficacy/independence		
Other (specify)		

## DURATION/INTENSITY OF INTERVENTION

Number of exercises per day	Number of face to face sessions with HP	Number of other sessions with HP	Duration of programme in hours	Number of weeks program ran
	1	1	<4	<4
	2-4	2-4	4-12	4-12
	>4	>4	>12	>12

Notes if necessary:

## IF PFMT – METHOD OF PFMT TEACHING

Verbal instruction	Digital palpation	Biofeedback	EMG/ultrasound
1	1	1	1
2-4	2-4	2-4	2-4
>4	>4	>4	>4

Notes if necessary:

**OUTCOME DETAILS + TIMING**

--

**LOSS TO FOLLOW UP**

	ALL	EXP	CONTROL
Number randomised			
Number lost, % loss			
Reason for losses			
Number at baseline			
<b>Number at follow up 1</b>			
Number lost, and % loss			
Reason for losses			
<b>Number at follow up 2</b>			
Number lost, and % loss			
Reason for losses			
<b>Number at follow up 3</b>			
Number lost, and % loss			
Reason for losses			
<b>Number at follow up 4</b>			

**MEASUREMENT TOOLS + TIMING**

	Scale/ instrument used	Measure of:	Data availability at time points				
			O = available but not in paper, X = in paper				
			Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	Time 5
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

**DATA ANALYSIS**

--



**ASSESSMENT OF STUDY QUALITY: RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIALS**

Domain	Description	YES	UNCLEAR	NO	QUOTES AND COMMENTS
<b>Sequence generation</b> Describe the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups.		Was the allocation sequence adequately generated?			
<b>Allocation concealment</b> Describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to determine whether intervention allocations could have been foreseen in advance of, or during, enrolment.		Was allocation adequately concealed?			
<b>Blinding of participants, personnel and outcome assessors</b> Describe all measures used, if any, to blind study participants and personnel from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. Provide any information relating to whether the intended blinding was effective.	<i>Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).</i>	Was knowledge of the allocated intervention adequately prevented during the study?			NB Blinding of outcome assessors and analysis as standard
	<b>Frequency of incontinent episodes:</b>				
	<b>Patient satisfaction/adverse events:</b>				
<b>Incomplete outcome data</b> Describe the completeness of outcome data for each main outcome, including attrition and exclusions from the analysis. State whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers in each intervention group (compared with total randomized participants), reasons for attrition/exclusions where reported, and any re-inclusions in analyses performed by the review authors.	<i>Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).</i>	Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed?			
	<b>Frequency of incontinent episodes:</b>				
	<b>QOL</b>				
<b>Selective outcome reporting.</b> State how the possibility of selective outcome reporting was examined by the review authors, and what was found.		Are reports of the study free of suggestion of selective outcome reporting?			
<b>Other sources of bias.</b> State any important concerns about bias not addressed in the other domains in the tool If particular questions/entries were pre-specified in the review's protocol, responses should be provided for each question/entry					





### ASSESSMENT OF STUDY QUALITY: QUALITATIVE STUDIES

STANDARD	CRITERIA	YES	NO	Justification for decision
Appropriate research design	Justification for design/method discussed/appropriate			
Sampling	Clear explanation of how participants were selected			
	Appropriateness of sample to provide knowledge sought by study			
	Explanation of final sample and reasons for non-response			
Data collection	Clear explanation of what data were collected e.g. interview schedule, questions			
	Clear explanation of how data were collected/ methods are explicit, justified			
	Clear explanation of form of data, and modification during study, and data handling			
Analysis	In-depth description of analysis process			
	Clear description of how categories/themes were derived			
	Clear description of how data were selected /how contradictory data/ outliers were handled etc			
Findings	Sufficient explicit data presented to support findings			
	Adequate discussion of evidence for and against researchers arguments			
	Testing of robustness /credibility of findings			
Researcher reflexivity	Examination of own role, and potential for bias at all stages e.g. formulation, collection, analysis			
	Reflection of response to process, events, and relationship with respondents			
Generalisability	Can findings be applied to population of interest?			
Ethical issues	Any concerns about how research was explained to participants, informed consent, confidentiality			

### ASSESSMENT OF STUDY QUALITY: OBSERVATIONAL STUDIES

STANDARD	CRITERIA	YES	NO	Justification for decision
Describes context	Describes the setting, location and relevant dates			
Sampling	Clear explanation of how participants were selected, i.e. gives eligibility criteria, source, method of selection			
	Appropriateness of sample to provide knowledge sought by study			
	Explanation of final sample and reasons for non-response			
Data collection	Clear explanation of what data were collected e.g. interview schedule, questions			
	Clear explanation of how data were collected/ methods are valid/reliable			
	Clear explanation of form of data, and modification during study, and data handling			
Analysis	Description of completeness of data/how missing data were handled			
	Type/method of analysis process adequately described			
Results	% response known for each section, number with missing data			
	Impact of bias/subgroups assessed			
	Reports numbers of events/outcomes			
Generalisability	Can findings be applied to population of interest?			
	Research was explained to participants, informed consent, confidentiality			

**OUTCOME DATA EXTRACTION: PREDICTOR VARIABLES**

TIMING		OUTCOME =				
CODE	VARIABLE CATEGORIES	Measured	in Significant UV analysis	Included in MV analysis	Independent predictor	Direction of correlation
<b>SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES</b>						
SD-G	Sex					
SD-A	Age					
SD-R	Ethnicity					
SD-EI	Education/income					
<b>PHYSIOLOGICAL UI VARIABLES</b>						
P-P	Parity, menopause, hysterectomy					
P-W	Weight/BMI					
P-U	Urodynamic variables					
P-TR	Previous treatment					
P-D	Duration of UI					
P-TY	Type of UI					
P-S	Severity/degree of UI					
<b>HEALTH/SELF-CARE VARIABLES</b>						
H-G	General health/comorbidities					
H-SC	Self care/mobility					
H-C	Cognitive abilities					
<b>PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLES</b>						
PSY-HP	Health perceptions					
PSY-P	Psychological problems					
PSY-PSB	Perceptions of seriousness/benefits					
PSY-SEF	Self-efficacy					
PSY-CON	Perceptions of control					
PSY-COM	Compliance/adherence					
PSY-KT	Knowledge-correct technique					
PSY-MA	Motivation/attitude					
PSY-GA	Goal achievement					
PSY-SEM	Self esteem					
<b>SOCIAL VARIABLES</b>						
SOC-D	Social demands					
SOC-I	Social influences					

### ASSESSMENT OF STUDY QUALITY: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF PREDICTOR VARIABLE RELATIONSHIPS

STANDARD	CRITERIA	YES	NO	Justification for decision
Was a defined sample of patients assembled?	Participant selection – source and methods described			
Were appropriate confounding variables considered?	Reason for selection explained + type/severity of problem considered, where relevant to outcome			
Were objective and unbiased criteria used for measurement of predictors?	Predictor variables clearly defined with appropriate (e.g. diagnostic) criteria			
	Data sources/ measurement of predictors valid/reliable			
	Blinding of data collection for predictors			
Were objective and unbiased criteria used for measurement of outcome variables?	Outcome variables clearly defined with appropriate (e.g. diagnostic) criteria			
	Data sources/ measurement of outcomes valid/reliable			
	Blinding of data collection for outcomes			
Was the sample size adequate?	Were predictor variables present in a significant proportion of the population (rarity)?			
	Sample includes at least 10 cases* for each <b>PREDICTOR VARIABLE**</b> considered in MV analysis			
	Sample includes at least 10 cases* for each <b>PREDICTOR VARIABLE**</b> considered in UV analysis			
Was follow up sufficiently long/complete?	% follow up >80%			
	Reasons given for drop out			
Analysis appropriate	Statistical tests appropriate for data			
	Important confounders accounted for in design (e.g. matching, restricted randomisation) or analysis (adjustment/standardisation)			
	Precision of estimates (CIs or SEs) given			

\* of lesser/last outcome category if outcome category is categorical

\*\*counting categorical variables as 1 less predictors than its number of categories considered.

**TABLE OF INCLUDED STUDIES**

<b>Aim</b>		
<b>Study details</b>		
<b>Country and participants</b>	<i>Country</i>	
	<i>Number of participants</i>	
	<i>Sample</i>	
	<i>Inclusion criteria</i>	
	<i>Exclusion criteria</i>	
	<i>Mean age</i>	
	<i>Type of incontinence</i>	
<b>Intervention</b>	<i>Behavioural intervention</i>	
	<i>Comparison group(s)</i>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	<i>Primary outcome</i>	
	<i>Secondary outcome(s)</i>	
	<i>Timing</i>	
<b>Notes</b>	<i>Study quality</i>	
	<i>Intervention quality</i>	

**AUTHOR CONTACT**

<b>Date</b>	

**NOTES**

<b>Source</b>	

**QUESTIONS**

<b>Source</b>	