University of Groningen

Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment compared with pelvic floor muscle training in older women with pelvic organ prolapse

Panman, Chantal; Wiegersma, Marian; Kollen, Boudewijn; Berger, Marjolein Y.; Lisman-van Leeuwen, Yvonne; Vermeulen, Karin; Dekker, Janny H

Published in:
Menopause-the Journal of the North American Menopause Society

DOI:
[10.1097/GME.0000000000000706](https://doi.org/10.1097/GME.0000000000000706)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Panman, C., Wiegersma, M., Kollen, B., Berger, M. Y., Lisman-van Leeuwen, Y., Vermeulen, K., & Dekker, J. H. (2016). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment compared with pelvic floor muscle training in older women with pelvic organ prolapse: 2-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial in primary care. *Menopause-the Journal of the North American Menopause Society*, 23(12), 1307-1318. <https://doi.org/10.1097/GME.0000000000000706>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment compared with pelvic floor muscle training in older women with pelvic organ prolapse: 2-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial in primary care

Chantal M.C.R. Panman, MD,¹ Marian Wiegersma, MD,¹ Boudewijn J. Kollen, PhD,¹ Marjolein Y. Berger, MD, PhD,¹ Yvonne Lisman-van Leeuwen, PhD,¹ Karin M. Vermeulen, PhD,² and Janny H. Dekker, MD, PhD¹

Abstract

Objective: We investigated the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment compared with pelvic floor muscle training (PFMT) in women with pelvic organ prolapse over a 2-year period.

Methods: Randomized controlled trial with women (≥ 55 y) with symptomatic pelvic organ prolapse, identified by screening. Participants were recruited from 20 primary care practices (October 2009–December 2012). Primary outcome was the difference in change of pelvic floor symptoms (PFDI-20 score) between groups over 24 months. Secondary outcomes included prolapse, urinary, and anorectal symptoms; quality of life; costs; sexual functioning; prolapse stage; pelvic floor muscle function; and participants' perceived symptom improvement.

Results: There was a nonsignificant difference in the primary outcome between pessary treatment ($n = 82$) and PFMT ($n = 80$) with a mean difference of -3.7 points (95% CI, -12.8 to 5.3 ; $P = 0.42$) in favor of pessary treatment. A significantly greater improvement in the prolapse symptom score was, however, seen with pessary treatment (mean difference -3.2 points [95% CI, -6.3 to -0.0 ; $P = 0.05$]). Direct medical costs over the 2-year study were \$309 and \$437 per person for pessary treatment and PFMT, respectively.

Conclusions: In older women with symptomatic prolapse, there was no significant difference between pessary treatment and PFMT in reducing pelvic floor symptoms, but specific prolapse-related symptoms did improve more with pessary treatment. Pessary treatment was preferable in the cost-effectiveness analysis. When counseling women for prolapse treatment it should, however, be taken into account that pessary fitting fails in a considerable portion of women and that pessary treatment was associated with more side effects compared with PFMT.

Key Words: Pelvic floor muscle training – Pelvic organ prolapse – Pessaries – Postmenopausal – Primary health care – Randomized controlled trial.

Pelvic organ prolapse is characterized by descent of the vaginal walls, uterus, or vaginal vault.¹ It is a common condition, and in a Dutch population survey of women

aged 45 to 85 years, 39% had moderate to severe prolapse on physical examination.² Given that the average age of the population is increasing, and given that the incidence of prolapse increases with age,³ the prevalence of prolapse is expected to increase. Women with a prolapse can present with a variety of pelvic floor symptoms, including vaginal bulging, pelvic pressure or heaviness, pelvic pain, and urinary or fecal incontinence or obstruction.⁴ Prolapse can, therefore, lead to discomfort and can negatively influence daily activities, sexuality,⁵ and quality of life.⁶ Treatment options for prolapse include vaginal pessaries, pelvic floor muscle training (PFMT), and surgery. The lifetime risk for prolapse surgery varies between 6% and 19%,⁷ and the monetary costs are expected to increase substantially in Western societies because of the aging population.^{7,8} This is a significant issue, and further efforts are needed to provide cost-effective non-surgical treatment options.

Pessaries are considered a first-line treatment for prolapse in the United States, being used by 77% of gynecologists.⁹ This practice is supported by observational studies that have

Received January 11, 2016; revised and accepted May 5, 2016.

From the ¹Department of General Practice, and ²Department of Epidemiology, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

C.M.C.R.P. and M.W. contributed equally to this work.

The funding organization had no role in the design and conduct of the study; the collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; the preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Funding/support: This trial is funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (ZonMw), project number 4201.1001.

Financial disclosure/conflicts of interest: None reported.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's Website (www.menopause.org).

Address correspondence to: Janny H. Dekker, MD, PhD, Department of General Practice, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, PO Box 196, 9700 AD Groningen, The Netherlands.

E-mail: j.h.dekker@umcg.nl

consistently shown pessaries to be effective in improving prolapse-related pelvic floor symptoms.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ PFMT also seems to be effective in improving prolapse-related pelvic floor symptoms when compared with no treatment.¹⁵⁻²² In a Cochrane review, Bugge et al²³ emphasized that there is an urgent need for randomized studies to compare the use of pessaries with other conservative measures. To date, though, pessary treatment and PFMT have not been directly compared and there is only limited information on the monetary costs of these conservative treatments. Therefore, in this 2-year follow-up study, we aimed to compare the effectiveness, defined as improvement of pelvic floor symptoms, and the cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment and PFMT in a primary care population of women aged at least 55 years with a symptomatic pelvic organ prolapse at or beyond the hymen.

METHODS

Design and setting

This was a randomized controlled trial performed in 20 primary care practices in the Netherlands. Participants were enrolled between October 14, 2009 and December 15, 2012. The last date of follow-up was December 10, 2014. The study design has previously been published.²⁴ The trial was registered in the Dutch Trial Register (www.trialregister.nl, identifier NTR 2047) and was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the University Medical Centre Groningen, (METc2009.215). All participants gave written informed consent.

Participants

Participating primary care physicians included all women aged at least 55 years registered in their practice. Women were excluded if they had undergone prolapse treatment in the previous year, were currently undergoing treatment for another urogynecological disorder, had a pelvic organ malignancy, or had impaired mobility, severe or terminal illness, cognitive impairment, or insufficient Dutch language comprehension. Eligible women then received a 5-item screening questionnaire by post.²⁴ This included questions on pelvic floor symptoms possibly related to prolapse (urinary incontinence, vaginal bulging, pelvic heaviness/pressure, and the need for vaginal splinting to start or complete micturition or defecation). Women who screened positive for one or more of these symptoms were invited for a baseline assessment.

The baseline assessment involved participants completing a set of questionnaires and undergoing a standardized interview and physical examination conducted by a research physician. The degree of prolapse was measured during the physical examination using the Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification system (POP-Q).²⁵ Women in whom the leading edge of the prolapse was at or beyond the hymenal remnants (POP-Q advanced stage 2 or stage 3) were considered to have an advanced prolapse and were eligible for the trial. Women with stage 4 prolapse were advised to consult their physician to get further information about the available treatment options.

Randomization and blinding

Eligible women were randomly allocated to pessary treatment or PFMT in a 1:1 ratio using an external computer system with an interactive voice response system (accessible by telephone). Block randomization with variable block sizes was used. Four research physicians were involved in this study. The research physician enrolling participants was blinded to the allocation sequence, the ordering of the blocks, and the size of the blocks.

It was not possible to blind participants or physiotherapists to the treatment because of the nature of the intervention. Equally, it was not feasible to blind the research physicians to group allocation because of their roles in treatment evaluation (eg, for the side effects of pessary treatment) and follow-up assessment. Research physicians performing the follow-up assessment were, however, blinded to all answers on the participant-completed questionnaires and to the outcomes of previous POP-Q measurements and evaluations of pelvic floor muscle function. Pelvic physiotherapists were also blinded to the answers on the participant-completed questionnaires. Data analysts were blinded to group allocation.

Interventions

Pessary treatment

Pessaries were fitted by a trained research physician. The first choice was an open ring pessary, followed by a ring pessary with support. If a ring pessary could not be fitted, a Shaatz or Gellhorn pessary was tried. All pessaries were made of silicone (Milex, Chicago, IL). A pessary was considered to have the correct size when the physician could place a finger between the pessary and the vaginal wall, the prolapse was reduced to above the hymen, it felt comfortable to the participant, and was retained during a Valsalva maneuver and coughing in both supine and standing positions. Pessary treatment was evaluated after 2 weeks. Pessary fitting was regarded as successful when participants had used the pessary without discomfort for 2 weeks. Participants in whom the pessary fell out or who experienced discomfort within the first 2 weeks were refitted with a different type or size of pessary and reviewed again after another 2 weeks. This procedure was repeated up to a maximum of three attempts. If a pessary was not fitted successfully after three attempts, pessary fitting was regarded as unsuccessful.

An experienced urogynecologist trained the four research physicians in pessary fitting and this urogynecologist was also available for consultation when difficulties were encountered during the fitting process. Additional control visits were scheduled every 3 months to clean the pessary, evaluate treatment, and monitor side effects by the participant's own general practitioner (GP), or by one of the research physicians, depending on the choice of the GP and the participant. In some cases, the physician who performed the outcome assessment was also the physician who had done the regular pessary checks. When a pessary led to vaginal discharge, irritation, or erosions, women were advised not to wear the pessary for 2 weeks and were reviewed again.

Topical estrogen was suggested in cases of discharge or ulceration due to vaginal atrophy.

Pelvic floor muscle training

Women randomized to PFMT were referred to a pelvic physiotherapist and their treatment started with an explanation of the function of the pelvic floor. Their pelvic floor muscle function and the ability to contract and relax the pelvic floor muscles correctly was examined using digital palpation. Women who were unable to contract or relax their pelvic floor muscles were first instructed how to do this. They received feedback during digital palpation or, if necessary, by applying myofeedback or electrical stimulation. As soon as they were able to control their pelvic floor they started the training by doing exercises during face-to-face contact and at home (3-5 times a wk, 2 or 3 times each d). All participants started with the same exercise regime, which was later tailored to the needs of each participant by adding specific exercises based on findings during the pelvic floor examination (see Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1, <http://links.lww.com/MENO/A179>, which shows the PFMT lifestyle and toilet advices and exercise program). In women with an overactive pelvic floor, relaxation exercises were used and the focus of the exercises was on relaxation rather than contraction. All participants were taught “the knack,” meaning that they learned to contract their pelvic floor muscles before and during any increase in abdominal pressure. Furthermore, attention was paid to toilet habits and lifestyle (eg, diet, smoking, and body weight) (see Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1, <http://links.lww.com/MENO/A179>, which shows the PFMT lifestyle and toilet advices and exercise program). Treatment modalities and the number of sessions were recorded for each participant. To minimize the effect of differences in experience or skill, all participating pelvic physiotherapists were required to be registered with the Dutch Pelvic Physiotherapists’ Organization.

Follow-up

Follow-up appointments were scheduled 3, 12, and 24 months after the start of pelvic floor muscle training or after reaching a successful pessary fitting. Follow-up included questionnaires and an examination of the pelvic floor, including a POP-Q measurement and an assessment of pelvic floor muscle function. Women wearing a pessary were asked to remove their pessary (or have it removed by their GP) 24 to 48 hours before the follow-up assessments. Women in whom pessary fitting was unsuccessful were followed up by questionnaire through the 24-month period. Participants who were not able to attend the follow-up appointment were also asked to complete follow-up questionnaires sent by post. In addition, nonattenders were phoned to check whether they had received consultations or treatments for prolapse symptoms and to check their use of absorbent pads. All women were allowed to consult their physician for symptoms of prolapse during the study period. Women were asked about these consultations and treatments at follow-up and the details recorded.

Outcome measures

Primary outcome

The primary outcome was distress caused by pelvic floor symptoms, as measured with the Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20 (PFDI-20).²⁶ This is a validated, participant-completed questionnaire with 20 questions about prolapse, anorectal, and urinary symptoms.²⁷ The PFDI-20 score ranges from 0 to 300, with higher scores indicating higher distress from pelvic floor symptoms.

Secondary outcomes

Secondary outcomes were the three subscales of the PFDI-20, which measure the distress caused by prolapse symptoms (the Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory-6, POPDI-6), anorectal symptoms (the Colorectal Anal Distress Inventory-8, CRADI-8), and urinary symptoms (the Urinary Distress Inventory-6, UDI-6). Condition-specific and general quality of life were assessed with the Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire-7 (PFIQ-7)²⁶ and by the physical (PCS-12) and mental (MCS-12) component scores of the Medical Outcomes Study Short Form Health Survey-12, respectively.²⁸ Sexual functioning was measured with the Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Incontinence Sexual Function Questionnaire-12 (PISQ-12).²⁹ At 24 months, a five-point scale was used to assess participants’ perceived global perception of improvement from the start of the study (much better, better, the same, worse, or much worse).³⁰ Costs were measured at each follow-up using a questionnaire based on the Medical Consumption Questionnaire (iMCQ).³¹ Adaptations were made to the selection of relevant cost items, such as the details of consultations, prolapse-related treatments, and the use of absorbent pads. The three-level version of the EuroQol health status measure (EuroQol 5D-3L) was used to collect data for the cost-utility analysis.³² Data on adverse treatment effects were collected during follow-up assessments.

The degree of prolapse was assessed with the POP-Q system.²⁵ In the POP-Q system, the degree of prolapse of the anterior vaginal wall (point Ba), the posterior vaginal wall (point Bp), and the uterus (or vaginal vault in case of hysterectomy) (point C) is measured in centimeters relative to the hymenal remnants. These measurements are converted to an ordinal scale of four prolapse stages for each compartment (anterior, posterior, apical). The overall POP-Q stage is equal to the POP-Q stage of the most severely prolapsed compartment. Pelvic floor muscle function was assessed by digital vaginal palpation in the supine position and was categorized as normal, underactive, overactive, or inactive according to the International Continence Society classification.³³ Research physicians were trained to perform a POP-Q measurement and to evaluate the pelvic floor muscles by an experienced urogynecologist.

Statistical analyses

Based on an estimated clinically relevant difference in change of the PFDI-20 score of 20 points between groups, and a standard deviation of 36 points,³⁴ for a type I error of

5%, power of 80%, successful pessary fitting in 70%, and dropout rate of 15% after 2 years, we needed to enroll 148 women.²⁴ All statistical tests were performed two-sided at a 5% significance level.

Primary and secondary outcomes

Outcome variables were repeatedly measured over time and compared between groups, so the statistical approach needed to correct for the correlated longitudinal information. Therefore we used MLwiN 2.29 (Centre for Multilevel Modeling, University of Bristol, UK) to conduct a multilevel analysis. Multilevel models produce hierarchical models that estimate regression coefficients and related variance components while correcting for the dependency of information. The lower level was defined as time of measurement and the upper level as the participant. The restricted iterative generalized least squares algorithm was used to estimate the regression coefficients, whereas the Wald test was used to obtain a *P* value for each regression coefficient. Linear multilevel analysis that included a fixed and random intercept³⁵ was conducted to test the longitudinal difference between treatment groups with respect to the primary outcome variable (ie, PFDI-20) and the secondary outcome variables (ie, POPDI-6, CRADI-8, UDI-6, PFIQ-7, PCS-12, MCS-12, and PISQ-12). For each equation, two primary intention-to-treat (ITT) analyses and two secondary per-protocol (PP) analyses were conducted, each with and without adjusting for the questionnaire and POP-Q (stage 2 or stage 3) baseline scores. The ITT population we used included all women randomized to each treatment arm, whereas the PP population only included those who completed the intervention to which they were allocated. Participants were excluded from the PP analyses if pessary fitting was unsuccessful, if they discontinued pessary treatment, if they did not start PFMT, and if they discontinued PFMT prematurely (according to the records of the pelvic physiotherapist).

Additional analyses were performed, based on the PP population, to establish the relationship between the degree of prolapse (of the anterior vaginal wall [point Ba], the posterior vaginal wall [point Bp] and the uterus or vaginal vault [point C]) and the treatment group after adjusting for baseline POP-Q measurements. We did not impute missing data because it is considered redundant to replace missing values in longitudinal datasets.³⁶ Normal probability plots and plots of standardized residual versus predicted values were inspected to assess if they met the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of the variance. In the event of noncompliance, a square root transformation of one of the baseline variables was performed.

Cost-effectiveness analysis

Direct medical costs were calculated for both groups. Cost categories were: pessaries and pessary-related visits, costs for physical therapy, consultations with GPs and medical specialists, the use of absorbent pads, medication, and other costs (mainly operative procedures). Costs were first valued in

Euros according to Dutch guidelines³⁷ at the 2014 price level, and later converted to US dollars based on the exchange rate on November 24, 2015 (€1.00 = \$1.0657). In the economic evaluation, we compared pessary treatment with PFMT in a cost-effectiveness analysis. Here, we assessed the incremental costs per point improvement on the PFDI-20 and expressed the results as an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER). In addition, a cost-utility analysis was performed with quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) to evaluate the balance between costs and QALYs, by using the EQ-5D-defined utility scores based on the UK tariff.³² We based our utility scores on the UK tariff for reasons of comparability (eg, the UK tariff is more frequently mentioned than the Dutch tariff in the literature). The outcomes are presented as an incremental cost-utility ratio (ICUR). Costs and effects were recorded and calculated on an individual participant basis, after which the mean differences of effects and costs between the two treatment groups were calculated. Point estimates of the ICER and ICUR were computed by dividing the difference in effects by the difference in costs between interventions. Bootstrap analyses (5,000 replications of the trial data) were performed to estimate alternative confidence intervals based on the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. Cost-effectiveness planes were constructed to visualize the uncertainty surrounding the ICER and ICUR.

RESULTS

Participants and descriptive statistics

In total, 162 women were randomized to pessary treatment (*n* = 82) or PFMT (*n* = 80) (Fig. 1). Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the study population.

The pessary group

Pessary fitting was successful in 47 women (57%); of these, 32 were fitted with an open ring pessary, 14 with a ring pessary with support, and 1 with a Shaatz pessary. During the study period, the pessary was replaced by another type and/or size in 12 women. A total of 35 women did not receive pessary treatment, mostly due to unsuccessful fitting (*n* = 34). In one participant, no fitting attempt was made since she seemed to meet one of the study's exclusion criteria (cognitive impairment). In 21 of the 34 women with unsuccessful fitting (62%), no suitable pessary could be found. Other reasons for deciding against pessary treatment during the fitting period were an increase in or development of urinary incontinence (*n* = 4), emotional resistance to pessary fitting/treatment (*n* = 5), discomfort during intercourse (*n* = 2), and a bothersome increase in vaginal discharge (*n* = 1; the participant was not willing to use topical estrogens). One woman (*n* = 1) reported a urinary tract infection during the fitting period and chose to discontinue the pessary treatment.

Baseline characteristics did not differ between women with and without a successful pessary fitting (data not shown). The median number of consultations for women with successful pessary fitting was 1.0 (interquartile range [IQR] 1.0-2.0), and that for women with unsuccessful fitting was 2.0

FIG. 1. Flowchart of participants through study. PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training. ^aOne women had both urinary incontinence and discomfort during intercourse.

(IQR 2.0-3.0). Of the 47 women who started pessary treatment, 12 discontinued the treatment before the end of the study (Fig. 1). During the study, seven women in the pessary group received PFMT for prolapse symptoms (after unsuccessful pessary fitting) and four women underwent prolapse repair surgery (pessary fitting was only successful in one).

The PFMT group

Of the 80 women randomized to PFMT, four did not attend pelvic physiotherapy and 10 discontinued PFMT prematurely (Fig. 1). One woman was erroneously included in the PFMT group (she had a prolapse but no symptoms on screening) and was therefore excluded from the analyses. For participants

TABLE 1. Baseline characteristics

	PFMT (n = 80)	Pessary (n = 82)
Mean age, y $\pm$ SD	65.6 $\pm$ 6.4	64.9 $\pm$ 7.4
Mean body mass index, kg/m ² $\pm$ SD	26.6 $\pm$ 4.3	26.1 $\pm$ 3.8
Mean parity $\pm$ SD	2.6 $\pm$ 1.1	2.4 $\pm$ 0.9
Postmenopausal, n (%)	80 (100.0)	81 (98.8)
Educational level, n (%)		
Primary only	6 (7.5)	3 (3.7)
Lower	26 (32.5)	31 (37.8)
Intermediate	25 (31.3)	22 (26.8)
Higher	23 (28.7)	26 (31.7)
Surgical history, n (%)		
Hysterectomy	10 (12.5)	15 (18.3)
Pelvic floor surgery	7 (8.8)	8 (9.8)
Prior prolapse treatment, n (%) ^a	21 (26.3)	18 (22.0)
Stage of prolapse, n (%) ^b		
Stage 2	62 (77.5)	58 (70.7)
Stage 3	18 (22.5)	24 (29.3)
Type of prolapse, n (%)		
Anterior	25 (31.3)	20 (24.7)
Posterior	3 (3.8)	0 (0.0)
Apical	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Anterior and posterior	26 (32.5)	23 (28.4)
Anterior and apical	8 (10.0)	19 (23.5)
Posterior and apical	2 (2.5)	0 (0.0)
Anterior and posterior and apical	16 (20.0)	19 (23.5)

PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training; POP-Q, pelvic organ prolapse quantification.

^aSurgical or conservative prolapse treatment more than 1 year ago.

^bPOP-Q stage of most prolapsed compartment.

who completed PFMT, the median number of treatments was 7 (IQR 6-10). PFMT was given over a median timeframe of 15.9 weeks (IQR 12-29.5 wk). Myofeedback was used in 14 participants (22%) and electric stimulation in nine (14%). During the study period, three women in the PFMT group received pessary treatment for prolapse symptoms and two women underwent surgery for prolapse.

Questionnaire scores

The questionnaire scores are summarized in Table 2. For the primary outcome (total PFDI-20 score), there was no significant difference in the longitudinal analyses between pessary treatment and pelvic floor muscle training: the ITT analysis showed a difference of -3.7 points (95% CI, -12.8 to 5.3 ; $P = 0.42$), whereas the PP analysis showed a slightly greater difference of -5.7 points (95% CI, -17.4 to 6.1 ; $P = 0.35$) both in favor of the pessary group (Table 3).

It is notable that there was a difference between groups in the evolution of PFDI-20 scores during the 24 months. Both groups showed an improvement in pelvic floor symptoms, as can be seen by the decrease in the PFDI-20 scores from baseline to follow-up at 3 months. In the following period (from 3 mo to the end of the study), the mean PFDI-20 score in the PFMT group slowly increased again, with scores at the end of the study being almost equal to the baseline scores (ie, there was a 2.8-point (4%) difference between baseline and 24 mo). In contrast, the improvement in pelvic floor symptoms in the pessary group continued until the end of the study, with a 9.3-point (16%) difference between baseline and 24 months (Fig. 2).

The ITT analyses showed a significant difference in prolapse (POPDI-6) symptoms between groups in favor of the pessary group over the 24 months (-3.2 ; 95% CI, -6.3 to -0.0 ; $P = 0.047$) (Table 3). In the pessary group, the POPDI-6 score improved by 4.2 points (24%) between baseline and 3 months, and the improvement remained until the end of the study. In the PFMT group, prolapse symptoms improved slightly between baseline and 3 months, but the POPDI-6 score had almost reached the baseline score again by 24 months (Table 2) (Fig. 2). There were no significant differences between groups for the other secondary questionnaire outcomes.

TABLE 2. Questionnaire baseline and follow-up scores (intention-to-treat)^a

Questionnaire	PFMT								Pessary							
	n	Baseline Mean $\pm$ SD	n	3 mo Mean $\pm$ SD	n	12 mo Mean $\pm$ SD	n	24 mo Mean $\pm$ SD	n	Baseline Mean $\pm$ SD	n	3 mo Mean $\pm$ SD	n	12 mo Mean $\pm$ SD	n	24 mo Mean $\pm$ SD
PFDI-20 ^b	75	65.0 $\pm$ 35.8	69	55.8 $\pm$ 37.4	66	60.2 $\pm$ 40.9	67	62.6 $\pm$ 43.8	79	59.8 $\pm$ 33.7	43	50.1 $\pm$ 30.6	45	50.6 $\pm$ 35.9	71	50.5 $\pm$ 34.7
POPDI-6 ^c	78	16.9 $\pm$ 13.0	70	15.6 $\pm$ 13.6	69	16.4 $\pm$ 15.4	68	17.1 $\pm$ 15.9	81	17.4 $\pm$ 13.5	45	13.2 $\pm$ 12.5	48	12.8 $\pm$ 12.8	73	12.9 $\pm$ 13.1
CRADI-8 ^d	75	18.1 $\pm$ 15.0	70	16.8 $\pm$ 16.4	66	17.7 $\pm$ 15.5	69	18.1 $\pm$ 16.0	81	15.7 $\pm$ 13.8	43	12.4 $\pm$ 10.5	48	14.2 $\pm$ 12.3	72	13.6 $\pm$ 13.4
UDI-6 ^e	76	30.4 $\pm$ 17.0	70	23.3 $\pm$ 16.6	68	25.0 $\pm$ 18.5	68	26.6 $\pm$ 20.6	81	27.2 $\pm$ 17.5	44	23.7 $\pm$ 16.3	47	22.3 $\pm$ 17.9	72	24.4 $\pm$ 16.0
PFIQ-7 ^f	74	19.4 $\pm$ 25.9	65	15.3 $\pm$ 20.1	66	15.8 $\pm$ 26.0	66	19.0 $\pm$ 28.5	79	18.5 $\pm$ 28.2	41	13.1 $\pm$ 26.1	50	19.1 $\pm$ 36.9	67	16.0 $\pm$ 28.7
PISQ-12 ^g	29	37.4 $\pm$ 4.1	25	37.7 $\pm$ 4.7	24	37.6 $\pm$ 4.2	24	36.7 $\pm$ 4.5	41	35.5 $\pm$ 5.1	19	37.7 $\pm$ 4.5	24	35.3 $\pm$ 5.9	34	35.7 $\pm$ 5.1
PCS-12 ^h	70	46.9 $\pm$ 11.4	64	46.4 $\pm$ 10.0	65	46.0 $\pm$ 10.4	60	44.9 $\pm$ 10.4	73	45.4 $\pm$ 9.9	44	46.7 $\pm$ 9.5	43	47.2 $\pm$ 8.8	70	47.2 $\pm$ 8.6
MCS-12 ⁱ	70	51.9 $\pm$ 8.9	64	52.3 $\pm$ 8.7	65	53.5 $\pm$ 8.3	60	53.9 $\pm$ 7.9	73	52.2 $\pm$ 10.1	44	52.1 $\pm$ 10.4	43	51.6 $\pm$ 10.3	70	52.2 $\pm$ 9.4

CRADI-8, Colorectal Anal Distress Inventory-8; MCS-12, Mental Component Health Summary (SF-12); PCS-12, Physical Component Health Summary (SF-12); PFDI-20, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20; PFIQ-7, Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire-7; PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training; PISQ-12, Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Incontinence Sexuality Questionnaire-12; POPDI-6, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory-6; UDI-6, Urinary Distress Inventory-6.

^aThis table shows the number of questionnaires which were sufficiently completed to calculate a score.

^bRange 0-300, higher score indicates more distress.

^cRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^dRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^eRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^fRange 0-300, higher score indicates higher impact of symptoms on daily life.

^gRange 0-48, higher score indicates better sexual functioning, only available for sexually active women.

^hRange 0-100, higher score indicates better health status; 1998 norm-based scores.

ⁱRange 0-100, higher score indicates better health status; 1998 norm-based scores.

TABLE 3. Difference in questionnaires between pelvic floor muscle training and pessary treatment over the course of 24 months

Questionnaire		Intention-to-treat		Per protocol	
		Mean (95% CI)	P	Mean (95% CI)	P
PFDI-20 ^a		−8.5 (−20.0 to 3.0)	0.15	−14.1 (−29.0 to 0.8)	0.064
	Adjusted ^b	−3.7 (−12.8 to 5.3)	0.42	−5.7 (−17.4 to 6.1)	0.35
POPDI-6 ^c		−3.8 (−8.0 to 0.4)	0.079	−5.6 (−11.1 to −0.1)	0.046
	Adjusted ^b	−3.2 (−6.3 to −0.0)	0.047	−4.6 (−8.6 to −0.6)	0.024
CRADI-8 ^d		−3.9 (−8.2 to 0.4)	0.075	−5.1 (−10.9 to 0.7)	0.087
	Adjusted ^b	−2.0 (−5.3 to 1.2)	0.22	−2.0 (−6.0 to 2.0)	0.33
UDI-6 ^e		−0.7 (−6.0 to 4.6)	0.80	−3.8 (−10.4 to 2.8)	0.26
	Adjusted ^b	1.1 (−3.3 to 5.5)	0.63	−0.4 (−5.8 to 5.1)	0.90
PFIQ-7 ^f		−2.2 (−11.1 to 6.7)	0.63	−7.3 (−18.2 to 3.5)	0.19
	Adjusted ^b	1.2 (−5.3 to 7.7)	0.72	1.1 (−6.2 to 8.4)	0.77
PISQ-12 ^g		−1.5 (−3.8 to 0.8)	0.20	0.0 (−2.9 to 2.9)	0.99
	Adjusted ^b	0.2 (−1.2 to 1.5)	0.83	1.2 (0.1 to 2.2)	0.028
PCS-12 ^h		1.2 (−1.7 to 4.1)	0.43	2.9 (−0.9 to 6.8)	0.13
	Adjusted ^b	2.1 (0.0 to 4.1)	0.050	3.7 (1.2 to 6.2)	0.004
MCS-12 ⁱ		−1.0 (−3.8 to 1.7)	0.46	−1.6 (−5.3 to 2.2)	0.41
	Adjusted ^b	−1.2 (−3.3 to 0.8)	0.24	−1.67 (−4.1 to 0.7)	0.17

CRADI-8, Colorectal Anal Distress Inventory-8; MCS-12, Mental Component Health Summary (SF-12); PCS-12, Physical Component Health Summary (SF-12); PFDI-20, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20; PFIQ-7, Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire-7; PISQ-12, Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Incontinence Sexuality Questionnaire-12; POPDI-6, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory-6; UDI-6, Urinary Distress Inventory-6.

^aRange 0-300, higher score indicates more distress.

^bAdjusted for baseline score and baseline Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantification stage (2 or 3).

^cRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^dRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^eRange 0-100, higher score indicates more distress.

^fRange 0-300, higher score indicates higher impact of symptoms on daily life, PFIQ-7 baseline score square root transformation.

^gRange 0-48, higher score indicates better sexual functioning, only available for sexually active women.

^hRange 0-100, higher score indicates better health status; 1998 norm-based scores.

ⁱRange 0-100, higher score indicates better health status; 1998 norm-based scores.

FIG. 2. Courses of the total PFDI-20 and the PFDI-20 subscale scores of pessary treatment and pelvic floor muscle training during the study. CRADI-8, Colorectal Anal Distress Inventory-8 (range 0-100, higher score indicates more distress); PFDI-20, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20 (range 0-300, higher score indicates more distress); PFMT, Pelvic Floor Muscle Training; POPDI-6, Pelvic Organ Prolapse Distress Inventory-6 (range 0-100, higher score indicates more distress); UDI-6, Urinary Distress Inventory-6 (range 0-100, higher score indicates more distress).

The PP analyses showed a significant difference between groups in favor of the pessary group for sexual functioning (PISQ-12) and in favor of the PFMT group for the physical component of general quality of life (PCS-12) (Table 3). After 24 months, the proportion of women who reported that their symptoms were improved, the same, or worse was comparable between the two groups (Table 4).

Physical examination

During the 24 months, there was a difference between the groups in the change in degree of prolapse of the anterior compartment (point Ba; 0.42; 95% CI, 0.01 to 0.83; $P = 0.04$) in favor of the PFMT group. This was, however, not the case for either the apical segment (point C; -0.06 ; 95% CI, -0.45 to 0.34 ; $P = 0.78$) or the posterior compartment (point Bp; 0.19 ; 95% CI -0.07 to 0.45 ; $P = 0.14$) (PP analysis only).

The proportion of women with improvement or deterioration of at least one POP-Q stage, or in whom the POP-Q stage remained the same between baseline and 24 months, did not differ between groups (Table 5). The change in pelvic floor muscle function between baseline and 24 months was also comparable in both groups (Table 6).

Adverse events

Of the 35 women who persisted with pessary treatment for 24 months, 21 (60%) had one or more side effects. These were increased vaginal discharge ($n = 14$), an increase of urinary incontinence ($n = 5$), and irritation or erosions of the vaginal walls on physical examination ($n = 10$). Women with mild irritation of the vaginal walls were advised to not wear the pessary for 2 weeks in the first instance, but 7 of 10 women with irritation or erosions of the vaginal walls were prescribed topical estrogen. No adverse effects were reported for PFMT.

Cost-effectiveness

Direct medical costs over the 2-year study, per person, amounted to \$309 in the pessary group and \$437 in the PFMT group. The mean difference was \$128 (95% CI, 27-236), with costs dependent on the primary treatment. Costs for pessaries and pessary-related visits were higher in the pessary group (\$202 per person compared with \$0.5 in the PFMT group), whereas costs for physical therapy were higher in the PFMT group (\$324 per person for the PFMT group compared with \$2 in the pessary group). Although costs for visits to the GP and medical specialist were comparable in both groups (\$32 per

person in the pessary group compared with \$35 in the PFMT group), costs for absorbent pads, however, were higher in the PFMT group (\$56 per person compared with \$20 in the pessary group) and costs for other prolapse treatments (ie, surgery) were higher in the pessary group (\$44 per person compared with \$22 in the PFMT group).

The ICER for the PFDI-20 was $-\$77$ (95% CI, -373 to 351), meaning that \$77 was preserved to improve one additional point on the PFDI-20 in the pessary group compared with the PFMT group. In total, 71% of the 5,000 replications in the bootstrap simulation were in the southeast quadrant of the cost-effectiveness plane, indicating better outcomes and lower costs for the pessary group (Fig. 3). The remaining 29% were located in the southwest quadrant, indicating less effectiveness and lower costs for the pessary group over the PFMT group.

Both treatment groups lost QALYs over the 2-year period, although loss of QALYs was slightly lower in the pessary group (0.024 in the pessary group and 0.065 in the PFMT group). This resulted in a negative ICUR of $-\$27,439$ (95% CI, $-91,974$ to $74,695$), meaning an additional saving of \$27,439 per QALY lost. Of the 5,000 bootstrap replications, 95% were located in the southeast quadrant of the cost-effectiveness plane, indicating greater effect and lower cost. The remaining 5% were located in the southwest quadrant, indicating less effect and lower costs for the pessary group compared with the PFMT group (Fig. 4).

DISCUSSION

Main findings

During the 24-month study period, we found no difference in the change in pelvic floor symptoms between pessary treatment and PFMT in women aged 55 years or older recruited by screening. Although pessary treatment led to a statistically significant greater improvement in typical prolapse symptoms compared with PFMT, the difference was small and the clinical relevance doubtful. Moreover, pessary treatment was less expensive than PFMT, as indicated by the direct medical costs of \$309 per person in the pessary group and \$437 per person in the PFMT group over the 2-year period.

Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this study are its long follow-up and the focus on participant-reported outcomes. Nevertheless, a

TABLE 4. Self-reported change of symptoms from the start of the study

	Intention-to-treat			Per protocol		
	PFMT (n = 70)	Pessary (n = 72)	P^a	PFMT (n = 57)	Pessary (n = 35)	P^a
Much better	6 (9%)	6 (8%)	0.45	4 (7%)	4 (11%)	0.67
Better	18 (26%)	19 (26%)		15 (26%)	11 (31%)	
The same	35 (50%)	41 (57%)		29 (51%)	17 (49%)	
Worse	11 (16%)	5 (7%)		9 (16%)	3 (9%)	
Much worse	0 (0%)	1 (1%)		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	

PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training.

^aChi-square test.

TABLE 5. *Change of POP-Q stage between baseline and 24 months*

	Intention-to-treat			Per protocol		
	PFMT (n = 62)	Pessary (n = 43)	<i>P</i> ^a	PFMT (n = 52)	Pessary (n = 35)	<i>P</i> ^a
Improvement ^b	9 (15%)	9 (21%)	0.69	8 (15%)	6 (17%)	0.86
The same	43 (69%)	28 (65%)		36 (69%)	25 (71%)	
Deterioration ^c	10 (16%)	6 (14%)		8 (15%)	4 (11%)	

PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training; POP-Q, pelvic organ prolapse quantification.

^aChi-square test.

^bImprovement ≥ 1 POP-Q stage.

^cDeterioration ≥ 1 POP-Q stage.

number of limitations deserve attention. First, the effects of both treatment options were lower than expected in this study when compared with previous studies on the effects of pessary treatment^{10,12,14} and PFMT.^{15,16,18,20} There are, however, several possible explanations for this difference.

In the design phase, we decided to screen women for symptomatic prolapse on the assumption that women with prolapse-related symptoms do not necessarily consult a physician.³⁸ Because all women agreed to participate in one of two active treatment arms, we assumed that the women recruited by screening would be comparable with those seeking treatment for prolapse in primary care (ie, that their PFDI-20 scores would be higher). Several women, however, experienced mild distressing pelvic floor symptoms at inclusion, as illustrated by their mean PFDI-20 baseline score of 60 points, which was lower than the expected 80 points suggested by previous research.³⁹ This might have caused an underestimation of the effectiveness of both pessary treatment and PFMT because the lower baseline scores may have allowed less room for improvement.

Second, women with unsuccessful pessary fitting were followed up by questionnaires only. Because this would bias the results of an ITT analysis for the outcomes “change of the degree of prolapse” and “change of pelvic floor muscle function,” these secondary outcomes were only analyzed using PP analyses. Consequently, we can only draw conclusions on the difference in change of prolapse stage and pelvic floor muscle function in women who completed pessary treatment or PFMT. Unsuccessful pessary fitting is a

known disadvantage of pessary treatment in some women. The results of the PP analyses reflect the effects of actual pessary treatment in women with successful pessary fitting; therefore, these results should be more relevant to clinicians than the results of an ITT analysis.

Third, in the design phase of this trial we assumed 74 enrollments in the pessary group of which 70% had a successful pessary fitting trial. In reality we included 82 women in the pessary group with a success rate of pessary fitting of 57%. Although this percentage corresponds to fitting rates found in other studies, it was lower than we estimated when designing the study. Because of our recruitment strategy (inclusion of all women with prolapse in a participating practice) we randomized more women than planned and this largely compensates for the greater than estimated pessary fitting failure rate. For the ITT analyses (the primary analyses), we reached the required number of women with a successful pessary fit. In longitudinal analyses, it is considered redundant to replace missing values and therefore we did not use multiple imputation techniques. For the per protocol analyses, we calculated that we needed 44 women finishing pessary treatment after 24 months (attrition rate of 15%). Because of the lower than estimated successful fitting rate (57%) and a higher attrition rate of 25% (n = 12), this number turned out to be 35 instead of 44. Therefore, inferences from the results of the per protocol analyses should be interpreted with caution.

Another limitation is that blinding of participants was not possible because of the nature of the intervention. In addition,

TABLE 6. *Change of pelvic floor muscle function between baseline and 24 months*

	Intention-to-treat			Per protocol		
	PFMT (n = 62)	Pessary (n = 43)	<i>P</i> ^a	PFMT (n = 52)	Pessary (n = 35)	<i>P</i> ^a
Abnormal > normal			0.21			0.08
Underactive > normal	13 (21%)	13 (30%)		10 (19%)	13 (37%)	
Overactive > normal	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
The same	41 (66%)	29 (67%)		36 (69%)	22 (63%)	
Normal > abnormal						
Normal > underactive	3 (5%)	1 (2%)		2 (4%)	0 (0%)	
Normal > overactive	1 (2%)	0 (0%)		1 (2%)	0 (0%)	
Abnormal > abnormal						
Underactive > overactive	2 (3%)	0 (0%)		2 (4%)	0 (0%)	
Overactive > underactive	2 (3%)	0 (0%)		1 (2%)	0 (0%)	

PFMT, pelvic floor muscle training.

^aChi-square test.

FIG. 3. Incremental cost-effectiveness plane for the PFDI-20: 5000 bootstrap replications for the mean difference between costs and PFDI-20. PFDI-20, Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory-20.

although outcome assessment was mainly through participant-completed questionnaires, thus avoiding assessor bias, questionnaire responses may have been biased by participants' awareness of treatment allocation.

Finally, we ensured that the PFMT interventions were tailored to participants' specific needs. Also, to improve the level of standardization, all physiotherapists were required to be registered with the Dutch Pelvic Physiotherapists Organization (NVFB) and participants were trained according to the same basic exercise guidelines. Despite these efforts, we cannot exclude the possibility of differences in interventions and practices between physiotherapists; nevertheless, this reflects daily practice and should not invalidate our results.

Interpretation

To date, no randomized controlled trials have compared pessary treatment and PFMT. Observational studies have shown pessaries to be effective in improving pelvic floor symptoms related to prolapse,¹⁰⁻¹⁴ whereas randomized controlled trials have shown PFMT to be effective in improving

FIG. 4. Incremental cost-effectiveness plane for QALYs: 5000 bootstrap replications for the mean difference between costs and QALYs. QALYs, quality-adjusted live years.

prolapse-related pelvic floor symptoms compared with no treatment.¹⁵⁻²²

In our study, pessary fitting was successful in 57% of women randomized to pessary treatment, which is consistent with previous reported success rates of 41% to 86%.^{13,40-50} This indicates that pessary fitting fails in a considerable portion of women and that pessary treatment might be suitable for many women but not for all women with a symptomatic prolapse.

Our study showed no significant difference in the change of pelvic floor symptoms measured by the PFDI-20 during the 24-month period when comparing pessary treatment and PFMT; but, women in the pessary group did show a significantly greater reduction in prolapse-specific symptoms (POPDI-6 scale) (ie, vaginal bulging, heaviness, or pressure in pelvic area, and vaginal splinting for micturition or bowel movement) compared with women in the PFMT group. The POPDI-6 score decreased by almost 26% between baseline and 24 months in the group receiving pessary treatment (indicating less distress related to prolapse symptoms), whereas the score increased slightly for women in the PFMT group. This suggests that women with typical prolapse symptoms benefit from pessary treatment more than from PFMT, which is plausible given that pessaries redress prolapse directly. In the PP analysis, we found significant differences between groups in sexual functioning, the physical component of general quality of life, and the degree of prolapse of the anterior compartment over the 24 months. These differences were, however, small and may not be clinically relevant.

In our study, there was a difference in the proportion of side effects. Sixty percent of women in the pessary group reported one or more side effects whereas no adverse events were reported for pelvic floor muscle training. For the majority of those women in the pessary group, side effects were no reason to discontinue pessary treatment. It is, however, relevant to discuss side effects when counseling women for the most appropriate conservative treatment for pelvic organ prolapse.

Our study was the first to compare the cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment and PFMT. Over the 2-year period, direct medical costs were lower for pessary treatment compared with PFMT, and costs for the use of absorbent pads were also lower for women in the pessary group. To our knowledge, the cost-effectiveness of either pessary treatment or PFMT has only been addressed in 2 other studies. On the one hand, Hullfish et al studied the cost-effectiveness of pessary treatment, expectant management, and surgical management for apical prolapse (stage ≥ 3 , after hysterectomy) in the United States using a Markov decision model. They found pessary treatment to be cost effective, achieving 10.4 quality-adjusted months at a cost of \$10,000 per participant. Based on their own experience with pessary treatment, the authors estimated the annual costs of pessary treatment to be \$1,300, with the addition of another \$324 in case of complications due to pessary use.⁵¹ These numbers may be applicable to the US setting, where specialized outpatient clinics provide pessary

treatment, but can probably not be generalized to Dutch general practice. Indeed, the direct medical costs of pessary treatment were considerably lower in our study, with mean costs of just \$309 per person over the 2-year period.

On the other hand, Hagen et al studied the cost-effectiveness of PFMT compared with a control intervention over a 12-month period. The mean costs of PFMT amounted to \$405 per person (£268, based on the exchange rate on November 24, 2015).¹⁸ Interestingly, we found that the direct medical costs of PFMT were a little higher (\$437 per person), which probably resulted from the higher number of PFMT sessions in our study.

Although all women who participated in this trial experienced distress from their symptomatic prolapse, we showed that the effect of both treatments was lower than expected based on the results of other studies. Given that some women only experienced mild distress related to their pelvic floor symptoms, we might expect a larger effect for both pessary treatment and PFMT among women with bothersome symptoms and a wish for treatment. We therefore encourage that physicians adopt a proactive attitude to prolapse and that women with bothersome prolapse-related symptoms be informed about the available treatment options, but active screening for prolapse cannot be recommended. The results of our study showed that pessary treatment seems to be more effective in improving prolapse-specific symptoms than pelvic floor muscle training. Therefore, our advice would be to start with pessary treatment in women with mainly prolapse-specific symptoms. An advantage of pessary treatment is that it was associated with lower costs compared with pelvic floor muscle training. It should, however, also be taken into account that pessary fitting fails in a considerable portion of women and that pessary treatment was associated with more side effects compared with pelvic floor muscle training. For women with pelvic floor symptoms other than prolapse-specific symptoms, we are not able to pronounce a preference for pessary treatment or PFMT because there was no significant difference between PFMT and pessary treatment. Therefore, our advice would be to inform women about both treatments, including the advantages and disadvantages, to ensure that women are able to make an informed choice between both treatments.

CONCLUSIONS

This is the first study to investigate the effectiveness of pessary treatment and PFMT over a 2-year period in women aged 55 years or older with symptomatic prolapse at or beyond the hymen identified by screening. In this population, there was no significant difference between pessary treatment and PFMT in the reduction of pelvic floor symptoms, but women with typical prolapse symptoms seemed to benefit more from pessary treatment rather than from PFMT. Pessary treatment was preferable to PFMT in the cost-effectiveness analysis, with PFMT being more expensive but no more effective. When counseling women for prolapse treatment it should, however, be taken into account that pessary fitting

fails in a considerable portion of women and that pessary treatment was associated with more side effects compared with pelvic floor muscle training. Future research should continue down several avenues: we need to investigate the effectiveness of pessary treatment and PFMT in a primary care population of women with bothersome symptoms and a wish for treatment, and we should do research to identify the characteristics of women with the greatest potential for benefit from pessary treatment. Finally, it would be interesting to explore the effectiveness of the combination of PFMT and pessary treatment.

Acknowledgments: We thank Aaltje Schram,[†] Bert Messelink, and Truuske de Bock for their contributions to the design of this study. We also thank the participating general practices for their ongoing support, and all the participants for their invaluable contribution to this study. Finally, we thank Dr Robert Sykes (www.doc.rob.co.uk) for providing English Language revision.

REFERENCES

- Haylen BT, de Ridder D, Freeman RM, et al. An International Urogynecological Association (IUGA)/International Continence Society (ICS) joint report on the terminology for female pelvic floor dysfunction. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2010;29:4-20.
- Slieker-ten Hove MC, Pool-Goudzwaard AL, Eijkemans MJ, Steegers-Theunissen RP, Burger CW, Vierhout ME. The prevalence of pelvic organ prolapse symptoms and signs and their relation with bladder and bowel disorders in a general female population. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2009;20:1037-1045.
- Swift S, Woodman P, O'Boyle A, et al. Pelvic Organ Support Study (POSS): the distribution, clinical definition, and epidemiologic condition of pelvic organ support defects. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2005;192:795-806.
- Jelovsek JE, Maher C, Barber MD. Pelvic organ prolapse. *Lancet* 2007;369:1027-1038.
- Tok EC, Yasa O, Ertunc D, Savas A, Durukan H, Kanik A. The effect of pelvic organ prolapse on sexual function in a general cohort of women. *J Sex Med* 2010;7:3957-3962.
- Fritel X, Varnoux N, Zins M, Breart G, Ringa V. Symptomatic pelvic organ prolapse at midlife, quality of life, and risk factors. *Obstet Gynecol* 2009;113:609-616.
- Cheon C, Maher C. Economics of pelvic organ prolapse surgery. *Int Urogynecol J* 2013;24:1873-1876.
- Wu JM, Kawasaki A, Hundley AF, Dieter AA, Myers ER, Sung VW. Predicting the number of women who will undergo incontinence and prolapse surgery, 2010 to 2050. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2011;205:230.e1-230.e5.
- Cundiff GW, Weidner AC, Visco AG, Bump RC, Addison WA. A survey of pessary use by members of the American urogynecologic society. *Obstet Gynecol* 2000;95:931-935.
- Barber MD, Walters MD, Cundiff GW; PESSRI Trial Group. Responsiveness of the Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory (PFDI) and Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire (PFIQ) in women undergoing vaginal surgery and pessary treatment for pelvic organ prolapse. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2006;194:1492-1498.
- Clemons JL, Aguilar VC, Tillinghast TA, Jackson ND, Myers DL. Patient satisfaction and changes in prolapse and urinary symptoms in women who were fitted successfully with a pessary for pelvic organ prolapse. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2004;190:1025-1029.
- Cundiff GW, Amundsen CL, Bent AE, et al. The PESSRI study: symptom relief outcomes of a randomized crossover trial of the ring and Gellhorn pessaries. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2007;196:405.e1-405.e8.
- Fernando RJ, Thakar R, Sultan AH, Shah SM, Jones PW. Effect of vaginal pessaries on symptoms associated with pelvic organ prolapse. *Obstet Gynecol* 2006;108:93-99.

[†]Deceased.

14. Patel M, Mellen C, O'Sullivan DM, LaSala CA. Impact of pessary use on prolapse symptoms, quality of life, and body image. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2010;202:499.e1-499.e4.
15. Kashyap R, Jain V, Singh A. Comparative effect of 2 packages of pelvic floor muscle training on the clinical course of stage I-III pelvic organ prolapse. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2013;121:69-73.
16. Braekken IH, Majida M, Engh ME, Bo K. Can pelvic floor muscle training reverse pelvic organ prolapse and reduce prolapse symptoms? An assessor-blinded, randomized, controlled trial. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2010;203:170.e1-170.e7.
17. Ghroubi S, Kharat O, Chaari M, Ben Ayed B, Guermazi M, Elleuch MH. Effect of conservative treatment in the management of low-degree urogenital prolapse. *Ann Readapt Med Phys* 2008;51:96-102.
18. Hagen S, Stark D, Glazener C, et al. Individualised pelvic floor muscle training in women with pelvic organ prolapse (POPPY): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2014;383:796-806.
19. Hagen S, Stark D, Glazener C, Sinclair L, Ramsay I. A randomized controlled trial of pelvic floor muscle training for stages I and II pelvic organ prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2009;20:45-51.
20. Piya-Anant M, Therasakvichya S, Leelaphatanadit C, Techatisak K. Integrated health research program for the Thai elderly: prevalence of genital prolapse and effectiveness of pelvic floor exercise to prevent worsening of genital prolapse in elderly women. *J Med Assoc Thai* 2003;86:509-515.
21. Stupp L, Resende AP, Oliveira E, Castro RA, Girao MJ, Sartori MG. Pelvic floor muscle training for treatment of pelvic organ prolapse: an assessor-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Int Urogynecol J* 2011;22:1233-1239.
22. Wiegersma M, Panman CMC, Kollen BJ, Berger MY, Lisman-Van Leeuwen Y, Dekker JH. Effect of pelvic floor muscle training compared with watchful waiting in older women with symptomatic mild pelvic organ prolapse: randomised controlled trial in primary care. *BMJ* 2014;349:g7378.
23. Bugge C, Adams EJ, Gopinath D, Reid F. Pessaries (mechanical devices) for pelvic organ prolapse in women. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013;2:CD004010.
24. Wiegersma M, Panman CMC, Kollen BJ, et al. Pelvic floor muscle training versus watchful waiting or pessary treatment for pelvic organ prolapse (POPPS): design and participant baseline characteristics of two parallel pragmatic randomized controlled trials in primary care. *Maturitas* 2014;77:168-173.
25. Bump RC, Mattiasson A, Bo K, et al. The standardization of terminology of female pelvic organ prolapse and pelvic floor dysfunction. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1996;175:10-17.
26. Barber MD, Walters MD, Bump RC. Short forms of two condition-specific quality-of-life questionnaires for women with pelvic floor disorders (PFDI-20 and PFIQ-7). *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2005;193:103-113.
27. Utomo E, Blok BF, Steensma AB, Korfage IJ. Validation of the Pelvic Floor Distress Inventory (PFDI-20) and Pelvic Floor Impact Questionnaire (PFIQ-7) in a Dutch population. *Int Urogynecol J* 2014;25:531-544.
28. Ware J Jr, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care* 1996;34:220-233.
29. Rogers RG, Coates KW, Kammerer-Doak D, Khalsa S, Qualls C. A short form of the Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Urinary Incontinence Sexual Questionnaire (PISQ-12). *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2003;14:164-168.
30. Burgio KL, Goode PS, Richter HE, Locher JL, Roth DL. Global ratings of patient satisfaction and perceptions of improvement with treatment for urinary incontinence: validation of three global patient ratings. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2006;25:411-417.
31. Bouwmans C, Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Koopmanschap M, Krol M, Severens H, Brouwer W. *Manual iMTA Medical Cost Questionnaire (iMCQ)*. Rotterdam (The Netherlands): iMTA Erasmus University Rotterdam; 2013.
32. Dolan P. Modeling valuations for EuroQol health states. *Med Care* 1997;35:1095-1108.
33. Messelink B, Benson T, Berghmans B, et al. Standardization of terminology of pelvic floor muscle function and dysfunction: report from the pelvic floor clinical assessment group of the International Continence Society. *Neurourol Urodyn* 2005;24:374-380.
34. Culligan PJ, Scherer J, Dyer K, et al. A randomized clinical trial comparing pelvic floor muscle training to a Pilates exercise program for improving pelvic muscle strength. *Int Urogynecol J* 2010;21:401-408.
35. Twisk JWR. *Applied Multilevel Analysis. Practical Guides to Biostatistics and Epidemiology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
36. Twisk JWR. *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis for Epidemiology. A Practical Guide*. 4th ed. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2003.
37. Hakkaart-van Roijen L, Tan SS, Bouwmans CAM. Guidelines for cost-studies. Methods and unit prices for economic evaluations in health care. Dutch Health Care Insurance Board; Actualized version 2010.
38. Thakar R, Stanton S. Management of genital prolapse. *BMJ* 2002;324:1258-1262.
39. Gutman RE, Ford DE, Quiroz LH, Shippey SH, Handa VL. Is there a pelvic organ prolapse threshold that predicts pelvic floor symptoms? *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2008;199:683.e1-683.e7.
40. Powers K, Lazarou G, Wang A, et al. Pessary use in advanced pelvic organ prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2006;17:160-164.
41. Clemons JL, Aguilar VC, Tillinghast TA, Jackson ND, Myers DL. Risk factors associated with an unsuccessful pessary fitting trial in women with pelvic organ prolapse. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2004;190:345-350.
42. Geoffrion R, Zhang T, Lee T, Cundiff GW. Clinical characteristics associated with unsuccessful pessary fitting outcomes. *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg* 2013;19:339-345.
43. Handa VL, Jones M. Do pessaries prevent the progression of pelvic organ prolapse? *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2002;13:349-351.
44. Hanson LA, Schulz JA, Flood CG, Cooley B, Tam F. Vaginal pessaries in managing women with pelvic organ prolapse and urinary incontinence: patient characteristics and factors contributing to success. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 2006;17:155-159.
45. Lewthwaite BJ, Staley D, Girouard L, Maslow K. Characteristics of women with continued use of vaginal pessaries. *Urol Nurs* 2013;33:171-176.
46. Maito JM, Quam ZA, Craig E, Danner KA, Rogers RG. Predictors of successful pessary fitting and continued use in a nurse-midwifery pessary clinic. *J Midwifery Womens Health* 2006;51:78-84.
47. Manchana T. Ring pessary for all pelvic organ prolapse. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2011;284:391-395.
48. Markle D, Skoczylas L, Goldsmith C, Noblett K. Patient characteristics associated with a successful pessary fitting. *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg* 2011;17:249-252.
49. Mutone MF, Terry C, Hale DS, Benson JT. Factors which influence the short-term success of pessary management of pelvic organ prolapse. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2005;193:89-94.
50. Nguyen JN, Jones CR. Pessary treatment of pelvic relaxation: factors affecting successful fitting and continued use. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs* 2005;32:255-261.
51. Hullfish KL, Trowbridge ER, Stukenborg GJ. Treatment strategies for pelvic organ prolapse: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Int Urogynecol J* 2011;22:507-515.