## Published Online: 2024 November 26

## Systematic Review



# Posterior Tibial Nerve Stimulation Effect on Treatment of Overactive Bladder: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Maede Afzali 🔟 <sup>1</sup>, Fariba Ghaderi 🔟 <sup>1,\*</sup>, Hanieh Salehi-Pourmehr 🔟 <sup>2</sup>, Abbas Soltani 🔟 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran
<sup>2</sup> Research Center for Evidence-Based Medicine, Iranian EBM Centre: A JBI Centre of Excellence, Faculty of Medicine, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

\* Corresponding Author: Department of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran. Email: ghaderimailbox@gmail.com

Received: 14 April, 2024; Revised: 1 October, 2024; Accepted: 22 October, 2024

# Abstract

**Context:** Overactive bladder (OAB) is a symptomatic syndrome indicative of lower urinary tract dysfunction. Current treatments for OAB syndrome include behavioral therapy, pharmacotherapy, minimally invasive procedures like sacral nerve stimulation and tibial nerve stimulation, as well as surgical options.

**Objectives:** This systematic review aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of posterior tibial nerve stimulation (PTNS) as a treatment for OAB syndrome and to identify potentially effective stimulation methods.

**Evidence Acquisition:** A systematic search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, ProQuest, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and The Cochrane Library databases for predefined keywords. Two independent reviewers screened the studies' titles, abstracts, and full texts. The quality of the studies was assessed using the JBI risk of bias (RoB) checklists. Studies meeting the inclusion criteria were summarized in an extraction table. Meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager Software.

**Results:** Out of 2,282 studies identified, 63 were included in the data extraction table, and 19 of these were included in the meta-analysis to compare the effect of PTNS based on the number of treatment sessions (less than 12 sessions vs. 12 - 24 sessions). Despite heterogeneity among the studies, results showed a significant reduction in voiding frequency post-intervention (95% confidence interval, -4.25 to -1.48, P < 0.0001, Z = 4.06), with a greater reduction in the 12 - 24 sessions group (chi<sup>2</sup> = 8.40, df = 1 (P

confidence interval, -4.25 to -1.48, P < 0.0001, Z = 4.06), with a greater reduction in the 12 - 24 sessions group (cm = 8.40, df = 10)

< 0.004); I<sup>2</sup> = 88.1%). Additionally, specific electrode placement methods further reduced voiding frequency after PTNS.

**Conclusions:** Posterior tibial nerve stimulation can reduce voiding frequency in patients with OAB and painful bladder syndrome. However, establishing a standard PTNS method remains challenging due to variations among studies and the absence of control groups in many cases. Based on the results, PTNS with a frequency of 20 Hz, pulse duration of 200  $\mu$ s, and stimulation intensity at the pain threshold appears effective for both transcutaneous and percutaneous techniques over 12 - 24 sessions. The percutaneous method may be more effective than the transcutaneous method.

Keywords: Overactive Bladder Syndrome, Posterior Tibial Nerve Stimulation, Percutaneous, Transcutaneous, Systematic Review

## 1. Context

Overactive bladder (OAB) is a symptomatic syndrome indicating lower urinary tract dysfunction, as defined by the International Continence Society (ICS) classification (1). According to this definition, OAB involves a sudden, urgent need to urinate—with or without incontinence often characterized by increased frequency and nocturia, in the absence of a urinary tract infection (UTI) or other underlying pathologies. Patients presenting with these symptoms are diagnosed with either dry OAB (without incontinence) or wet OAB (with incontinence), with approximately 66% experiencing dry OAB and 33% wet OAB. Many individuals with OAB also suffer from painful bladder syndrome (PBS), also known as interstitial cystitis—a chronic condition marked by bladder pain and symptoms like urgency and frequency (2).

Overactive bladder syndrome has a prevalence ranging from 1.5% to 36.4%, significantly impacting patients' quality of life and imposing economic burdens on the healthcare system. Compared to healthy

Copyright © 2025, Afzali et al. This open-access article is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which allows for unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is properly cited.

individuals, those with OAB are more likely to experience anxiety, depression, social isolation, reduced confidence, and impaired interpersonal relationships (3). Current treatments for OAB include behavioral therapy, pharmacotherapy, minimally invasive procedures, and other surgical options (4). Newer therapeutic methods have emerged, such as botulinum neurotoxin, sacral nerve neuromodulation (SNM), and posterior tibial nerve stimulation (PTNS) (5).

According to the European Association of Urology (EAU), American Urological Association (AUA), and National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), PTNS is recommended as a minimally invasive neuromodulation technique for OAB. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation received FDA approval in 2000 (6). Unlike acupuncture, PTNS targets an anatomical site rather than energy pathways (7) and is administered via two methods: P-PTNS and T-PTNS (3). In the percutaneous method, nerve stimulation is delivered through a needle electrode, while the transcutaneous method uses a surface electrode with a reference electrode placed on the same leg. Some studies have reported minor side effects, including pain, burning, bruising, and minor bleeding at the needle site posttreatment (3). The ease of use of PTNS allows patients to utilize it in home-based treatments.

Numerous studies have investigated the effects of PTNS on both painful bladder syndrome and overactive bladder syndrome (3, 8).

## 2. Objectives

This systematic review aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of posterior tibial nerve stimulation as a treatment for overactive bladder syndrome and to identify a potentially effective stimulation method.

## 3. Evidence Acquisition

The systematic review adhered to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (9). This systematic review was registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022367658). The following databases were searched: PubMed, Scopus, ProQuest, Google Scholar, Web of Science, and The Cochrane Library, without restrictions on time or language, up to April 2022.

## 3.1. Inclusion Criteria

The study included randomized controlled trials and nonrandomized quasi-experimental trials that met the inclusion criteria. The Patient, Problem/Intervention/Comparison/Outcome (PICO) criteria were as follows:

(1) Participants: Patients with idiopathic OAB or painful bladder symptoms who received PTNS as treatment, regardless of age, gender, or race.

(2) Interventions: Any type of posterior tibial nerve electrical stimulation, including P-PTNS or T-PTNS.

(3) Comparison: Control, sham, no treatment, routine treatment, medication, or placebo.

(4) Outcome: The primary outcome was the mean difference in voiding frequency, while secondary outcomes included mean voided volume, urinary incontinence episodes (UI), maximum cystometric capacity, urgency, and urgency urinary incontinence (UUI).

## 3.2. Exclusion Criteria

(1) Animal studies or studies using non-living samples

(2) Neurological OAB

(3) Full-text articles not available, even after contacting the authors

(4) Studies that did not specify treatment protocols in their articles or responses to inquiries

Electrical Stimulation Thresholds

The electrical stimulation threshold is defined at three levels:

(1) Sensory Threshold: The level of electrical stimulation where the person only feels the current.

(2) Motor threshold: The intensity of stimulation at which a motor response becomes apparent.

(3) Pain threshold: The intensity of stimulation surpasses the motor response limit and approaches the person's pain and tolerance threshold.

**Electrical Stimulation Methods** 

The electrical stimulation methods are categorized into six levels based on electrode placement:

- Method 1: The first electrode is positioned 3 - 5 cm above the medial malleolus, while the second electrode is placed around the medial malleolus.

- Method 2: The first electrode is positioned less than 3 cm above the medial malleolus, with the second electrode around the medial malleolus.

- Method 3: The first electrode is placed 3 - 5 cm above the medial malleolus, and the second electrode is positioned on the arch of the foot.

- Method 4: The first electrode is positioned less than 3 cm above the medial malleolus, with the second electrode on the arch of the foot. - Method 5: The first electrode is positioned more than 5 cm above the medial malleolus, with the second electrode placed around the medial malleolus.

- Method 6: Both electrodes are placed on the tibial nerve on the foot at points not defined in the previous methods (Appendix 1 in Supplementary File).

## 3.3. Data Synthesis

The mean difference between the two groups was used as the effect index. Heterogeneity between studies was measured using the I-Squared (I<sup>2</sup>) Index, where an I<sup>2</sup> value greater than 50% indicated substantial heterogeneity. In cases of heterogeneity, the randomeffects model was applied; otherwise, the fixed-effects model was used. A funnel plot was used to assess potential publication bias in the studies. A P-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

For statistical analysis, the numerical values of the variables before and after the intervention in each study group, along with the sample size of each group, were recorded in separate Excel files. Statistical meta-analysis was performed using review manager (RevMan) version 5.4 software (Cochrane Collaboration).

## 4. Results

In the initial search of the databases, 2,282 studies were identified. After removing 969 duplicate articles, two independent reviewers screened the titles and abstracts, resulting in a final selection of 63 articles (10-72). The selection process is depicted in the PRISMA flow diagram (Figure 1). Data extraction tables and a summary of the results are provided in Appendices 2a and b in Supplementary File.

## 4.1. Voiding Frequency

The results showed that in 48 out of 63 studies, the frequency of urination decreased following PTNS. A within-group comparison of average urination frequency using PTNS with the needle method, considering subgroups based on treatment duration (before and after intervention), demonstrated significant heterogeneity among studies ( $Tau^2 = 8.45$ ;  $chi^2 = 1433.69$ , df = 18, P < 0.00001,  $I^2 = 99\%$ ). The mean reduction in urination frequency post-treatment was 2.87 times (95% confidence interval: -4.25 to -1.48, P <0.0001). This reduction was more pronounced in the 12 -24 session group ( $chi^2 = 8.40$ , df = 1, P < 0.004, I<sup>2</sup> = 88.1%). These findings suggest that PTNS with the needle method significantly reduces urination frequency in both the 12 - 24 session and less than 12 session treatment groups (Figure 2).

When examining different electrode placement methods, 19 studies were included in the meta-analysis, revealing significant heterogeneity among the studies (Tau<sup>2</sup> = 8.45; chi<sup>2</sup> = 1433.69, df = 18, P < 0.00001, l<sup>2</sup> = 99%). The results indicated that PTNS using the needle method significantly reduces urination frequency with electrode placement methods 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 (Figure 3).

In the subgroup analysis considering stimulation intensity, significant reductions in urination frequency were observed at both the movement and pain thresholds following treatment (Figure 4).

When comparing the average frequency of urination using PTNS with the surface method, accounting for subgroups based on treatment duration (before and after intervention), 10 studies were included in the meta-analysis. After treatment with this stimulation method, the average frequency of urination decreased by 2.07 times (95% CI: -2.93 to -1.21), a statistically significant improvement (P < 0.0001). The decrease in urination frequency was notably greater in the 12 - 24 session treatment period. However, the difference between subgroup values was not statistically significant (chi<sup>2</sup> = 0.22, df = 2, P = 0.90; I<sup>2</sup> = 0%) (Figure 5).

When comparing the effect of transcutaneous surface PTNS on mean voiding frequencies, considering electrode placement methods, 8 studies using methods 1, 5, and 6 were analyzed. The heterogeneity among studies was moderate and statistically significant (Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.47; chi<sup>2</sup> = 11.04, df = 7, P = 0.14; I<sup>2</sup> = 37%). A statistically significant reduction in mean voiding frequencies was observed after treatment with this stimulation method (P < 0.00001). Electrode placement methods 5 and 6 significantly decreased mean voiding frequencies, while method 1 did not produce a significant reduction (Appendix 3 in Supplementary File).

In an analysis of sensory threshold subgroups before and after intervention, 10 studies were included across sensory, movement, and pain threshold subgroups. The heterogeneity among studies was statistically significant (Tau<sup>2</sup> = 1.02; chi<sup>2</sup> = 20.70, df = 9, P = 0.01; I<sup>2</sup> = 57%). There was a statistically significant reduction in mean voiding frequencies following treatment (P < 0.00001). Electrical stimulation intensities at the sensory and pain thresholds led to a significant decrease in mean voiding frequencies, with no statistically significant difference between the subgroups (chi<sup>2</sup> = 2.25, df = 2, P = 0.33; I<sup>2</sup> = 11.0%) (Appendix 4 in Supplementary File).

## 4.2. Mean Voided Volume

In this study, the mean voided volume (MVV) was analyzed as a secondary outcome. Out of the 63 studies



#### Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of study selection. Search results, study selection, and inclusion process

reviewed, MVV increased in 15 studies, with only one study reporting a decrease.

For the intragroup comparison of MVV using PTNS with the needle method, 10 studies were included in a meta-analysis, divided into two subgroups: 12 - 24 sessions and more than 24 sessions. There was significant heterogeneity among the studies (Tau<sup>2</sup> = 309.86; chi<sup>2</sup> = 47.49, df = 9, P < 0.00001; I<sup>2</sup> = 81%). The results indicated a statistically significant increase in MVV after treatment with PTNS, with an average increase of 28.28 mL (95% CI: 14.43 to 42.13), and this improvement was statistically significant (P < 0.001, Z = 0.4) (Appendix 5 in Supplementary File).

In the subgroup analysis of electrode placement methods, 10 studies were included in the meta-analysis. MVV significantly increased after treatment compared to pre-treatment values (28.28 mL, 95% CI: 14.43 to 42.13) (P < 0.001, Z = 0.4). The second and third electrode placement methods led to significant increases in MVV, while the first electrode placement method did not show a statistically significant improvement, and no significant reduction was observed with the sixth electrode placement method (Appendix 6 in Supplementary File).

In comparing MVV by the needle method, considering the electrical stimulation threshold limits

|  |            | After    |         |                        | efore                |       |        | Mean Difference      | Mean Difference    |
|--|------------|----------|---------|------------------------|----------------------|-------|--------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Study or Subgroup  | Mean       | SD       | Total   | Mean                   | SD                   | Total | Weight | IV, Random, 95% Cl   | IV, Random, 95% Cl |
| 2.3.1 12-24  |            |          |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
| Carlo Vecchioli-Scaldazza 2018                             | 0.47       | 0.5      | 35      | 1.24                   | 0.42                 | 35    | 5.9%   | -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] | •                  |
| Finazzi-Agro, E. 2010                                      | 9.5        | 0.38     | 18      | 13.6                   | 0.63                 | 18    | 5.9%   | -4.10 [-4.44, -3.76] | -                  |
| Kabay, S. 2021   | 7.1        | 1        | 39      | 10.9                   | 2.4                  | 39    | 5.8%   | -3.80 [-4.62, -2.98] |                    |
| Kizilyel, S. 2015  | 8.9        | 0.88     | 10      | 10.1                   | 0.88                 | 10    | 5.8%   | -1.20 [-1.97, -0.43] | -                  |
| MacDiarmid, S. 20010                                       | 9.8        | 3        | 33      | 12.6                   | 3.3                  | 33    | 5.5%   | -2.80 [-4.32, -1.28] | _ <b>—</b>         |
| Marchal, C. 2011   | 6.6        | 0.34     | 53      | 14.7                   | 1.39                 | 53    | 5.9%   | -8.10 [-8.49, -7.71] | +                  |
| Onal 2012  | 8.1        | 3.2      | 18      | 8.8                    | 3.8                  | 18    | 5.1%   | -0.70 [-3.00, 1.60]  |                    |
| Peters 2009  | 9.8        | 2.8      | 110     | 12.3                   | 3.2                  | 110   | 5.8%   | -2.50 [-3.29, -1.71] | -                  |
| Rajab, M. 2015   | 12.15      | 3.72     | 20      | 14.55                  | 4.1                  | 20    | 5.0%   | -2.40 [-4.83, 0.03]  |                    |
| Rio-Gonzalez, S. 2017                                      | 7.1        | 3        | 200     | 14.5                   | 8.2                  | 200   | 5.6%   | -7.40 [-8.61, -6.19] | - <b>-</b>         |
| Sherif 2017  | 6.9        | 0.8      | 30      | 12.2                   | 1.2                  | 30    | 5.9%   | -5.30 [-5.82, -4.78] | +                  |
| Sonmez, R. 2022  | 6.31       | 1.33     | 19      | 11.57                  | 3.73                 | 19    | 5.4%   | -5.26 [-7.04, -3.48] |                    |
| Ugurlucan 2013   | 7.4        | 2.9      | 35      | 7.6                    | 2.6                  | 35    | 5.6%   | -0.20 [-1.49, 1.09]  |                    |
| van der Pal, F. 2006                                       | 12         | 6.5      | 11      | 11                     | 5.8                  | 11    | 3.3%   | 1.00 [-4.15, 6.15]   |                    |
| Vandoninck, V. 2003  | 10         | 8.16     | 90      | 13                     | 6.16                 | 90    | 5.2%   | -3.00 [-5.11, -0.89] |                    |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |            |          | 721     |                        |                      | 721   | 81.5%  | -3.24 [-4.86, -1.62] | ◆                  |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 9.48; Chi <sup>2</sup> = | = 1304.6   | 2. df =  | 14 (P < | 0.0000                 | 1); I <sup>2</sup> = | 99%   |        |                      |                    |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 3.93 (P                       | < 0.0001   | )        |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
|  |            |          |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
| 2.3.2 <12  |            |          |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
| Elshora, I. A 2020   | 10.47      | 0.52     | 15      | 11.24                  | 0.53                 | 15    | 5.9%   | -0.77 [-1.15, -0.39] | +                  |
| Preyer, O., et al. 2015                                    | 10.3       | 4        | 18      | 11.3                   | 3                    | 18    | 5.1%   | -1.00 [-3.31, 1.31]  |                    |
| Zhao, J 2004   | 11.1       | 4.6      | 14      | 13.4                   | 9.8                  | 14    | 3.0%   | -2.30 [-7.97, 3.37]  |                    |
| Zhao, J 2008   | 12.19      | 4.92     |         | 13.36                  | 4.61                 | 18    | 4.5%   | -1.17 [-4.28, 1.94]  |                    |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |            |          | 65      |                        |                      | 65    | 18.5%  | -0.79 [-1.16, -0.42] | ◆                  |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = | = 0.37, df | = 3 (P   | = 0.95  | ); I <sup>2</sup> = 09 | %                    |       |        |                      |                    |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 4.20 (P                       | < 0.0001   | )        |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
|  |            |          |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |
| Total (95% CI)   |            |          | 786     |                        |                      |       | 100.0% | -2.87 [-4.25, -1.48] | <b>•</b>           |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 8.45; Chi <sup>2</sup> = |            |          | 18 (P < | 0.0000                 | 1); l²=              | 99%   |        |                      | -10 -5 0 5 10      |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 4.06 (P                       | < 0.0001   | )        |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      | After Before       |
| Test for subgroup differences: Ch                          | ni² = 8.40 | . df = 1 | (P = 0  | .004), I <sup>a</sup>  | = 88.1               | %     |        |                      |                    |
|  |            |          |         |                        |                      |       |        |                      |                    |

#### Figure 2. Voiding frequency after treatment according to the treatment sessions

before and after intervention, 9 studies were included in the meta-analysis. Following treatment, MVV increased significantly by an average of 30.81 mL (95% CI: 17.06 to 44.55) (P < 0.001, Z = 39.4) (Appendix 7 in Supplementary File).

In the intragroup comparison of MVV using the surface method, considering subgroups based on treatment duration before and after intervention, three eligible studies were analyzed across two subgroups: 12 - 24 sessions and more than 24 sessions. The results showed an increase in MVV by 23.58 mL (95% CI: 1.91 to 45.26), which was statistically significant (P = 0.03, Z = 2.13) (Appendix 8 in Supplementary File).

In the intragroup comparison of MVV using the surface method, considering subgroups of electrode placement methods before and after intervention, two studies in the subgroup analysis indicated a mean increase in MVV of 34.32 mL (95% CI: -0.54 to 69.18). This improvement rate was statistically significant (P = 0.05, Z = 1.93) (Figure 1) (Appendix 9 in Supplementary File).

To estimate intragroup changes in MVV before and after intervention using the surface method, based on stimulation threshold, three studies were included across three subgroups: Motor, sensory, and pain thresholds. The improvement in MVV was statistically significant in the motor and sensory threshold subgroups (P = 0.03, Z = 2.13) (Appendix 10 in Supplementary File).

The results for urinary incontinence, urgency, maximum cystometric capacity, and urgency urinary incontinence are summarized in Appendices 11 a - i in Supplementary File.

To assess potential biases, the quality of the selected studies was evaluated using the JBI quality appraisal tool for randomized and quasi-experimental trials, as detailed in Appendix 12 in Supplementary File.

## 5. Discussion

This systematic review aimed to identify the optimal PTNS application method for treating patients with OAB and painful bladder syndrome by comparing various therapeutic techniques and parameters. Both needle and surface PTNS methods were found to significantly reduce voiding frequency, with the effect being most pronounced with needle stimulation for 12 - 24 sessions and surface stimulation across varying durations. Specific electrode placement methods showed positive outcomes, although effectiveness varied between placements. The greatest benefits were observed at stimulation intensities set to movement and pain thresholds.



#### Figure 3. Voiding frequency after treatment according to the needle placement

In addition to reducing voiding frequency, PTNS both needle and surface methods—significantly increased MVV, with needle stimulation showing more consistent results. Similar to findings with voiding frequency, certain electrode placements were more effective than others. Stimulation at sensory and pain thresholds also led to a significant increase in MVV. These findings suggest that PTNS, particularly needlebased stimulation, is a promising non-invasive treatment for LUTS, with notable effectiveness in reducing voiding frequency and enhancing MVV.

Micturition is regulated by centers located in the cortex, pons, and spinal cord. The cortical micturition center oversees the regulation of urination, while the spinal micturition center facilitates the completion of the voiding process (1). Elevated anxiety levels can increase central facilitation, leading to a higher frequency and more instances of urinary incontinence. The pontine micturition center plays a crucial role in coordinating and finalizing the voiding process (2).

In adults, the spinal micturition center typically remains inactive, except in cases involving spinal cord injury. Bladder distension triggers low-level vesical afferent activity, which, in turn, stimulates sympathetic outflow to the bladder outlet and pudendal outflow to the external urethral sphincter. This response promotes continence by inhibiting detrusor muscle contraction. Neuromodulation therapy for treating OAB modifies spinal cord reflexes and cortical engagement through afferent signaling, reducing detrusor overactivity and alleviating urinary frequency and urgency. Electrical stimulation applied to the pelvic nerve, sensory fibers of the pudendal nerve, or muscular nerve fibers originating from the lower limbs can effectively inhibit the spinal micturition centers (3).

The tibial nerve, also known as the posterior tibial nerve, originates from the L4-S3 nerve roots and provides innervation to the pelvic floor musculature, bladder sphincters, and the detrusor muscle. Anatomically, it is located approximately three to four centimeters above the medial malleolus. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation is considered a relatively low-risk intervention for OAB, with minor adverse effects such as mild bleeding, discomfort, and skin inflammation at the

| No. to an Oat and an   |          | After    | T-4-1    |                        | efore                            | T-4-1 | 101-1-1-1 | Mean Difference      | Mean Difference                         |
|--|----------|----------|----------|------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup<br>2.4.1 movement threshold  | Mean     | SD       | rotal    | Mean                   | SD                               | rotal | weight    | IV, Random, 95% Cl   | IV, Random, 95% Cl                      |
|  |          |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      | 5 c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c |
| Carlo Vecchioli-Scaldazza 2018   | 0.47     |          |          |                        |                                  | 35    | 5.9%      | -0.77 [-0.99, -0.55] |   |
| Elshora, I. A 2020   | 10.47    |          |          | 11.24                  |                                  | 15    | 5.9%      | -0.77 [-1.15, -0.39] |   |
| Kizilyel, S. 2015  |          | 0.88     |          | 10.1                   |                                  | 10    |           | -1.20 [-1.97, -0.43] |   |
| MacDiarmid, S. 20010   | 9.8      | 3        |          |                        |                                  | 33    |           | -2.80 [-4.32, -1.28] |   |
| Marchal, C. 2011   | 6.6      |          | 53       |                        |                                  | 53    |           |                      |   |
| Onal 2012  | 8.1      | 3.2      |          | 8.8                    |                                  | 18    |           | -0.70 [-3.00, 1.60]  |   |
| Peters 2009  | 9.8      | 2.8      |          |                        |                                  | 110   |           | -2.50 [-3.29, -1.71] |   |
| Rio-Gonzalez, S. 2017  | 7.1      | 3        |          |                        |                                  | 200   | 5.6%      | -7.40 [-8.61, -6.19] |   |
| Sherif 2017  | 6.9      |          |          |                        |                                  | 30    |           |                      |   |
| Jgurlucan 2013   | 7.4      | 2.9      | 35       | 7.6                    | 2.6                              | 35    | 5.6%      | -0.20 [-1.49, 1.09]  |   |
| /andoninck, V. 2003  | 10       | 8.16     |          | 13                     | 6.16                             | 90    |           | -3.00 [-5.11, -0.89] |   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |          |          | 629      |                        |                                  | 629   | 62.1%     | -3.00 [-4.99, -1.00] |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 11.02; Chi <sup>2</sup>  | = 1340.  | 54, df : | = 10 (P  | < 0.000                | 01); P                           | = 99% |           |                      |   |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 2.94 (P   | = 0.003) |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| 2.4.2 sensory threshold  |          |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |          |          | 0        |                        |                                  | 0     |           | Not estimable        |   |
| Heterogeneity: Not applicable  |          |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| Test for overall effect: Not applica   | ble      |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| 2.4.3 pain threshold   |          |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| inazzi-Agro, E. 2010   | 9.5      | 0.38     | 18       | 13.6                   | 0.63                             | 18    | 5.9%      | -4.10 [-4.44, -3.76] | +                                       |
| <abay, 2021<="" s.="" td=""><td>7.1</td><td>1</td><td>39</td><td>10.9</td><td>2.4</td><td>39</td><td>5.8%</td><td></td><td></td></abay,> | 7.1      | 1        | 39       | 10.9                   | 2.4                              | 39    | 5.8%      |                      |   |
| Prever, O., et al. 2015  | 10.3     | 4        | 18       | 11.3                   | 3                                | 18    |           |                      |   |
| Rajab, M. 2015   | 12.15    |          |          | 14.55                  | 4.1                              | 20    |           | -2.40 [-4.83, 0.03]  |   |
| Sonmez, R. 2022  |          | 1.33     |          | 11.57                  |                                  | 19    |           |                      |   |
| an der Pal, F. 2006  |          | 6.5      |          |                        | 5.8                              | 11    | 3.3%      |                      |   |
| Zhao, J 2004   | 11.1     |          |          | 13.4                   | 9.8                              | 14    |           | -2.30 [-7.97, 3.37]  |   |
| Zhao, J 2008   | 12.19    |          |          | 13.36                  |                                  | 18    |           |                      |   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |          |          | 157      |                        |                                  | 157   |           |                      |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.70; Chi <sup>2</sup> =   | = 17.72  | df = 7 ( | P = 0.0  | 1):   <sup>2</sup> = 6 | 60%                              |       |           |                      | -                                       |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 7.16 (P   |          |          | . 0.0    | .,,,                   |                                  |       |           |                      |   |
| Fotal (95% CI)   |          |          | 786      |                        |                                  | 786   | 100.0%    | -2.87 [-4.25, -1.48] | •                                       |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 8,45; Chi <sup>2</sup> =   | 1433.6   | 9 df=    |          | 0.0000                 | 1) <sup>,</sup>   <sup>2</sup> = |       |           |                      |   |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 4.06 (P   |          |          |          | 0.0000                 | ·/·· =                           | 0070  |           |                      | -4 -2 0 2 4                             |
| Test for subgroup differences: Ch  |          |          | /P = 0   | 77) 12-                | 0.0%                             |       |           |                      | Favours [experimental]Aft Before        |
| restion subgroup dilierences. Of   | n = 0.08 | , ui = 1 | 1 (F = 0 | .00,1-=                | - 0 %                            |       |           |                      |   |
|  |          |          |          |                        |                                  |       |           |                      |   |

Figure 4. Voiding frequency after treatment according to the intensity of stimulation

needle insertion site. However, a standardized treatment protocol for PTNS is not yet established, and various regimens continue to be explored.

Transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation represents a non-invasive alternative that can be safely performed using surface electrodes placed at the tibial nerve's anatomical site. Recent studies suggest that both P-PTNS and T-PTNS produce comparable outcomes in managing OAB and bowel dysfunction. A pilot study assessing treatment for fecal incontinence and OAB reported a 53% response rate in both the Global Response Assessment (GRA) and the International Consultations on Incontinence Questionnaires (ICIQ-OAB and ICIQ-LUTS) (3).

While the exact mechanisms by which PTNS achieves its effects remain unclear, several hypotheses have been proposed. Possible mechanisms include changes in brain endorphin levels, depolarization of sacral and lumbar somatic afferent fibers, activation of efferent fibers to the striated urethral sphincter, and cortical reorganization in response to stimulation (66, 69). An analysis of PTNS application methods showed that 33 studies used the P-PTNS method, which was generally more effective (20, 66, 67, 72). In our systematic review and meta-analysis, no significant side effects, aside from minor transient pain at the needle insertion site, were reported during PTNS treatment (3). In 14 reviewed studies, no adverse effects from PTNS treatment were reported (12, 18, 22, 66, 67). However, 21 studies documented minor side effects, including small blood spots and transient pain, likely associated with the needle insertion (66).

Posterior tibial nerve stimulation devices use biphasic currents, which generally should not produce chemical effects or complications; if chemical effects do occur, they tend to be minimal. No side effects related to the electrical current itself were reported in the studies, likely due to the type and form of the current used.

In the studies reviewed, the stimulation duration per session was consistently set at 20 minutes. However, there was considerable variation in the total number of effective treatment sessions across studies. Both needle and surface PTNS showed greater therapeutic effects over the long term, with low-frequency pulsed electrical stimulation reducing patients' symptoms through its influence on brain activity (73). Finazzi-Agro et al. found that 12 PTNS sessions could lead to reorganization of

|   |   | After                                |  | _               | efore             |                        |                       | Mean Difference                                     | Mean Difference             |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Study or Subgroup   | Mean  | SD                                   | Total                                    | Mean            | SD                | Total                  | Weight                | IV, Random, 95% Cl                                  | IV, Random, 95% Cl          |
| 3.3.1 <12   |   |                                      |  |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
| Alve, A. T 2020   | 7.84  | 2.84                                 | 39                                       | 11.81           | 3.73              | 39                     | 12.0%                 | -3.97 [-5.44, -2.50]                                | _ <b></b>                   |
| Jacomo, R. H 2020   | 6.66  | 5                                    | 25                                       | 7.3             | 7.4               | 25                     | 4.5%                  | -0.64 [-4.14, 2.86]                                 |                             |
| Subtotal (95% CI)   |   |                                      | 64                                       |                 |                   | 64                     | 16.6%                 | -2.70 [-5.87, 0.47]                                 |                             |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 3.67  |   |                                      | '= 1 (P                                  | = 0.09);        | <b>2</b> = 66     | 6%                     |                       |   |                             |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 1  | .67 (P =  | 0.10)                                |  |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
| 3.3.2 12-24   |   |                                      |  |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
| Abulseoud, A 2018   | 10.6  | 2.32                                 | 15                                       | 13.3            | 1.64              | 15                     | 12.2%                 | -2.70 [-4.14, -1.26]                                | _ <b></b>                   |
| Bacchi 2021   |   | 3.24                                 | 52                                       |                 | 3.24              | 52                     | 13.4%                 | -2.80 [-4.05, -1.55]                                | _ <b>-</b> _                |
| Bykoviene 2018  | 7.52  | 2.3                                  | 22                                       |                 | 3.24              | 22                     | 11.0%                 | -1.34 [-3.00, 0.32]                                 |                             |
| Martin-Gracia, M. 2018  | 7.7   | 2.8                                  | 12                                       | 8.5             | 1.9               | 12                     | 9.7%                  | -0.80 [-2.71, 1.11]                                 |                             |
| Pierre, M. L. 2021  | 8.4   | 3.9                                  | 26                                       | 11              | 6.3               | 26                     | 6.1%                  | -2.60 [-5.45, 0.25]                                 |                             |
| Ramirez-Garcia, I. 2018   | 9   | 2.7                                  | 34                                       | 10.6            | 3.8               | 34                     | 11.5%                 | -1.60 [-3.17, -0.03]                                |                             |
| Subtotal (95% CI)   |   |                                      | 161                                      |                 |                   | 161                    | 63.9%                 | -2.09 [-2.75, -1.43]                                | ◆                           |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00  | Chi <sup>2</sup> =  | 4.97, df                             | = 5 (P                                   | = 0.42);        | ² = 09            | %                      |                       |   |                             |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 6  | .19 (P <  | 0.0000                               | 11)                                      |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
|   |   |                                      |  |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
| 333742  |   |                                      |  |                 |                   |                        |                       |   |                             |
| 3.3.3 24<   | 10  | 1 / 0                                | 26                                       | aa o            | 4 4 4             | 26                     | 10.2%                 | 0.24 [.1.46 2.14]                                   |                             |
| Welk 2020   |   | 1.48                                 |  |                 |                   |                        | 10.2%<br>0.3%         | 0.34 [-1.46, 2.14]                                  |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021  | 10<br>9.4   |                                      | 26<br>30<br>56                           | 9.66<br>12.9    |                   | 26<br>30<br>56         | 9.3%                  | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]                                |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021<br><b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b>  | 9.4   | 3.4                                  | 30<br>56                                 | 12.9            | 4.4               | 30<br>56               |                       |   |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021  | 9.4<br>; Chi² = ;   | 3.4<br>7.87, df                      | 30<br>56                                 | 12.9            | 4.4               | 30<br>56               | 9.3%                  | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]                                |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021<br><b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b><br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 6.44  | 9.4<br>; Chi² = ;   | 3.4<br>7.87, df                      | 30<br>56                                 | 12.9            | 4.4               | 30<br>56               | 9.3%                  | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]                                |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021<br><b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b><br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 6.44  | 9.4<br>; Chi² = ;   | 3.4<br>7.87, df                      | 30<br>56                                 | 12.9            | 4.4               | 30<br>56<br>37%        | 9.3%                  | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]                                | •                           |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021<br><b>Subtotal (95% CI)</b><br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 6.44<br>Test for overall effect: Z = 0                          | 9.4<br>; Chi <sup>2</sup> = ;<br>.81 (P =                           | 3.4<br>7.87, df<br>0.42)             | 30<br>56<br>f = 1 (P<br>281              | 12.9<br>= 0.005 | 4.4<br>i); I² = { | 30<br>56<br>37%<br>281 | 9.3%<br><b>19.5</b> % | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]<br>- <b>1.56 [-5.32, 2.21]</b> |                             |
| Welk 2020<br>Zonić-Imamović, M. 2021<br><b>Subtotal (95% Cl)</b><br>Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 6.44<br>Test for overall effect: Z = 0<br><b>Total (95% Cl)</b> | 9.4<br>; Chi <sup>2</sup> = ;<br>.81 (P =<br>; Chi <sup>2</sup> = ; | 3.4<br>7.87, df<br>0.42)<br>20.70, ( | 30<br>56<br>f = 1 (P<br>281<br>df = 9 (F | 12.9<br>= 0.005 | 4.4<br>i); I² = { | 30<br>56<br>37%<br>281 | 9.3%<br><b>19.5</b> % | -3.50 [-5.49, -1.51]<br>- <b>1.56 [-5.32, 2.21]</b> | -4 -2 0 2 4<br>After Before |

Figure 5. Voiding frequency after treatment according to the surface method stimulation and treatment duration

cortical networks in supraspinal centers, further supporting PTNS's neuromodulatory effects (74).

Increasing the number of therapy sessions led to more pronounced effects for both transcutaneous and percutaneous stimulation techniques. However, in the 2020 study by Welk, transcutaneous stimulation techniques showed no therapeutic effect when the treatment period exceeded 24 sessions. This suggests that further detailed clinical trials are needed to establish optimal treatment duration for both OAB and painful bladder syndrome.

In 49 studies, posterior tibial nerve stimulation was applied to one leg, while 6 studies applied it bilaterally. When comparing unilateral versus bilateral stimulation in treating painful bladder syndrome, no particular preference was indicated, and no direct comparison was conducted between these two approaches (70, 72).

Patients with OAB experienced a significant reduction in voiding frequency when treated with percutaneous or transcutaneous stimulation on one leg. Further clinical trials are recommended to investigate the effects of bilateral treatment on both legs.

Details regarding specific electrical stimulation parameters, such as current type and form, were generally not reported in the included studies. However, Stoller's method appears to be widely accepted, utilizing parameters including a frequency of 20 Hz, pulse width of 200  $\mu$ s, and an adjustable pulse intensity of 0 to 10 mA, delivered through a low-voltage device (67, 68, 70). Notably, a pulse duration over 100  $\mu$ s stimulates sensory fibers and induces analgesia by activating descending pain inhibitory pathways (73).

In comparing electrode placement methods, categorized into six distinct techniques, percutaneous stimulation using methods 2 and 3 significantly reduced voiding frequency and increased MVV in patients with OAB and bladder pain syndrome. This effect may be attributed to the superficial location of the posterior tibial nerve in these regions, allowing for effective stimulation. According to traditional Chinese medicine principles, these acupuncture points are believed to support the spleen and restore balance to yin and blood, as well as to the liver and kidneys. However, minor errors in needle insertion can occur, affecting proper nerve stimulation.

For transcutaneous stimulation techniques, electrode placement method 6 resulted in a significant reduction in voiding frequency and an increase in MVV for overactive bladder syndrome. More clinical trials are recommended to further explore the impact of

electrode placement methods in treating OAB and bladder pain syndrome.

## 5.1. Strengths of the Study

This meta-analysis comprehensively evaluated the effects of different PTNS methods on treating OAB and painful bladder syndrome. The literature search was conducted without restrictions on time or language, ensuring a broad inclusion of relevant studies. Parameters related to the electrical stimulation methods were carefully extracted from the included studies. In cases where complete information was lacking, the study team reached out to corresponding authors to obtain detailed explanations on the PTNS application methods used.

## 5.2. Weaknesses of the Study

A notable limitation was that 45 out of 63 studies lacked detailed information on PTNS treatment protocols, leading to their exclusion from the metaanalysis. This lack of detail is one of the study's weaknesses. Additionally, some authors did not respond to requests for clarification, limiting the ability to gather comprehensive data.

The studies included in this systematic review exhibited high heterogeneity in terms of PTNS outcomes across both transcutaneous and percutaneous stimulation techniques, as evidenced by a high I<sup>2</sup> value. For studies examining PTNS for painful bladder syndrome, methodological limitationsincluding small sample sizes, varied diagnostic criteria, protocols-hindered different stimulation and statistical analysis and meta-analysis.

Further, there was considerable variability in the PTNS application methods used for painful bladder syndrome within intervention groups. The presence of different control groups across studies also complicated efforts to draw conclusive findings on the treatment's efficacy.

## 5.3. Suggestions

Future clinical trials should aim to reduce the high heterogeneity observed in studies by standardizing parameters where possible. Studies of painful bladder syndrome were not included in the intragroup comparison of the transcutaneous stimulation effect due to methodological limitations, so it is recommended that future trials include this condition. Additionally, evaluating the intensity of stimulation at the sensory threshold, comparing different stimulation thresholds, and rigorously studying electrode placement methods would provide more precise data on optimal PTNS application for these syndromes.

## 5.4. Conclusions

This study revealed that PTNS can effectively reduce voiding frequency in patients with OAB and painful bladder syndrome. However, due to study heterogeneity and the absence of control groups in many studies, it is challenging to define a standardized PTNS method. Based on the meta-analysis results, PTNS with a frequency of 20 Hz, pulse duration of 200 µs, and stimulation intensity at the pain threshold over 12 - 24 sessions on one foot in both transcutaneous and percutaneous stimulation techniques showed significant reductions in urinary frequency in patients with OAB. While no specific electrode placement method was identified for either transcutaneous or percutaneous techniques, transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation (TTNS) appears to have minimal side effects.

## **Supplementary Material**

Supplementary material(s) is available here [To read supplementary materials, please refer to the journal website and open PDF/HTML].

## Footnotes

**Authors' Contribution:** Study concept and design: M. A. and F. G.; acquisition of data: M. A., F. G., and A. S.; analysis and interpretation of data: M. A., F. G., and A. S.; drafting of the manuscript: M. A., F. G., and A. S.; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: M. A. and F. G.; statistical analysis: H. S. P.; administrative, technical, and material support: M. A. and F. G.; study supervision: F. G.

**Conflict of Interests Statement:** The authors declare no conflict of interest in this study.

**Data Availability:** The data presented in this study are uploaded during submission as an appendix file and are openly available for readers.

**Funding/Support:** This study is funded by Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran.

## References

 Wein AJ, Rovner ES. Definition and epidemiology of overactive bladder. Urology. 2002;60(5 Suppl 1):7-12. discussion 12. [PubMed ID: 12493342]. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(02)01784-3.

- 2. Naser M, Nasr MM, Shehata LH. Updates of Overactive Bladder (OAB) Management. *Inter J Progressive Sci Technol*. 2020.
- Ghavidel-Sardsahra A, Ghojazadeh M, Rahnama I, Naseri A, Yazdandoost S, Khezerloo T, et al. Efficacy of percutaneous and transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation on idiopathic overactive bladder and interstitial cystitis/painful bladder syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2022;41(2):539-51. [PubMed ID: 35032328]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.24864.
- 4.
   Robinson D, Cardozo L. Managing overactive bladder. Climacteric.

   2019;22(3):250-6.
   [PubMed ID: 31034265].

   https://doi.org/10.1080/13697137.2018.1552254.
   31034265].
- Chung E, Lee D, Gani J, Gillman M, Maher C, Brennan J, et al. Position statement: a clinical approach to the management of adult nonneurogenic overactive bladder. *Med J Aust.* 2018;208(1):41-5. [PubMed ID: 29320672]. https://doi.org/10.5694/mja16.01097.
- Ariza-Mateos MJ, Cabrera-Martos I, Ortiz-Rubio A, Torres-Sanchez I, Rodriguez-Torres J, Valenza MC. Effects of a Patient-Centered Graded Exposure Intervention Added to Manual Therapy for Women With Chronic Pelvic Pain: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2019;100(1):9-16. [PubMed ID: 30312595]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.08.188.
- de Wall LL, Heesakkers JP. Effectiveness of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation in the treatment of overactive bladder syndrome. *Res Rep Urol.* 2017;9:145-57. [PubMed ID: 28861404]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC5565382]. https://doi.org/10.2147/RRU.S124981.
- Al-Danakh A, Safi M, Alradhi M, Almoiliqy M, Chen Q, Al-Nusaif M, et al. Posterior Tibial Nerve Stimulation for Overactive Bladder: Mechanism, Classification, and Management Outlines. *Parkinsons Dis*. 2022;2022:2700227. [PubMed ID: 35400016]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8984064]. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2700227.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2021;**10**(1):89. [PubMed ID: 33781348]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8008539]. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4.
- Abulseoud A, Moussa A, Abdelfattah G, Ibrahim I, Saba E, Hassouna M. Transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve electrostimulation with low dose trospium chloride: Could it be used as a second line treatment of overactive bladder in females. *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2018;**37**(2):842-8. [PubMed ID: 28792105]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.23361.
- 11. Ahmed KS, El Badry SM, ElDeeb AM, Rehan MR. Effect of transcutaneous versus percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation on overactive bladder in postmenopausal women. *Eur J Mol Clin Med.* 2020;7:1539-48.
- Alkis O, Sevim M, Guven Kartal I, Baser A, Ibrahim Ivelik H, Aras B. Comparison of transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation (TTNS) protocols for women with refractory overactive bladder (OAB): A prospective randomised trial. *Int J Clin Pract.* 2021;75(9). e14342.
   [PubMed ID: 33966335]. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcp.14342.
- Teixeira Alve A, Azevedo Garcia P, Henriques Jacomo R, Batista de Sousa J, Borges Gullo Ramos Pereira L, Barbaresco Gomide Mateus L, et al. Effectiveness of transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation at two different thresholds for overactive bladder symptoms in older women: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Maturitas*. 2020;135:40-6. [PubMed ID: 32252963]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2020.02.008.
- 14. Bacchi Ambrosano Giarreta F, Milhem Haddad J, Souza de Carvalho Fusco HC, Chada Baracat E, Casarotto RA, Alves Gonçalves Ferreira E. ¿Es más efectivo el tratamiento combinado de electroestimulación transcutánea del nervio tibial y electroestimulación vaginal que el tratamiento en monoterapia de electroestimulación del nervio tibial para la vejiga hiperactiva? Un ensayo controlado aleatorizado. Actas

Urológicas Españolas. 2021;45(1):64-72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acuro.2020.03.012.

- Boudaoud N, Binet A, Line A, Chaouadi D, Jolly C, Fiquet CF, et al. Management of refractory overactive bladder in children by transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation: A controlled study. J Pediatr Urol. 2015;11(3):138 e1-10. [PubMed ID: 25979217]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpurol.2014.09.013.
- Bykoviene L, Kubilius R, Aniuliene R, Bartuseviciene E, Bartusevicius A. Pelvic Floor Muscle Training With Or Without Tibial Nerve Stimulation and Lifestyle Changes Have Comparable Effects on The Overactive Bladder. A Randomized Clinical Trial. Urol J. 2018;15(4):186-92. [PubMed ID: 29781068]. https://doi.org/10.22037/uj.v0i0.4169.
- Ebid AA, El-Shamy SM, El Monsif TA. Effect of Posterior Tibial Nerve Stimulation and Trospium Hydrochloride in Treatment of Overactive Bladder Syndrome: A Randomized Controlled Study. Indian J Physiother Occup Ther. 2012;6(3):36-41.
- Elshora IA, Soliman AA, Ali SI. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation vs trospium chloride in treatment of overactive bladder in elderly women. *The Scientific Journal of Al-Azhar Medical Faculty, Girls.* 2020;4(3):427-32. https://doi.org/10.4103/sjamf.sjamf\_64\_20.
- Finazzi-Agro E, Petta F, Sciobica F, Pasqualetti P, Musco S, Bove P. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation effects on detrusor overactivity incontinence are not due to a placebo effect: a randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled trial. *J Urol.* 2010;**184**(5):2001-6. [PubMed ID: 20850833]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2010.06.113.
- Girtner F, Fritsche HM, Zeman F, Huber T, Haider M, Pickl C, et al. Randomized Crossover-Controlled Evaluation of Simultaneous Bilateral Transcutaneous Electrostimulation of the Posterior Tibial Nerve During Urodynamic Studies in Patients With Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms. *Int Neurourol J*. 2021;25(4):337-46. [PubMed ID: 33504123]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8748303]. https://doi.org/10.5213/inj.2040408.204.
- 21. Gungor Ugurlucan F, Onal M, Aslan E, Ayyildiz Erkan H, Kizilkaya Beji N, Yalcin O. Comparison of the effects of electrical stimulation and posterior tibial nerve stimulation in the treatment of overactive bladder syndrome. *Gynecol Obstet Invest*. 2013;**75**(1):46-52. [PubMed ID: 23171636]. https://doi.org/10.1159/000343756.
- Jacomo RH, Alves AT, Lucio A, Garcia PA, Lorena DCR, de Sousa JB. Transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus parasacral stimulation in the treatment of overactive bladder in elderly people: a triple-blinded randomized controlled trial. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2020;**75**. e1477. [PubMed ID: 31939564]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC6943254]. https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2020/e1477.
- Karademir K, Baykal K, Sen B, Senkul T, Iseri C, Erden D. A peripheric neuromodulation technique for curing detrusor overactivity: Stoller afferent neurostimulation. *Scand J Urol Nephrol.* 2005;**39**(3):230-3. [PubMed ID: 16118096]. https://doi.org/10.1080/00365590510031147.
- Kizilyel S, Karakeci A, Ozan T, Unus I, Barut O, Onur R. Role of percutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation either alone or combined with an anticholinergic agent in treating patients with overactive bladder. *Turk J Urol.* 2015;41(4):208-14. [PubMed ID: 26623150]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC4621149]. https://doi.org/10.5152/tud.2015.94210.
- 25. Mallmann S, Ferla L, Rodrigues MP, Paiva LL, Sanches PRS, Ferreira CF, et al. Comparison of parasacral transcutaneous electrical stimulation and transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation in women with overactive bladder syndrome: A randomized clinical trial. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2020;**250**:203-8. [PubMed ID: 32464435]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2020.05.005.
- 26. Manriquez V, Guzman R, Naser M, Aguilera A, Narvaez S, Castro A, et al. Transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation versus extended release oxybutynin in overactive bladder patients. A prospective randomized trial. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.*

2016;**196**:6-10. [PubMed ID: 26645117]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2015.09.020.

- Martin-Garcia M, Crampton J. A single-blind, randomized controlled trial to evaluate the effectiveness of transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation (TTNS) in Overactive Bladder symptoms in women responders to percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation (PTNS). *Physiotherapy.* 2019;**105**(4):469-75. [PubMed ID: 30862384]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physio.2018.12.002.
- Peters KM, Carrico DJ, Wooldridge LS, Miller CJ, MacDiarmid SA. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation for the long-term treatment of overactive bladder: 3-year results of the STEP study. J Urol. 2013;189(6):2194-201. [PubMed ID: 23219541]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2012.11.175.
- Peters KM, Carrico DJ, Perez-Marrero RA, Khan AU, Wooldridge LS, Davis GL, et al. Randomized trial of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus Sham efficacy in the treatment of overactive bladder syndrome: results from the SUmiT trial. *J Urol.* 2010;**183**(4):1438-43. [PubMed ID: 20171677]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2009.12.036.
- Preyer O, Umek W, Laml T, Bjelic-Radisic V, Gabriel B, Mittlboeck M, et al. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus tolterodine for overactive bladder in women: a randomised controlled trial. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2015;**191**:51-6. [PubMed ID: 26073262]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2015.05.014.
- Ramirez-Garcia I, Blanco-Ratto L, Kauffmann S, Carralero-Martinez A, Sanchez E. Efficacy of transcutaneous stimulation of the posterior tibial nerve compared to percutaneous stimulation in idiopathic overactive bladder syndrome: Randomized control trial. *Neurourol Urodyn.* 2019;38(1):261-8. [PubMed ID: 30311692]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.23843.
- Ramirez-Garcia I, Kauffmann S, Blanco-Ratto L, Carralero-Martinez A, Sanchez E. Patient-reported outcomes in the setting of a randomized control trial on the efficacy of transcutaneous stimulation of the posterior tibial nerve compared to percutaneous stimulation in idiopathic overactive bladder syndrome. *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2021;40(1):295-302. [PubMed ID: 33118624]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.24554.
- Sancaktar M, Ceyhan ST, Akyol I, Muhcu M, Alanbay I, Mutlu Ercan C, et al. The outcome of adding peripheral neuromodulation (Stoller afferent neuro-stimulation) to anti-muscarinic therapy in women with severe overactive bladder. *Gynecol Endocrinol.* 2010;**26**(10):729-32. [PubMed ID: 20210697]. https://doi.org/10.3109/09513591003649815.
- Sherif H, Khalil M, Omar R. Management of refractory idiopathic overactive bladder: intradetrusor injection of botulinum toxin type A versus posterior tibial nerve stimulation. *Can J Urol.* 2017;**24**(3):8838-46. [PubMed ID: 28646940].
- Souto SC, Reis LO, Palma T, Palma P, Denardi F. Prospective and randomized comparison of electrical stimulation of the posterior tibial nerve versus oxybutynin versus their combination for treatment of women with overactive bladder syndrome. *World J Urol.* 2014;**32**(1):179-84. [PubMed ID: 23749315]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00345-013-1112-5.
- Svihra J, Kurca E, Luptak J, Kliment J. Neuromodulative treatment of overactive bladder--noninvasive tibial nerve stimulation. *Bratisl Lek Listy*. 2002;**103**(12):480-3. [PubMed ID: 12696778].
- Vecchioli-Scaldazza C, Morosetti C. Effectiveness and durability of solifenacin versus percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus their combination for the treatment of women with overactive bladder syndrome: a randomized controlled study with a follow-up of ten months. *Int Braz J Urol.* 2018;44(1):102-8. [PubMed ID: 29064651]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC5815539]. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1677-5538.IB[U.2016.0611.

- Zhang Y, Wang S, Zu S, Zhang C. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and solifenacin succinate versus solifenacin succinate alone for treatment of overactive bladder syndrome: A double-blind randomized controlled study. *PLoS One.* 2021;**16**(6). e0253040. [PubMed ID: 34161360]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8221460]. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253040.
- Ayala-Quispe VB, Guerrero-Reyes G, Gutiérrez-González A, Hernández-Velázquez R, Moysén-Marín CM, Barragán-Ochoa C. Eficacia de la neuromodulacion transcutánea vs percutánea del nervio tibial en el síndrome de vejiga hiperactiva no neurogénica. *Revista Mexicana de Urología.* 2020;80(1):1-18. https://doi.org/10.48193/revistamexicanadeurologa.v80i1.588.
- Lashin AM, Eltabey NA, Wadie BS. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation versus sham efficacy in the treatment of refractory overactive bladder: outcomes following a shortened 6-week protocol, a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Int Urol Nephrol.* 2021;53(12):2459-67. [PubMed ID: 34601705]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11255-021-02999-0.
- Pierre ML, Friso B, Casarotto RA, Haddad JM, Baracat EC, Ferreira EAG. Comparison of transcutaneous electrical tibial nerve stimulation for the treatment of overactive bladder: a multi-arm randomized controlled trial with blinded assessment. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2021;**76**. e3039. [PubMed ID: 34406271]. [PubMed Central ID: PMC8341038]. https://doi.org/10.6061/clinics/2021/e3039.
- Sonmez R, Yildiz N, Alkan H. Efficacy of percutaneous and transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation in women with idiopathic overactive bladder: A prospective randomised controlled trial. Ann Phys Rehabil Med. 2022;65(1):101486. [PubMed ID: 33429090]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rehab.2021.101486.
- Welk B, Mckibbon M. A randomized, controlled trial of transcutaneous tibial nerve stimulation to treat overactive bladder and neurogenic bladder patients. *Can Urol Assoc J.* 2020;14(7):E297-303. [PubMed ID: 32017693]. https://doi.org/10.5489/cuaj.6142.
- 44. Zonic-Imamovic M, Sinanovic O, Imamovic M, Muftic M, Jankovic S, Bazardzanovic M. Effects of Transcutaneous and Percutaneous Tibial Nerve Stimulation in Bosnian Female Patients with an Idiopathic Overactive Urinary Bladder. *Acta Med Acad.* 2021;**50**(2):235-43. [PubMed ID: 34847676]. https://doi.org/10.5644/ama2006-124.339.
- Geirsson G, Wang YH, Lindstrom S, Fall M. Traditional acupuncture and electrical stimulation of the posterior tibial nerve. A trial in chronic interstitial cystitis. *Scand J Urol Nephrol.* 1993;27(1):67-70. [PubMed ID: 8493470]. https://doi.org/10.3109/00365599309180416.
- 46. van Balken MR, Vandoninck V, Gisolf KW, Vergunst H, Kiemeney LA, Debruyne FM, et al. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation as neuromodulative treatment of lower urinary tract dysfunction. J Urol. 2001;166(3):914-8. [PubMed ID: 11490245]. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005392-200109000-00025.
- Amarenco G, Ismael SS, Even-Schneider A, Raibaut P, Demaille-Wlodyka S, Parratte B, et al. Urodynamic effect of acute transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation in overactive bladder. *J Urol.* 2003;**169**(6):2210-5. [PubMed ID: 12771752]. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ju.0000067446.17576.bd.
- Barroso UJ, Viterbo W, Bittencourt J, Farias T, Lordelo P. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation vs parasacral transcutaneous neuromodulation for overactive bladder in children. *J Urol.* 2013;**190**(2):673-7. [PubMed ID: 23422257]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2013.02.034.
- Capitanucci ML, Camanni D, Demelas F, Mosiello G, Zaccara A, De Gennaro M. Long-term efficacy of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation for different types of lower urinary tract dysfunction in children. J Urol. 2009;182(4 Suppl):2056-61. [PubMed ID: 19695611]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2009.03.007.
- 50. De Gennaro M, Capitanucci ML, Mastracci P, Silveri M, Gatti C, Mosiello G. Percutaneous tibial nerve neuromodulation is well

tolerated in children and effective for treating refractory vesical dysfunction. *J Urol.* 2004;**171**(5):1911-3. [PubMed ID: 15076308]. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ju.0000119961.58222.86.

- Del Rio-Gonzalez S, Aragon IM, Castillo E, Milla-Espana F, Galacho A, Machuca J, et al. Percutaneous Tibial Nerve Stimulation Therapy for Overactive Bladder Syndrome: Clinical Effectiveness, Urodynamic, and Durability Evaluation. Urology. 2017;108:52-8. [PubMed ID: 28687483]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2017.04.059.
- Fischer-Sgrott FO, Manffra EF, Busato Junior WF. Qualidade de vida de mulheres com bexiga hiperativa refratária tratadas com estimulação elétrica do nervo tibial posterior. *Revista Brasileira de Fisioterapia*. 2009;13(6):480-6. https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-35552009000600003.
- Govier FE, Litwiller S, Nitti V, Kreder KJ, Rosenblatt P. Percutaneous afferent neuromodulation for the refractory overactive bladder: results of a multicenter study. *J Urol.* 2001;165(4):1193-8. [PubMed ID: 11257669].
- 54. Hegazy AS, Ghareeb MEA, Kamal KM, Ashour A. Comparative Study between the Efficacy of Percutaneous Posterior Tibial Nerve Stimulation (PTNS) versus Propiverine Hydrochloride for the Treatment of the Overactive Bladder. *Ain Shams Medical Journal*. 2014;**312**(2077):1-12.
- Klingler HC, Pycha A, Schmidbauer J, Marberger M. Use of peripheral neuromodulation of the S3 region for treatment of detrusor overactivity: a urodynamic-based study. *Urology*. 2000;56(5):766-71. [PubMed ID: 11068296]. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0090-4295(00)00727-5.
- MacDiarmid SA, Peters KM, Shobeiri SA, Wooldridge LS, Rovner ES, Leong FC, et al. Long-term durability of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation for the treatment of overactive bladder. *J Urol.* 2010;**183**(1):234-40. [PubMed ID: 19913821]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2009.08.160.
- Macías-Vera NN, Velázquez-Castellanos PI, Godoy-Rodríguez N. Estimulación transcutánea del nervio tibial posterior versus darifenacina para el tratamiento de vejiga hiperactiva refractaria en mujeres. *Revista Mexicana de Urología*. 2016;**76**(1):3-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uromx.2015.10.003.
- Mathieu L, Peyronnet B, Senal N, Fontaine S, Manunta A, Honore T, et al. [Outcomes of transcutaneous posterior tibial nerve stimulation for overactive bladder in diabetic patients]. *Prog Urol.* 2017;**27**(17):1091-7. [PubMed ID: 28964687]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.purol.2017.08.006.
- Onal M, Ugurlucan FG, Yalcin O. The effects of posterior tibial nerve stimulation on refractory overactive bladder syndrome and bladder circulation. Arch Gynecol Obstet. 2012;286(6):1453-7. [PubMed ID: 22802118]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00404-012-2464-6.
- Pytel Á. A perkután nervus tibialis posterior stimuláció (PTNS) a túlműködő hólyagszindróma kezelésében: első hazai tapasztalatok. Magyar Urológia. 2018;30(2):65-8. https://doi.org/10.22591/magyurol.2018.2.pytela.65.
- van Balken MR, Vergunst H, Bemelmans BL. Prognostic factors for successful percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation. *Eur Urol.* 2006;**49**(2):360-5. [PubMed ID: 16359781]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2005.10.019.
- van Balken MR, Vergunst H, Bemelmans BL. Sexual functioning in patients with lower urinary tract dysfunction improves after percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation. Int J Impot Res. 2006;18(5):470-

5. discussion 476. [PubMed ID: 16528293]. https://doi.org/10.1038/si.ijir.3901457.

- van der Pal F, van Balken MR, Heesakkers JP, Debruyne FM, Bemelmans BL. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation in the treatment of refractory overactive bladder syndrome: is maintenance treatment necessary? *BJU Int.* 2006;**97**(3):547-50. [PubMed ID: 16469023]. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-410X.2006.06055.x.
- Vandoninck V, Van Balken MR, Finazzi Agro E, Petta F, Caltagirone C, Heesakkers JP, et al. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation in the treatment of urge incontinence. *Neurourol Urodyn.* 2003;22(1):17-23. [PubMed ID: 12478596]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.10036.
- Yoong W, Shah P, Dadswell R, Green L. Sustained effectiveness of percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation for overactive bladder syndrome: 2-year follow-up of positive responders. *Int Urogynecol J.* 2013;24(5):795-9. [PubMed ID: 22955253]. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00192-012-1936-3.
- Baykal K, Senkul T, Sen B, Karademir K, Adayener C, Erden D. Intravesical heparin and peripheral neuromodulation on interstitial cystitis. Urol Int. 2005;74(4):361-4. [PubMed ID: 15897705]. https://doi.org/10.1159/000084439.
- 67. Kabay S, Kabay SC, Sevim M. First-line treatment posterior tibial nerve stimulation in patients with interstitial cystitis/bladder pain syndrome. *Central European Journal of Urology*. 2021;74(2):208-14. https://doi.org/10.5173/ceju.2021.0372.
- Ragab MM, Tawfik AM, Abo El-enen M, Elnady M, El-Gamal OM, El-Kordy M, et al. Evaluation of Percutaneous Tibial Nerve Stimulation for Treatment of Refractory Painful Bladder Syndrome. Urology. 2015;86(4):707-11. [PubMed ID: 26188120]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2015.06.041.
- Zhao J, Bai J, Zhou Y, Qi G, Du L. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation twice a week in patients with interstitial cystitis. Urology. 2008;71(6):1080-4. [PubMed ID: 18372023]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2008.01.018.
- Zhao J, Nordling J. Posterior tibial nerve stimulation in patients with intractable interstitial cystitis. *BJU Int.* 2004;**94**(1):101-4. [PubMed ID: 15217440]. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-410X.2004.04909.x.
- Marchal C, Herrera B, Antuna F, Saez F, Perez J, Castillo E, et al. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation in treatment of overactive bladder: when should retreatment be started? *Urology*. 2011;**78**(5):1046-50. [PubMed ID: 21908024]. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2011.07.1394.
- van Balken MR, Vandoninck V, Messelink BJ, Vergunst H, Heesakkers JP, Debruyne FM, et al. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation as neuromodulative treatment of chronic pelvic pain. *Eur Urol.* 2003;**43**(2):158-63. discussion 163. [PubMed ID: 12565774]. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0302-2838(02)00552-3.
- Martellucci J. Electrical Stimulation for Pelvic Floor Disorders. 2015. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06947-0.
- Finazzi-Agro E, Rocchi C, Pachatz C, Petta F, Spera E, Mori F, et al. Percutaneous tibial nerve stimulation produces effects on brain activity: study on the modifications of the long latency somatosensory evoked potentials. *Neurourol Urodyn.* 2009;**28**(4):320-4. [PubMed ID: 19090588]. https://doi.org/10.1002/nau.20651.