Supplementary Material

Title

The diagnosis and management of pudendal neuralgia

Authors

Mohammed Ahmed[1] (msa030717@gmail.com),

Periklis Zavridis[2] (P.Zavridis@euc.ac.cy),

Despina Hadjiconstanti[3] (drh_medillustrations@outlook.com),

Panagiotis Zis[4] (takiszis@gmail.com)

Affiliations

1) University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom
2) Medical School, European University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus
3) Department of Neurology, Nicosia General Hospital, Nicosia, Cyprus
4) Medical School, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

Corresponding Author: Panagiotis Zis[4] (takiszis@gmail.com)

Prisma checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Lines 2-3
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	-
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Lines 115-119
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Lines 115-119
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Lines 135-151
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Line 123
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Lines 123-134
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Lines 152-161
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	-
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	-
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	-
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Lines 163-168
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	-
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Methods 2.2
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	-
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	-
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	-
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	-
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	-

-

Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure 1
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Supplementary Material
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Supplementary Material
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Tables 2-4
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	-
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	-
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	-
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	-
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	-
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Lines 674-694
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Lines 847-856
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Lines 847-856
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Lines 858-884
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Lines 170-176
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Lines 170-176
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	-
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Lines 898-900
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Lines 906-912
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Lines 901-904

Quality assessment of papers included in this review, where applicable

Paper Title	Author	Study type	Scale used	Score
Chronic Pelvic Pain: Neurogenic or Non-Neurogenic? Warm Detection Threshold Testing Supports a Diagnosis of Pudendal Neuropathy	Antolak & Antolak	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	5/9
Evaluation of diagnostic accuracy of Colour Duplex Scanning, compared to electroneuromyography, diagnostic score and surgical outcomes, in Pudendal Neuralgia by entrapment: a prospective study on 96 patients	Mollo *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	7/9
Clinical usefulness of quantitative thermal sensory testing in the diagnosis and surgical treatment of women with pudendal neuropathy	Beco *et al.*	Case-Control	Newcastle-Ottawa (case-control study)	8/9
Contribution of ultrasound in the assessment of patients with suspect idiopathic pudendal nerve disease	Tagliafico *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	4/9
Transvaginal pudendal nerve blocks in patients with pudendal neuralgia: 2-year follow-up results	Basol *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	7/9
CT-guided nerve block for pudendal neuralgia: diagnostic and therapeutic implications	Mamlouk *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	3/9
Response to pudendal nerve block in women with pudendal neuralgia	Vancaillie *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	5/9
Dual Site Pudendal Nerve Infiltration: More than Just a Diagnostic Test?	Kastler *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	6/9
Role of nerve block as a diagnostic tool in pudendal nerve entrapment	Dickson *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	5/9
The Clinical Efficacy of High-Voltage Long-Duration Pulsed Radiofrequency Treatment in Pudendal Neuralgia: A Retrospective Study	Wang & Song	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	4/9
Therapeutic Efficacy of Ultrasound-Guided High-Voltage Long-Duration Pulsed Radiofrequency for Pudendal Neuralgia	Ji *et al.*	Case-control	Newcastle-Ottawa (case-control study)	6/9

Effectiveness of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation as an adjunct to selected physical therapy exercise program on male patients with pudendal neuralgia: A randomized controlled trial	Eid *et al.*	RCT	JADAD score	3/5
Percutaneous CT-guided cryoablation for the treatment of refractory pudendal neuralgia	Prologo *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	6/9
Pudendal Neuralgia: A New Option for Treatment? Preliminary Results on Feasibility and Efficacy	Venturi *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	4/9
Long-term treatment of chronic orofacial, pudendal, and central neuropathic limb pain with repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the motor cortex	Hodaj *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	7/9
Endoscopic transperineal pudendal nerve decompression: operative pudendoscopy	Beco *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	5/9
Initial experience using a novel nerve stimulator for the management of pudendal neuralgia	Roberts *et al.*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	7/9
Adding corticosteroids to the pudendal nerve block for pudendal neuralgia: a randomised, double-blind, controlled trial	Labat *et al*	RCT	JADAD score	5/5
Endoscopic trans gluteal minimal-invasive approach for nerve liberation (ENTRAMI technique) in case of pudendal and/or cluneal neuralgia by entrapment: One-year follow-up	Jottard *et al*	Cohort	Newcastle-Ottawa (cohort study)	6/9
Decompression and transposition of the pudendal nerve in pudendal neuralgia: a randomized controlled trial and long-term evaluation	Robert *et al.*	RCT	JADAD score	2/5