

Development of an anatomic intravaginal device and comparison with a conventional vaginal cone regarding their effectiveness in pelvic floor muscle perception and strength: randomized clinical test

Nilza Maria Nave Castro, Jenniffer de Souza Ramos, Paulo Roxo Barja, Fernanda Pupio Silva Lima

Laboratory of Engineering of Sensory Motor Rehabilitation, Universidade do Vale do Paraíba, São José dos Campos, Brazil

ABSTRACT

The weakness and lack of perception of the perineal musculature and pelvic floor cause a series of emotional and social problems that can affect the social quality of life.

This muscular structure is responsible for maintaining the support of the internal organs and participating in the maintenance of the urinary and fecal continence, as well as allowing coitus and childbirth.

The objective of this study was evaluating the maximum pressure during the contraction of the perineal musculature and the performance of the pelvic floor muscles after using both the anatomical intravaginal device and the conventional vaginal cone.

METHODS

A double-blind, randomized, lab-controlled trial was conducted in the Engineering of Sensory-Motor Rehabilitation Laboratory, located at the Institute of Research and Development, Universidade do Vale do Paraiba-Univap.

The study began after the research project was approved by the Ethics Committee in Research (CEP) and upon the signing of the Free and Informed Consent Term by the volunteers.

The study included 30 volunteers, who were equally and randomly distributed into three groups: Group I (control group), Group II (the group that used the conventional vaginal cone), and Group III (which used the anatomical intravaginal device developed specifically for this study).

For the AFA, considered a selection criterion, the volunteers were oriented as to the correct performance of the contraction with the maximum inhibition of synergistic muscles. After this initial examination, Groups II and III were submitted to a physical therapy intervention with the cones and, subsequently, evaluated using biofeedback and bargraph, respectively

Intravaginal device and conventional vaginal cone



Figure A: intravaginal device developed for the research (Source: author) and Figure B: conventional vaginal cone (Source: Carci)

RESULTS

After the data analysis, it was verified that the mean obtained by the three contractions performed with a 3-sec rest between them, captured by the bargraph (Graph 1) and biofeedback (Graph 2), followed by the use of the anatomical intravaginal device that was significantly greater when compared with the conventional vaginal cone and the control group.

The analysis of the data showed a statistically significant difference, concerning the evaluated parameters, in the group that used the anatomically shaped intravaginal device.



Graph1. Bargraph BoxPlot

Graph 2. Biofeedback BoxPlot

Graph 3. Scatter diagram

The intravaginal device developed in this study was more effective in improving the perception and the consequent perineal muscle contraction capacity, in comparison with the conventional cone, which can be assigned to its innovative configuration and design concerning the anatomical shape and increased diameter and length.

CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES

Alapati S, Jambhekar K. Dynamic Resonance Imaging of the pelvic floor. Elsevier 2017. 38(3):188–199. Bhattacharyya KB. The stretch reflex and the contributions of C David Marsden. Ann Indian Acad Neurol. 2017;20:1-4. Contreras Ortiz O, Coya Nuñes F, Ibañez G. Evaluación functional del piso pelviano femenino (classificacion functional). Bol Soc Latinoam Uroginecol Cir Vaginal. 1994;1:5-9. Douglas CR. Treaty of physiology - applied to medical science. 6th ed: Guanabara Koogan; 2006. Dumoulin C, Pazzoto Cacciari C, Mercier J. Keeping the pelvic floor health. Climateric. 2019. https://doi.org/10.1080/13697137.2018. 1552934. Fernandes AC, Reis B, Patrizzi L, Meirelles MC. Clinical functional evaluation of female's pelvic floor: integrative review. Fisioterapia Mov. 2018;31:1-9. Golmakani N, Khadem N, Arabipoor A, Kerigh BF, Esmaily H. Behavioral intervention program versus vaginal cones on stress urinary incontinence and related quality of life: a randomized clinical trial. Oman Med J. 2014;29:32. Haddad JM, Ribeiro RM, Bernardo WM, Abrão MS, Baracat EC. Vaginal cone use in passive and active phases in patients with stress urinary incontinence. Clinics. 2001;66(5):785-91. https://doi.org/ 10.1590/S1807-59322011000500013. Hall JE, Guyton AC. Textbook of medical physiology. Ed Elsevier.13th edition. 2016 Herbison GP, Dean N. Weighted vaginal cones for urinary incontinence: review. Cochrane Collab. 2013:1-76. https://doi.org/10.1002/ 14651858.CD002114.pub2. López-Liria R, Varverde-Martínez M, Padilla-Góngora D, Rocamora-Pérez P. Effectiveness of physiotherapy treatment for urinary incontinence in women: a systematic review. 2019;28(4):490-501. Nambiar KA, Bosh R, Cruz F, Lemack G, Thiruchelvam N, Tubaro A, et al. EUA guideline on assessment and nonsurgical management of urinary incontinence. Eur Urol. 2018;73:596-609. Oblasser C, Christie J, Maccourt C. Vaginal cones or balls to improve pelvic floor muscle performance and urinary continence in women post partum: a quantitative systematic review and meta-analysis protocol. Rev Elsevier. 2015:3–9. Oliveira M, Ferreira M, Azevedo MJ, Machado JF, Santos PC. Pelvic floor muscle training protocol for stress urinary incontinence in women: a systematic review. Mag Braz Med Assoc. 2017;63(7): 642-50. Plevnik S. A new method for testing and strengthening of pelvic floor muscles. Proceedings of the 15th Annual General Meeting. International Continence Society 1985;267–268. Res. Biomed. Eng. (2020) 36:121–128 127 Author's personal copy Vural M, Capan N, Karan A, Eskiyurt N, Yalcin O. Vaginal cone therapy in patients with stress urinary incontinence. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2013;288:99–103. Yuce T, Dokmeci F, Çetinkaya SE. A prospective randomized trial comparing the use of tolderine or weighted vaginal cones in women with overactive bladder syndrome. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2016;197:91–7.