

What do we know about reporting of social determinants of health in randomised controlled trials of non-surgical interventions for treating pelvic organ prolapse?

Results of a secondary analysis of a Health Technology Assessment

Eugenie Evelynne Johnson,¹ Ryan PW Kenny,¹ Aoife Oliver,¹ Madeleine Still,¹ Sheila A Wallace,¹ Lucy Dwyer,² Nicola Adanna Okeahialam,² Tafadzwa Patience Kunonga¹

¹ Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
² Saint Mary's Hospital, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK

www.ics.org/2026/abstract/847

**AIMS**

To identify how social determinants of health are reported in current randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of non-surgical interventions for treating pelvic organ prolapse (POP).

METHODS: OVERVIEW

**Protocol registration**
Secondary analysis registered on OSF

**Study selection**
Gold standard according to Cochrane Handbook (1)

**Synthesis**
Tabulated using PROGRESS-Plus domains (2)

**Searches run**
Up to April 2025, including iterative citation chaining

**Data extraction**
Gold standard according to Cochrane Handbook (1)



Eligibility criteria and methods for the main Health Technology Assessment were shaped with the involvement of 10 women with lived experience of POP



Full methods available in the OSF protocol; scan to read

RESULTS: OVERVIEW OF STUDIES



53 studies with 9442 women with POP included



26 studies set in low-and-middle-income countries



Overall limited reporting of PROGRESS-Plus domains

RESULTS: EXCLUSION CRITERIA IN STUDIES

Some trials **excluded women with comorbidities or additional health needs** with no explicit rationale for these criteria reported

Mental and psychiatric disorders (N=9)

Detrusor overactivity (N=2)

Cognitive disorders (N=1)

Intrinsic sphincter (N=1)

Cystometric capacity reduction (N=1)

RESULTS: DEMOGRAPHICS REPORTED AT BASELINE

Age, postpartum status and menopausal status reported in **more than 50% of included studies**

Place of residence, ethnicity, culture, language, occupation, socioeconomic status **reported in less than 20% of all studies**

Gender/sex, religion, sexual orientation, time-dependent relationships **not reported** in any of the 53 studies

CONCLUSIONS

Description of social determinants of health associated with inequalities is **poorly reported**

IMPLICATIONS

Future RCTs should **report PROGRESS-Plus factors at baseline** and ensure they are clinically and socio-economically inclusive

REFERENCES

(1) Higgins JPT, et al, editor(s). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.5 (updated August 2024). Cochrane, 2024. Available from www.cochrane.org/handbook.
(2) O'Neill J, et al. Applying an equity lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in health. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2014;67(1):56 – 64.