

• REVIEW •

Bio-feedback treatment of fecal incontinence: Where are we, and where are we going?

Giuseppe Chiarioni, Barbara Ferri, Antonio Morelli, Guido Iantorno, Gabrio Bassotti

Giuseppe Chiarioni, Gastroenterological Rehabilitation Division of the University of Verona, Valeggio sul Mincio Hospital, Azienda Ospedaliera of Verona, Italy

Barbara Ferri, Gastroenterology and Digestive Endoscopy Institute, Policlinico "GB Rossi", University of Verona Medical School, Italy Antonio Morelli, Gabrio Bassotti, Gastroenterology and Hepatology Section, Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Perugia Medical School, Italy

Guido Iantorno, Digestive Motility Unit, Gastroenterology Municipal Hospital "Dr. C.Bonorino Udaondo", Buenos Aires, Argentina

Correspondence to: Dr. Gabrio Bassotti, Strada del Cimitero, 2/a 06131 San Marco (Perugia), Italy. gabassot@tin.it

Fax: +39-75-584-7570

Abstract

Fecal incontinence is a disabling disease, often observed in young subjects, that may have devastating psycho-social consequences. In the last years, numerous evidences have been reported on the efficacy of bio-feedback techniques for the treatment of this disorder. Overall, the literature data claim a success rate in more than 70% of cases in the short term. However, recent controlled trials have not confirmed this optimistic view, thus emphasizing the role of standard care. Nonetheless, many authors believe that this should be the first therapeutic approach for fecal incontinence due to the efficacy, lack of side-effects, and scarce invasiveness. Well-designed randomized, controlled trial are eagerly awaited to solve this therapeutic dilemma.

© 2005 The WJG Press and Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Key words: Biofeedback; Fecal incontinence

Chiarioni G, Ferri B, Morelli A, Iantorno G, Bassotti G. Biofeedback treatment of fecal incontinence: Where are we, and where are we going? *World J Gastroenterol* 2005; 11 (31): 4771-4775

http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/11/4771.asp

INTRODUCTION

Fecal incontinence is a common health care problem, with modest physical but important psychosocial consequences that can be distressful and incapacitating, up to complete social isolation^[1]. Fecal incontinence is one of the fields in which bio-feedback techniques are thought to be most

successful, and owing to the fact that bio-feedback procedures have had a strong impact in gastro-enterology, behavioral research in this area has greatly increased in recent years^[2,3]. The term bio-feedback training refers to the use of various devices (mechanical, electrical) that are supposedly able to increase the awareness of a biological response, so that patients can learn, through a process of "trial and error", to improve their voluntary control of this response^[4]. Bio-feedback training sessions are usually supplemented by home practice training (Kegel exercises), with the purpose of enforcing muscle strength through an increase of the number of muscle fibers innervated by existing nerves. It is commonly thought that bio-feedback is not able to repair or generate new neural pathways.

The increase of patient's awareness of somatic sensations, and the improvement of motor skills, which represent the basis of biologic self-regulation, are critical points for bio-feedback training. For instance, a cause of fecal incontinence is the loss of the ability to feel rectal fullness, a major point for contracting the pelvic floor muscles to avoid incontinence^[5]. In these patients, the goal of biofeedback training is to improve the ability to detect rectal filling through sensory re-training^[6,7].

Types of bio-feedback training for fecal incontinence

Bio-feedback treatment of fecal incontinence was proposed by Engel and coworkers, 30 years ago^[8]. Patients were taught to improve their ability to voluntarily contract the external anal sphincter during rectal filling, either by improving the strength of the sphincter (motor skills training) or by increasing the ability to perceive weak rectal distention (discrimination training) or by combining the previous two mechanisms (training in the coordination of sphincter contractions with rectal sensation). No side effects were reported and the treatment was generally well accepted. Further trials had shown that therapeutic goals can be achieved through training, that employs measurements of pressures (manometry) or electrical activity (electromyography, EMG) in the anal canal^[2,3].

Manometric bio-feedback

Bio-feedback training aimed at increasing the strength of the external anal sphincter has usually been carried out by recording anal canal pressures, coupled to visual/auditory signals proportional to the pressures themselves. Anal pressure may be recorded by balloon probes or by perfused catheters^[4]. During manometric recording, the patient is required to squeeze as to prevent defecation while being given visual feedback and verbal guidance on how to reach

this goal. The patients may also be taught to inhibit wrong responses such as contraction of the abdominal muscles. Asking the patient to squeeze may be obtained in response to balloon distention of the rectum^[9] or without rectal distention^[10]. Some authors have suggested that improving squeeze duration is more important than maximizing anal strength. Therefore, patients are taught to pursue this therapeutic goal as a part of the bio-feedback protocol^[10,11].

EMG bio-feedback

Strengthening the pelvic floor muscle may also be achieved by showing the patient, a recording of the integrated (average) EMG activity from the striated muscles which surround the anal canal^[12]. In EMG training, the patient is asked to squeeze and relax without rectal distention, and home exercises in which the patient is required to repeatedly squeeze the pelvic floor muscles (Kegel exercises) are usually added to the training to further strengthen these muscles. Other methods of EMG recording of the pelvic floor employ an anal plug with surface electrodes^[13], very easy to use and requiring no preparation.

Sensory discrimination training

This is aimed at increasing the patient's ability to perceive and respond to rectal distention^[14]. After inserting within the rectum a catheter-mounted balloon, the latter is inflated with different air volumes; the patient is then asked to signal when the feeling of distention is perceived, or to contract the pelvic floor muscles in response to the distention. For these purposes, easily perceived distention with large volumes of air is firstly given, the volumes of distention are gradually decreased until the patient is able to perceive them with difficulty. Repeated distention slightly above and below the sensory threshold of the patient, coupled to the investigator's feedback on the accuracy of detection, teach the patient to recognize distention of even weaker intensity^[3,4]. This type of sensory training is often coupled to sphincter strength training, asking the patient always to contract (as strongly as possible) in response to rectal distention and providing feedback on the strength of contraction and accuracy of detection^[3,4]. Several evidences suggest that sensory discrimination training (aimed at reducing the threshold for perception of rectal distention) is very important for an effective bio-feedback procedure^[6-8,15]. We have recently evaluated 24 patients with severe, solid-stool fecal incontinence[16] by teaching them to squeeze in response to rectal distention; the patients were evaluated 3 mo after bio-feedback training, and were classified as responders (>75% decrease of incontinence episodes) or non-responders. Comparison of the two groups showed that responders displayed significantly lower sensory thresholds after training with respect to non-responders, but squeeze pressures were not significantly different between groups. Sensory thresholds measured before bio-feedback training were good predictors of which patients would respond to it; in fact, patients with more severe sensory impairment had poor response to bio-feedback training[16]. Sphincter strength and severity of fecal incontinence before bio-feedback training were not useful as predictors of outcome.

METHODS

An internet-based comprehensive search strategy of the Medline and Science Citation Index was performed using the keywords bio-feedback and fecal incontinence, in various combinations with the Boolean operators AND, OR, and NOT. Only articles related to human studies were used, and manual cross-referencing was also performed. Articles published in English between January 1965 and September 2004 were selected; however, a search in non-English languages and in journals was also older than 1965 performed in our library. Letters were excluded, and abstracts were quoted only when the full papers were unavailable.

Usefulness of bio-feedback in fecal incontinence

Most of the available studies concerning the use of biofeedback to treat fecal incontinence have been carried out by manometric means; however, a clear superiority of pressure vs EMG feedback has not surfaced[17], and only one study aimed at comparing pressure vs EMG feedback training showed no significant differences between the two techniques[18].

Looking at all the studies available in literature regardless of etiology, it is found that about 2/3 of patients display at least a 75% decrease of their episodes of fecal incontinence^[19,20], although only about 50% of them developed complete continence. However, it must be stressed that (1) no uniform criteria for defining improvement or assessing outcome have been adopted; (2) inclusion criteria differed; (3) treatment protocols varied and (4) only few prospective, randomized, parallel-group studies have been published, not enough to draw conclusions on the overall efficacy of bio-feedback training. In addition, recent randomized studies have not confirmed the optimistic outcome of previous open studies. These trials will be examined in detail in the following paragraph.

In a first randomized controlled study, bio-feedback plus behavioral management was compared to behavioral management alone in children with fecal incontinence due to myelomeningocele^[21]; both groups displayed significant improvement, suggesting that bio-feedback has the same effects as behavioral management for most children with myelomeningocele. However, it must be stressed that patients with spinal cord defects show commonly worst responses to bio-feedback than patients with incontinence due to other causes^[22]. In a second controlled study, van der Plas and coworkers studied 71 children with fecal incontinence without constipation and randomized them to standard care and laxatives or standard care and laxatives plus bio-feedback. At 12-18 mo follow-up, approximately 50% of children in both groups showed significant symptoms improvement. A trend toward better outcome was shown in the bio-feedback group, but statistical significance was not reached^[23]. In the first randomized study of bio-feedback in adults with fecal incontinence, a complex cross-over design was employed making interpretation of results quite difficult^[24]. Twenty-five patients were initially randomized to either three sessions, sensory discrimination training without bio-feedback on sphincter strength or equivalent distention without feedback on the accuracy of their detection of the strength of contractions. Patients in the sensory training group had significant decrease of frequency of episodes of incontinence with respect to controls, but between-group differences did not reach statistical significance (probably due to small sample size). Control patients were then given sensory training, and displayed improvement in continence. Thereafter, all patients were randomized again to sphincter-strengthening exercises without bio-feedback or to squeeze in response to rectal distention with feedback. Overall, the patients had further improvement of continence in this second step of the study, but no significant differences were observed between groups, suggesting that sensory training is important for the treatment of incontinence, although the results are not definitive due to the small size samples. Recently, the St. Mark group reported a large, randomized, controlled study on 171 adults with fecal incontinence^[25]. Patients were randomized into four groups: (1) standard care with advice; (2) standard care with advice plus anal sphincter exercises taught verbally and via digital examinations; (3) same as group 2 plus biofeedback therapy run at the clinic; (4) same as group 3 plus sphincter exercises guided by a home bio-feedback device. Approximately half of patients in all groups reported improvement of symptoms at one year follow-up. Interestingly, quality of life measurements, bowel symptoms and anal sphincter pressures were improved in similar percentage in all groups. Bio-feedback therapy yielded no greater benefit than did standard care with advice on an intention-to-treat analysis.

This trial appears methodologically sound in most instances with few, relevant limitations mostly related to the lack of details of the bio-feedback protocol used. Type and dosage of anti-diarrheal medications used in all the groups were also not provided. The results of this trial are at variance with a previous open study coming from the same Center, where bio-feedback therapy was reported to improve symptoms in the majority of patients with fecal incontinence^[26]. Moreover, another prospective, randomized, controlled study comparing pelvic floor exercises plus anal exercises taught via digital examination with either manometry or anal ultrasound-guided bio-feedback in 120 adults with fecal incontinence had failed to show any additional benefit of behavior therapy over Kegel exercises in terms of clinical outcome, quality of life measurements, and anal pressures $\sp[27]$. In this trial, a clinical benefit was evident in the short term in approximately 70% of all patients. The same group then reported this clinical benefit as substantially preserved in the long term follow-up^[28]. Interestingly, quality of life measurements and subjective perception of "catching up" with incontinence improved even in patients whose incontinence scores worsened. Therefore, intervention "per se" seems to improve subjective symptoms perception in fecal incontinence.

Do predictors of outcome exist

Although it is traditionally thought that subgroups of patients (demented, mentally retarded, young children, severely depressed, mobility impaired) are less prone to respond to bio-feedback training, there are few data to support these concepts as guidelines^[29]. The available data may be

summarized as follows: (1) severe mechanical damage of the anal sphincters is generally associated with poor bio-feedback responses[30,31]; (2) major sensory impairment determines a poor response to bio-feedback training[16,26,32]; (3) although many studies have not found the response to bio-feedback predictable on the basis of pretreatment findings[33-35], there are reports showing that a low basal pressure of the internal anal sphincter is associated with poor outcomes^[36]; (4) abnormally prolonged pudendal nerve conduction times are employed to identify subjects with pudendal nerve injuries as a cause of incontinence; these measurements correlate poorly with the response to bio-feedback^[37]; (5) there is no significant association between fecal incontinence and anxiety or depression[38,39], the latter, however, may decrease the patient's ability to learn and to comply with home practice^[40]; (6) the association of constipation by outlet dysfunction may affect outcome unfavorably^[41].

Associate treatments

There are several reports of miscellaneous combinations of bio-feedback with surgical procedures to treat fecal incontinence. Results described as positive have been reported for high imperforate anus repair[42], gracilis muscle transposition[43], and anterior resection of the rectum and total colectomy with ileo-anal anastomosis[44]; however, all these were uncontrolled studies, and the patient sample's were small. Other studies associated electrical stimulation with pelvic floor bio-feedback in a miscellaneous group of patients (including subjects with fecal incontinence and subjects with constipation due to pelvic floor dysfunction), and claimed that this association was more effective that a single approach^[45]. Real-time ultrasonographic imaging of the pelvic floor muscles has also been employed to teach patients with fecal incontinence to squeeze the external anal sphincter^[46], but the trials with this technique are still ongoing. Loening-Baucke implemented standard medical care with a pressure bio-feedback protocol in a small group of adults with fecal incontinence. No additional benefit could be evidenced compared to standard medical care alone^[47].

Conclusions

Although fecal incontinence is a socially devastating disorder, many physicians are still unaware that it is often amenable to treatment^[48]. Recently, well-designed, randomized trials have shown that standard medical care implemented with simple pelvic floor exercises is effective in a large percentage of patients with fecal incontinence. Attention to diet, scheduled defecations and judicious use of anti-diarrheal medications seem to preserve a relevant role in this "untreatable" disease. Traditionally, bio-feedback techniques have been rated to offer a suitable non-invasive method of approaching the problem superior to conservative simpler therapeutic measurements. This has not been confirmed by randomized, controlled trials. Notwithstanding the reported symptoms improvement in over 2/3 of fecally incontinent patients shown in open trials, and the common belief that behavior therapy is a safe and effective therapeutic option for many patients with fecal incontinence, experimental evidence is giving conflicting results. Properly

designed and carefully analyzed bio-feedback trials are actually needed to prove the effectiveness of this treatment in fecal incontinence. Meanwhile, it is reassuring to know that simple therapeutic measurements may effectively help these individuals affected by such a disabling disorder.

REFERENCES

- Bharucha AE. Fecal incontinence. Gastroenterology 2003; 124: 1672-1685
- 2 Bassotti G, Whitehead WE. Biofeedback as a treatment approach to gastrointestinal tract disorders. Am J Gastroenterol 1994; 89: 158-164
- 3 Bassotti G, Chiarioni G. Terapia conductual, relajación, y biorretroalimentación en los trastornos funcionales del tracto digestivo inferior. In Montoro Huguet MA, ed. Principios básicos de Gastroenterología para médicos de familia. Madrid: Jarpyo Editores 2002: 377-390
- 4 Whitehead WE, Heymen S, Schuster MM. Motility as a therapeutic modality: bio-feedback treatment of gastrointestinal disorders. In Schuster MM, Crowell MD, Koch KL, eds. Schuster Atlas of Gastrointestinal Motility, Second edition. Hamilton: BC Decker Inc 2002: 381-397
- 5 **Sun WM**, Read NW, Miner PB. Relation between rectal sensation and anal function in normal subjects and patients with faecal incontinence. *Gut* 1990; **31**: 1056-1061
- 6 Wald A, Tunuguntla AK. Anorectal sensorimotor dysfunction in fecal incontinence and diabetes mellitus. Modification with biofeedback therapy. N Engl J Med 1984; 310: 1282-1287
- 7 Buser WD, Miner PB. Delayed rectal sensation with fecal incontinence. Successful treatment using anorectal manometry. *Gastroenterology* 1986; 91: 1186-1191
- 8 Engel BT, Nikoomanesh P, Schuster MM. Operant conditioning of rectosphincteric responses in the treatment of fecal incontinence. N Engl J Med 1974; 290: 646-649
- 9 Glia A, Gylin M, Akerlund JE, Lindfors U, Lindberg G. Biofeedback training in patients with fecal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 1998; 41: 359-364
- 10 Patankar SK, Ferrara A, Larach SW, Williamson PR, Perozo SE, Levy JR, Mills J. Electromyographic assessment of biofeedback training for fecal incontinence and chronic constipation. Dis Colon Rectum 1997; 40: 907-911
- 11 **Chiarioni G,** Scattolini C, Bonfante F, Vantini I. Liquid stool incontinence with severe urgency: anorectal function and effective biofeedback therapy. *Gut* 1993; **34**: 1576-1580
- 12 Cox DJ, Sutphen J, Borowitz S, Dickens MN, Singles J, White-head WE. Simple electromyographic bio-feedback treatment for chronic pediatric constipation/encopresis: preliminary report. *Biofeedback Self Regul* 1994; 19: 41-50
- 13 **Eisman E,** Tries J. A new probe for measuring electromyographic activity from multiple sites in the anal canal. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1993; **36**: 946-952
- 14 Whitehead WE, Wald A, Diamant NE, Enck P, Pemberton JH, Rao SSC. Functional disorders of the anus and rectum. In Drossman DA, Corazziari E, Talley NJ, Thompson WG, Whitehead WE, eds. Rome II. The functional gastrointestinal disorders, second edition. Mc Lean, VA: Degnon Associates 2000: 483-532
- 15 Latimer PR, Campbell D, Kasperski J. A component analysis of biofeedback in the treatment of fecal incontinence. Biofeedback Self Regul 1984; 9: 311-324
- 16 Chiarioni G, Bassotti G, Stanganini S, Vantini I, Whitehead WE. Sensory retraining is key to biofeedback therapy for formed stool fecal incontinence. Am J Gastroenterol 2002; 97: 109-117
- 17 Heymen S, Jones KR, Ringel Y, Scarlett Y, Whitehead WE. Biofeedback treatment of fecal incontinence: a critical review. Dis Colon Rectum 2001; 44: 728-736
- 18 Heymen S, Wexner SD, Vickers D, Nogueras JJ, Weiss EG, Pikarsky AJ. Prospective, randomized trial comparing four biofeedback techniques for patients with constipation. Dis

- Colon Rectum 1999; 42: 1388-1393
- 19 Enck P. Biofeedback training in disordered defecation. A critical review. Dig Dis Sci 1993; 38: 1953-1960
- 20 Rao SS, Enck P, Loening-Baucke V. Biofeedback therapy for defecation disorders. *Dig Dis* 1997; 15(Suppl 1): 78-92
- 21 Whitehead WE, Parker L, Bosmajian L, Morrill-Corbin ED, Middaugh S, Garwood M, Cataldo MF, Freeman J. Treatment of fecal incontinence in children with spina bifida: comparison of biofeedback and behavioral modification. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1986; 67: 218-224
- 22 Cerulli MA, Nikoomanesh P, Schuster MM. Progress in biofeedback conditioning for fecal incontinence. *Gastroenterology* 1979; 76: 742-746
- 23 van der Plas RN, Benninga MA, Redekop WK, Taminiau JA, Buller HA. Randomised trial of biofeedback training for encopresis. Arch Dis Child 1996; 75: 367-374
- 24 Miner PB, Donnelly TC, Read NW. Investigation of mode of action of biofeedback in treatment of fecal incontinence. *Dig Dis Sci* 1990; 35: 1291-1298
- 25 Norton C, Chelvanayagam S, Wilson-Barnett J, Redfern S, Kamm MA. Randomized controlled trial of biofeedback for fecal incontinence. *Gastroenterology* 2003; 125: 1320-1329
- 26 Norton C, Kamm MA. Outcome of biofeedback for faecal incontinence. Br J Surg 1999; 86: 1159-1163
- 27 Solomon MJ, Pager CK, Rex J, Roberts R, Manning J. Randomized, controlled trial of biofeedback with anal manometry, transanal ultrasound, or pelvic floor retraining with digital guidance alone in the treatment of mild to moderate fecal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 2003; 46: 703-710
- 28 Pager CK, Solomon MJ, Rex J, Roberts RA. Long-term outcomes of pelvic floor exercise and biofeedback treatment for patients with fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2002; 45: 997-1003
- Whitehead WE, Wald A, Norton NJ. Treatment options for fecal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 2001; 44: 131-144
- 30 Iwai N, Nagashima M, Shimotake T, Iwata G. Biofeedback therapy for fecal incontinence after surgery for anorectal malformations: preliminary results. J Pediatr Surg 1993; 28: 863-866
- 31 Leroi AM, Dorival MP, Lecouturier MF, Saiter C, Welter ML, Touchais JY, Denis P. Pudendal neuropathy and severity of incontinence but not presence of an anal sphincter defect may determine the response to bio-feedback therapy in fecal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 1999; 42: 762-769
- 32 Kraemer M, Ho YH, Tan W. Effectiveness of anorectal biofeedback therapy for faecal incontinence: medium-term results. Tech Coloproctol 2001; 5: 125-129
- 33 Sangwan YP, Coller JA, Barrett RC, Roberts PL, Murray JJ, Schoetz DJ. Can manometric parameters predict response to bio-feedback therapy in fecal incontinence? *Dis Colon Rectum* 1995; 38: 1021-1025
- 34 Keck JO, Staniunas RJ, Coller JA, Barrett RC, Oster ME, Schoetz DJ, Roberts PL, Murray JJ, Veidenheimer MC. Biofeedback training is useful in fecal incontinence but disappointing in constipation. Dis Colon Rectum 1994; 37: 1271-1276
- 35 Ferrara A, De Jesus S, Gallagher JT, Williamson PR, Larach SW, Pappas D, Mills J, Sepulveda JA. Time-related decay of the benefits of biofeedback therapy. *Tech Coloproctol* 2001; 5: 131-135
- 36 Hamalainen KJ, Raivio P, Antila S, Palmu A, Mecklin JP. Biofeedback therapy in rectal prolapse patients. Dis Colon Rectum 1996; 39: 262-265
- 37 Diamant NE, Kamm MA, Wald A, Whitehead WE. AGA technical review on anorectal testing techniques. *Gastroenter-ology* 1999; 116: 735-760
- 38 Nelson R, Furner S, Jesudason V. Fecal incontinence in Wisconsin nursing homes: prevalence and associations. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1998; 41: 1226-1229
- 39 Heymen S, Wexner SD, Gulledge AD. MMPI assessment of patients with functional bowel disorders. Dis Colon Rectum 1993; 36: 593-596

- 40 American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 4th ed rev. American Psychiatric Association, Washington (DC), 1999
- 41 Fernandez-Fraga X, Azpiroz F, Aparici A, Casaus M, Malagelada JR. Predictors of response to biofeedback treatment in anal incontinence. Dis Colon Rectum 2003; 46: 1218-1225
- 42 Arnbjorsson E, Breland U, Kullendorff CM, Mikaelsson C, Okmian L. Physiotherapy to improve faecal control after Stephen's rectoplasty in high imperforate anus. Z Kinderchir 1986; 41: 101-103
- 43 **Sielezneff I,** Bauer S, Bulgare JC, Sarles JC. Gracilis muscle transposition in the treatment of faecal incontinence. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 1996; **11**: 15-18
- 44 Ho YH, Chiang JM, Tan M, Low JY. Biofeedback therapy for excessive stool frequency and incontinence following ante-

- rior resection or total colectomy. *Dis Colon Rectum* 1996; **39**: 1289-1292
- 45 Menard C, Trudel C, Cloutier R. Anal reeducation for postoperative fecal incontinence in congenital diseases of the rectum and anus. J Pediatr Surg 1997; 32: 867-869
- 46 Solomon MJ, Rex J, Eyers AA, Stewart P, Roberts R. Biofeed-back for fecal incontinence using transanal ultrasonography: novel approach *Dis Colon Rectum* 2000; 43: 788-792
- 47 **Loening-Baucke V.** Efficacy of biofeedback training in improving faecal incontinence and anorectal physiologic function. *Gut* 1990; **31**: 1395-1402
- 48 Rudolph W, Galandiuk S. A practical guide to the diagnosis and management of fecal incontinence. Mayo Clin Proc 2002; 77: 271-275

Science Editor Guo SY Language Editor Elsevier HK