Report presented by Dr. Renly Lim at the EAU (European Association of Urology) March 2016 in Munich, Germany

Double Blind RCT into patient perception of QRS-PelviCenter

"Efficacy, acceptability and tolerability of magnetic stimulation on females with SUI".

Abstract

Title

Patients' perception and treatment satisfaction of pulsed magnetic stimulation treatment for stress urinary incontinence

Key words

Magnetic stimulation, stress urinary incontinence

Introduction and Objectives

We evaluated patients' perception and treatment satisfaction of pulsed magnetic stimulation (PMS) for stress urinary incontinence (SUI) in a randomized, double-blind, sham-controlled trial.

Materials and Methods

Female patients with SUI were randomly assigned to the intervention or control group for eight weeks (twice weekly). Patients completed the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form (ICIQ-SF) to assess treatment efficacy.

Additionally, patients answered a series of questions on their experience and treatment satisfaction, each measured on a 5-point Likert scale. Likert score 1 and 2 were considered negative responses, score 3 as neutral and scores 4 and 5 as positive responses.

Results and Limitations

115 patients (95.8% response rate) were enrolled (intervention: n=57, control: n=58). Subjects in the intervention group showed mean decrease of 5.72 (SE=0.67, $p<0.001$, 95%CI=[-7.69,-3.75]) in the ICIQ-SF score which was significantly better than the control group with mean decrease of 2.69 (SE=0.67, $p=0.001$, 95%CI=[-4.64,-0.73]), ($p=0.002$). Overall, 47 (82.4%) and 27 (46.6%) subjects in the intervention and control group respectively were either 'satisfied' or 'completely satisfied' ($p<0.001$). 46 (80.7%) subjects in the intervention group perceived PMS as comfortable while 47 (82.5%) subjects experienced no pain. Furthermore, 45 (78.9%) subjects felt there were no inconvenience to attend treatments, while 44 (77.2%) subjects were motivated to continue the treatments. 51 (89.5%) of subjects stated that they would recommend PMS to their friends with SUI. 54 (94.7%) of subjects in the intervention group did not experience any adverse effects. There were no significant differences between the intervention and control group in the above parameters. Regardless of treatment groups, 109 (94.8%) subjects would not consider surgical options even if they require further treatment for their condition.

Conclusions

Patients' perception is a key feature in determining treatment acceptability and efficacy. PMS was proven to be well-accepted, well-tolerated, and effective for treatment of SUI.