

1  
2  
3 CONstriction OF THE LEVATOR HIATUS DURING INSTRUCTION OF PELVIC  
4 FLOOR OR TRANSVERSUS ABDOMINIS CONTRACTION. A 4D ULTRASOUND  
5 STUDY.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Kari Bø, professor PhD, PT, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences

13  
14 Department of Sports Medicine, Oslo Norway  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 Ingeborg H. Brækken, Msci, PT, MT, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences

21  
22 Department of Sports Medicine, Oslo Norway  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Memona Majida, consultant gynaecologist, Akershus University Hospital

28  
29 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lørenskog, Norway  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Marie E. Engh, Associate professor, PhD, Consultant gynaecologist. Akershus University

35  
36 Hospital, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Lørenskog, Norway  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Correspondent author: Kari Bø, Professor PhD. Norwegian School of Sport Sciences,

42  
43 Department of Sports Medicine. P.O Box 4014, Ulleval Stadion. 0806 Oslo, Norway

44  
45 Tlf. +47 23 26 20 00, Fax +47 22 23 42 20, e-mail: [kari.bo@nih.no](mailto:kari.bo@nih.no)  
46  
47

48  
49 No disclosures

50  
51 An abstract containing these results is accepted as a discussion poster to be presented at the

52  
53 ICS annual meeting in Kairo October 2008  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ABSTRACT

Introduction and Hypothesis: A new theory claims that the pelvic floor muscles (PFM) can be trained via the transversus abdominis (TrA). The aim of the present study was to compare the effect of instruction of PFM and TrA contraction on constriction of the levator hiatus, using 4D perineal ultrasonography.

Methods: Thirteen women with pelvic organ prolapse participated in the study. Perineal ultrasound in standing position was used to assess constriction of the levator hiatus.

Analyses were conducted off-line with measurements in the axial plane of minimal hiatal dimensions.

Results: The reduction of all the hiatal dimensions was significantly greater during PFM than TrA contraction. All patients had a reduction of the levator hiatus area during PFM contraction (mean reduction 24,0% (range 6,1%-49,2%). In two patients there was an increase of the levator hiatus area during TrA contraction.

Conclusions: Instruction of PFM contraction is more effective than TrA contraction.

Key words: levator hiatus, pelvic floor muscles, transversus abdominis, ultrasound

Brief summary: 4D ultrasound showed that instruction of pelvic floor muscle contraction was more effective than transversus abdominis in constriction of the levator hiatus

## INTRODUCTION

Today, there is Level A evidence that pelvic floor muscle training (PFMT) can effectively treat stress (SUI) and mixed urinary incontinence, and it is recommended as first line treatment for these conditions [1]. Cure rates, measured as < 2 grams of leakage on pad testing varies between 44-70% [2]. In addition, there is evidence from three randomized controlled trials (RCT) that PFMT may also be effective in treatment of pelvic organ prolapse (POP) [3- 5].

Recently, a theoretical model involving training of the deep abdominal muscles, in particular the transversus abdominis (TrA), to initiate tonic PFM activity has been introduced to restore pelvic floor dysfunction [6]. This approach is based on the understanding that synergistic activity of the PFM and TrA occurs in normal trunk activities in healthy continent women. It has also been suggested that if women are not able to contract the PFM, contracting the TrA may be used to stimulate PFM contraction [7]. Today, there seem to be an increasing number of physical therapists skipping vaginal palpation and teaching TrA contraction instead of PFM contraction to women with pelvic floor disorders.

The PFM surround the pelvic openings and during a voluntary contraction they close the urethra and increase urethral closure pressure, lift the pelvic organs inside the pelvis, stabilize and prevent descent during rise in intra-abdominal pressure [8] and constrict the levator hiatus (LH) [9]. Because of its position in the bottom of the pelvic canister, the PFM are supposed to contract unconsciously during any increase in intra-abdominal pressure and as a response to impact from ground reaction forces eg during running and jumping. Hence, an increasing tone and co-contraction of the PFM is expected in continent women during increased impact from physical activity, coughing and sneezing [10]. The TrA, due to its anatomical location, can

1  
2  
3 have no such direct effect on the continence mechanism, as it is not surrounding the urethra  
4  
5 and does not form a structural base to counteract gravity in the standing position. A possible  
6  
7 contribution must go via a co-contraction of the PFM during the TrA contraction.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Recently the dimensions of the LH have achieved increasing interest in understanding  
13  
14 pathophysiology and mechanism of incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse (POP) in women  
15  
16 [8]. Reduction of the LH opening can be used to measure the effectiveness of a single PFM  
17  
18 contraction [9]. The aim of the present study was to compare the effect of instruction of PFM  
19  
20 and TrA contraction on constriction of the levator hiatus, using 4D perineal ultrasonography.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Consecutive women, at their first consultation when participating in an ongoing randomized controlled trial (RCT) on PFMT to reduce pelvic organ prolapse (POP), took part in the present study. None of the participants had started to train the PFM. Exclusion criterion for participation in the RCT was inability to understand instructions given in the Norwegian language, being nulliparous, being less than one year post-partum, having had previous pelvic surgery, having chronic lung disease or stage 0 and 4 POP measured by Pelvic Organ Prolapse Quantified (POP-Q) [11]. All participants were interviewed about age, weight, height, education, physical activity level, pelvic floor symptoms and birth history. Pelvic organ prolapse questionnaire was used to assess symptoms of POP [12].

The data examined for this project were obtained in the context of a randomized controlled trial of PFMT on POP approved by the Regional Medical Ethics Committee, and the Norwegian Social Science Data Services. All subjects gave written informed consent to participate.

### Power calculation

So far we have data on LH reduction during PFM contraction from 17 volunteers for a reliability study [13]. We used these data showing that there was a mean 25% (95% CI: 18-32) reduction of the LH area during PFM contraction for the power calculation. We suggest that 50 % less constriction of the LH during TrA contraction compared to each woman's PFM contraction may be a clinically relevant co-contraction. Using alfa 0.05 and power of detecting differences of 0.80, 13 women was the minimum sample size.

### Instruction of PFM and TrA contraction

1  
2  
3 Correct PFM contraction was defined as an inward lift and squeeze around the pelvic  
4 openings and assured with vaginal palpation in crook-lying position [14]. Correct TrA  
5  
6 contraction was taught according to Urquart et al [15]. The participants were first taught to  
7  
8 breathe in and out and then gently and slowly draw in the lower abdomen below the navel  
9  
10 without moving the upper stomach, back or pelvis [15]. Correct contraction was assured with  
11  
12 palpation medial to the anterior superior iliac spines.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 Apparatus

21  
22 A GE E8 ultrasound system (GE Healthcare, Oslo, Norway) with 4-8 MHz curved array  
23  
24 3D/4D ultrasound transducer (RAB 4-8 l/obstetric) was used. The volume acquisition angle  
25  
26 was set to its maximum of 70 ° in the sagittal plane and 85 ° in the coronal plane (frame rate  
27  
28 was approximate 3 Hz).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 Procedure

35  
36 Participants were instructed to void before the examination. After instruction of PFM and TrA  
37  
38 contractions in a crook lying position by a trained physiotherapist (PT), one gynaecologist  
39  
40 (MM) performed the ultrasound examinations. The PT (IHB) gave instructions to the  
41  
42 participants and supervised the test procedure. The PFM and TrA contractions were  
43  
44 performed in the standing position. It took approximately 16 seconds to perform each  
45  
46 manoeuvre and recording was with 4D real time ultrasound. The ultrasound transducer was  
47  
48 covered with a condom and directed cranially on the perineum [16]. Only a minor part of the  
49  
50 PB was scanned in order to include the back sling of the puborectal muscle. All participants  
51  
52 first performed PFM contractions followed by TrA contractions.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Ultrasound analyses

Analyses of 4D real time volumes were conducted offline on a laptop by one investigator (IHB), using the software “4D View v 6.2” (GE Healthcare, Oslo, Norway). All volumes were previewed and excluded from analysis unless a significant portion of the pubovisceral muscle was visible. Measurements were performed in the axial plane of minimal hiatal dimensions (Fig i). The plane of minimal hiatal dimensions was identified as the minimal distance between the hyperechogenic posterior aspect of the PB and the hyperechogenic anterior border of the puborectal muscle at the anorectal angle [9]. The back sling of the puborectal muscle forms a “bump” posterior to the rectum in the mid-sagittal plane [17], which forms the anorectal junction. In order to ensure that the minimal hiatal dimensions were found, the axial and sagittal plane was carefully observed [13]. The area of levator hiatus was measured as the area bordered by the pubovisceral muscle, symphysis pubis and inferior pubic ramus (Fig i). In addition, hiatal dimension from the right to the left side (LHrl) and anteroposterior distance (LHap) were quantified. Intra-tester reliability of constriction of LH area and antero-posterior dimension during PFM contraction has been found to be very good to good [13]. Muscle length of the PFM (pubovisceral muscle) was calculated as the circumference of the LH minus the suprapubic arch [18]. Measurements of the muscle length demonstrated good reliability at rest and fair reliability during contraction [13].

### Statistical analysis

Background variables are reported as frequencies or means with standard deviation (SD). All data were normally distributed. Reduction in levator hiatus dimensions during contraction of PFM and TrA are given as means with SD and as percentages. Differences in reduction levator hiatus area, anterior-posterior dimension, transverse dimension and muscle length between PFM contraction and TrA (effect sizes) are reported as means with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Paired Samples Test is used to test differences between the two manoeuvres. P-

value is set to  $< 0.05$ .

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## RESULTS

Background variables of the study group are shown in Table 1. All participants were of Scandinavian origin. Six women reported mechanical symptoms from their POP (heaviness, bulging), 5 SUI, 2 urge urinary incontinence and 8 defecatory problems.

Changes in LH area, transverse and AP dimensions and PFM length during PFM and TrA contractions are given in Table 2. There was a statistically significant difference in reduction of all the hiatus dimensions in favour of the PFM contraction.

All patients had a reduction of the levator hiatus area during PFM contraction with a mean percentage of reduction of 24.0% (range 6.1%-49.2%). The corresponding percentage of reduction during TrA contraction was 9.5% (range -9.1%-28.7%). In two patients there was an increase of the levator hiatus area (opening of the hiatus) with 0.4% and 9.8% during TrA contraction, respectively.

## DISCUSSION

This study showed that instruction to contract the PFM was significantly more effective than instruction to contract the TrA in constriction of the levator hiatus and shortening of the PFM length in a group of women diagnosed with POP and other symptoms of pelvic floor disorders. During PFM contraction all women had a reduction in all levator hiatus dimensions, while two women had an opening of the hiatus during TrA contraction.

Till date, only few research groups have quantified the constriction of the LH area during PFM contraction [13, 18- 19]. Thyer et al [18] and Braekken et al [13] have both demonstrated that the 4D ultrasound method used is reliable in measuring LH dimensions. Weinstein et al [19] found that there was a constriction of 1.5 cm<sup>2</sup> of the LH area and a reduction of muscle length from 8.7 cm to 7.9 cm in nulliparous asymptomatic women. Thyer et al [18] showed a reduction in LH area from 18.9 to 15.4 cm<sup>2</sup> in women consulting a gynecology clinic. Our results on degree of LH constriction during PFM contraction are somewhat greater than what was found in the above mentioned studies. This may be due to differences in populations and pelvic floor function, but also to the actual instruction and verbal motivation to reach maximal voluntary contraction

We have not been able to find other studies investigating a possible closure of the hiatus during TrA contraction. However, other research groups have investigated a possible co-contraction of the PFM during TrA contraction using other measurement methods. Bø & Stien [20], Sapsford & Hodges [21] and Neumann & Gill [22] found a co-contraction of the PFM during TrA contraction measured with different EMG methods. These studies were all investigating healthy women, were such co-contraction is expected and a factor that may explain that they are continent. The sample sizes of the trials were all small (N=6, 4, 6), and

1  
2  
3 given the small study groups, the results cannot be generalized to the healthy population.  
4  
5 Furthermore, they cannot be extrapolated to be valid in women with different types of pelvic  
6  
7 floor disorders where the pelvic floor muscles, peripheral nerves and fascias may be injured  
8  
9 and not functioning. The present study also had a small sample size, but it was based on a  
10  
11 power calculation, and our results showed that a co-contraction of the PFM during TrA  
12  
13 contraction can not be expected in all women with POP or other pelvic floor disorders.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 The results of the present study support the results of a former study [23]. Using suprapubic  
21  
22 ultrasound we found that in 30% of healthy volunteers there was a downward movement of  
23  
24 the pelvic floor during a TrA contraction. Furthermore, in two participants a voluntary  
25  
26 contraction of the PFM on top of the TrA contraction could not counteract the downward  
27  
28 movement from the TrA. Contrary to this, Jones et al [7] found that there was a co-contraction  
29  
30 of the TrA in a group of 9 SUI women and in 22 healthy volunteers. However, they only  
31  
32 reported their results as mean values for the two groups, and we do not know if all the SUI  
33  
34 women had a co-contraction.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Previous studies have shown that the lift created by a co-contraction of the PFM during TrA  
42  
43 contraction is significantly weaker than what can be utilized with PFM contraction [23- 24].  
44  
45 Bø et al [23] found that the lift during PFM contraction was almost 3 times that occurring  
46  
47 during TrA contraction. Dumoulin et al [24] used MRI to compare bladder neck elevation  
48  
49 during contractions of the PFM, TrA and external rotators of the hip and found that  
50  
51 instruction of PFM contraction was 31.4 % and 50.8% more effective than instruction to  
52  
53 contract TrA and external rotators, respectively. Thompson et al [25] found that incontinent  
54  
55 women displayed greater bladder neck descent than continent women during abdominal curls.  
56  
57  
58 In general muscle training, the training needs to be specific both towards the aimed muscle  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 group and muscle action in order to increase muscle volume and strength [26]. Danneels et al  
4  
5 [27] compared low load stabilization training with targeted resistance training of the lumbar  
6  
7 muscles and found that only the latter increased cross-sectional area. They concluded that  
8  
9 intensive resistance training of the targeted muscle group seemed to be necessary to restore  
10  
11 the size of the muscles in patients with atrophy. The main aim of PFMT is to increase muscle  
12  
13 volume, close the levator hiatus, strengthening both the muscle fibers and the connective  
14  
15 tissue in and around the musculature to make it stiffer, and to lift the PFM into a higher  
16  
17 position inside the pelvis [28]. By changing the morphology a timed and adequately strong,  
18  
19 automatic co-contraction of the PFM may occur during increase in intra-abdominal pressure.  
20  
21 Hence PFMT needs to be specific and target the muscle group that can act on preventing POP  
22  
23 and incontinence.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In clinical physical therapy practices ultrasound or MRI are seldom available, and it is  
33  
34 difficult for the physical therapist to observe PFM function during instruction of TrA  
35  
36 contraction in a valid way from the outside [14]. The results of the present study do not  
37  
38 support the suggestion that there is always a reflex co-contraction of the PFM during TrA  
39  
40 contraction. Hence, we do find a general “justification for facilitation of the PFM via the TrA  
41  
42 if the patients are unable to voluntarily contract the PFM” [7]. On the contrary, if a co-  
43  
44 contraction is not verified, contraction of the TrA may open up the levator hiatus and push the  
45  
46 PFM downwards, thus stretch and weaken the pelvic floor.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Limits of the present study are small sample size to generalize to a larger population and that  
54  
55 we were not able to use a second ultrasound at the TrA simultaneously with the perineal  
56  
57 ultrasound. However, we followed written recommendations on how to instruct and assess an  
58  
59 effective TrA contraction using abdominal palpation [15], and used ultrasound on the TrA on  
60

1  
2  
3 some of the patients in standing to verify correct contraction. Hence, we have made sure that  
4 all the participants were able to perform a correct PFM and TrA contraction. We made the  
5 investigation in standing position as this is where the PFM and TrA muscle should act to  
6 resist gravity. We consider the upright position as a more functional way of assessing PFM  
7 function as this is where symptoms of pelvic floor dysfunction such as SUI and POP is  
8 experienced. One of the benefits of using 4D perineal ultrasound to measure PFM function, is  
9 that the assessment can be done in standing position.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 So far there has been only one RCT investigating whether TrA training has additional effect  
23 of PFMT in treatment of SUI in women [29]. The results did not show any additional effect of  
24 adding TrA training to PFMT. The present study showed that there was a co-contraction of  
25 the PFM with TrA contraction constricting the levator hiatus in 11 out of 13 women, but to a  
26 variable degree ranging from -9.8% to 28.7%. This constriction was significantly less than  
27 during a PFM contraction. Whether this is enough to improve PFM function and reduce SUI  
28 or POP needs to be evaluated in a RCT.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 Conclusions

42 Instruction of PFM contraction is significantly more effective in reducing the levator hiatus  
43 than instruction of TrA contraction in women with POP. In some women with symptoms of  
44 pelvic floor dysfunction contraction of the TrA may open up the hiatus instead of closing it. A  
45 significant co- contraction of the PFM can not be expected during TrA contraction in all  
46 women with pelvic floor dysfunction. In clinical practice indirect training via TrA without  
47 confirming that there is a simultaneous and efficient co-contraction of the PFM is therefore  
48 not recommended.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Acknowledgement  
4

5 We thank Professor, PhD Ingar Holme, Norwegian School of Sports Medicine, Department of  
6 Sports Medicine, Oslo, Norway for valuable advice in statistical analysis of the study. We  
7 gratefully acknowledge support for this research through the EXTRA funds from the  
8 Norwegian Foundation of Health and Rehabilitation and the Norwegian Women's Public  
9 Health Association.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

## REFERENCES

1. Wilson PD, Berghmans B, Hagen S, Hay-Smith J, Moore K, Nygaard I, Sinclear L, Yamanishi T, Wyman J (2005) Adult conservative management. In: Abrams P, Cardozo L, Khoury S, Wein A (eds): Incontinence, vol 1: 255-312. 3<sup>rd</sup> International Consultation on Incontinence. Health Publications Ltd Chap 15: 855-964
2. Bø K (2003) Is there still a place for physiotherapy in the treatment of female incontinence? EAU Update Series 1: 145-153
3. Piya-Anant M, Therasakvichya S, Leelaphatanadit C, Techatrisak K (2003) Integrated health research program for the Thia elderly: Prevalence of genital prolapse and effectiveness of pelvic floor exercise to prevent worsening of genital prolapse in elderly women. J Med Ass Thailand 86: 509-515
4. Hagen S, Stark D, Sinclair L, Glazener C, Ramsay I (2006) A feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial of a pelvic floor muscle training intervention for women with pelvic organ prolapse. Neurourol Urodyn 25: 6: 532-533
5. Ghroubi S, Kharrat O, Charu M, Ayed BB, Guermazi M, Elleuch MH (2008) Apport du traitement conservateur dans la prise en charge du prolapsus urogenital de bas grade. Le devenir apres deux ans. Annales Readaptation Medicine Physique 51: 96-102

1  
2  
3 6. Sapsford R (2004) Rehabilitation of pelvic floor muscles utilizing trunk stabilization.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Manual Ther 9: 3-12  
11

12 7. Jones RC, Peng Q, Shishido K, Perakash I, Constantinou CE (2006) 2D ultrasound imaging  
13 and motion tracking of pelvic floor muscle (PFM) activity during abdominal manoeuvres in  
14 stress urinary (SUI) women. Neurourol Urodyn 25, 6: 596-597  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 8. Ashton-Miller JA, DeLancey JOL (2007) Functional anatomy of the pelvic floor. Ann NY  
21 Acad Sci, 1101: 266-296  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 9. Dietz HP, Shek C, Clarke B (2005) Biometry of the pubovisceral muscle and levator hiatus  
31 By three dimensional pelvic floor ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 25,6:580-585  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 10. Bø K (2004) Pelvic floor muscle training is effective in treatment of female stress urinary  
42 incontinence, but how does it work? Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct 15: 76-84  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 11. Bump R, Mattiasson A, Bø K, Brubaker L., DeLancey J, Klarskov P, Shull BL, Smith  
52

53 ARB (1996) The standardization of terminology of female pelvic organ prolapse and pelvic  
54 floor dysfunction. Am J Obstet Gynecol 175:10-17  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
12. Mouritsen, L, Larsen JP (2003) Symptoms, bother and POPQ in women referred with Pelvic organ prolapse. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 4, 2: 122-127
13. Braekken I.H., Majida M., Ellstrom-Eng M, Dietz HP, Umek W, Bo K (2008) Test-retest and intra-observer repeatability of two-, three- and four-dimensional perineal ultrasound of pelvic floor muscle anatomy and function. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 19: 227-235
14. Bø K, Sherburn M (2005) Evaluation of female pelvic- floor muscle function and strength. *Phys Therapy* 85,3:269-282
15. Urquhart DM, Hodges PW, Allen TJ, Story IH. (2005) Abdominal muscle recruitment during a range of voluntary exercises. *Manual Therapy* 10: 144-155
16. Dietz HP, Wilson PD, Clarke B (2001) The use of perineal ultrasound to quantify levator activity and teach pelvic floor muscle exercises. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 12: 166-168
17. Margulies RU, Hsu Y, Kearney R, Stein T, Umek WH, DeLancey JOL (2006) Appearance of the levator ani muscle subdivisions in magnetic resonance images. *Obstet Gynecol* 107,5:1064-1069

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
18. Thyer I., Shek C, Dietz HP (2008) New imaging method for assessing pelvic floor biomechanics. *Ultrasound Obstet.Gynecol.* 31: 201-205
19. Weinstein MM, Jung SA, Pretorius DH, Nager CW, den Boer DJ, Mittal RK (2007) The reliability of puborectalis muscle measurements with 3-dimensional ultrasound imaging. *Am.J Obstet.Gynecol* 197, 1, 68 e1-6
20. Bø K, Stien R (1994) Needle EMG registration of striated urethral wall and pelvic floor muscle activity patterns during cough, valsalva, abdominal, hip adductor, and gluteal muscles contractions in nulliparous healthy females. *Neurourol Urodyn* 13: 35-41
21. Sapsford R, Hodges P (2001) Contraction of the pelvic floor muscles during abdominal maneuvers. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 82: 1081-1088
22. Neumann P, Gill V (2002) Pelvic floor and abdominal muscle interaction: EMG activity and intra-abdominal pressure. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic Floor Dysfunct* 13, 125-132
23. Bø K, Sherburn M, Allen T (2003) Transabdominal measurement of pelvic floor muscle activity when activated directly or via a transversus abdominis muscle contraction. *Neurourol Urodyn* 22: 582-588

- 1  
2  
3 24. Dumoulin C (2006) Papers to be read by title. International Continence Society Annual  
4 Meeting, Christchurch, New Zealand  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 25. Thompson JA, O'Sullivan P, Briffa NK, Neumann P (2000) Comparison of transperineal  
12 and transabdominal ultrasound in the assessment of voluntary pelvic floor muscle contractions  
13 and functional manoeuvres in continent and incontinent women. *Int Urogynecol J Pelvic*  
14 *Floor Dysfunct* 18: 779-786  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 26. Haskell WL, Lee IM, Pate RR, Powell KE, Blair SN, Franklin BA, et al 2007 Physical  
25 activity and public health. Updated recommendations for adults from the American College of  
26 Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 39:1423-1434  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 27. Danneels L, Cools A, Vanderstraeten G, Cambier D, Witvrouw E, Burgois J, Cuyper HJ  
35 De (2001) The effects of three different training modalities on the cross-sectional area of  
36 the paravertebral muscles. *Scand J Med Sci Sports* 6:347-354  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 28. Bø K (2007): Pelvic floor muscle training for stress urinary incontinence. In: Bø K,  
47 Berghmans B, Mørkved S, van Kampen M (eds): Evidence based physical therapy for the  
48 pelvic floor. Bridging science and clinical practice. Elsevier, London Chap 9: 171-187  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 29. Dumoulin C, Lemieux MC, Bourbonnais D, Gravel D, Bravo G, Morin M (2004)  
4  
5  
6 Physiotherapy for persistent postnatal stress urinary incontinence: a randomized controlled  
7  
8 trial. Obstet Gynecol 104: 504-510  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review

Table 1: Background variables of the participants. Mean with standard deviation (SD). N=13

Age (years)	46.5 (7.2)
BMI (kg/h <sup>2</sup> )	24.7 (3.6)
Parity	2.6 (0.8)
POP-Q stage (N)	
1	3
2	9
3	1

Table 2: Changes in levator hiatus opening dimensions and muscle length shortening during pelvic floor muscle (PFM) and transversus abdominis (TrA) contraction measured by 4D ultrasound. N = 13. Mean values with SD and mean difference between PFM and TrA contraction with 95% confidence intervals (CI).

	PFM contraction	TrA contraction	Mean difference with 95% CI	p-value
Change in levator hiatus area (cm <sup>2</sup> )	5.16 (3.20)	1.86 (2.23)	3.30 (1.35-5.25)	0.003
Change in transverse dimension (cm)	0.20 (0.31)	-0.02 (0.30)	0.23 (0.05-0.40)	0.016
Change in anterior-posterior dimension (cm)	1.24 (0.70)	0.70 (0.56)	0.54 (0.23-0.86)	0.003
Muscle length shortening (cm)	2.46 (1.39)	1.39 (1.19)	1.07 (0.20-1.95)	0.022

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Legends to figures

Fig. 1: Measurements in the axial plane of minimal hiatal dimensions. Levator hiatus area (LH area) is marked with lines. LH ap= levator hiatus; antero-posterior diameter. LH rl= Levator hiatus; transverse diameter right-left. PS= pubic symphysis."Test-retest reliability of pelvic floor muscle contraction measured by 4D ultrasound, Brækken et al, Neurourology and Urodynamics, in press 2008, Copyright © [2008] Wiley-Liss, Inc"

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig.i