INVESTIGATE-1		ourvey 2					
While completing the questionnai tests (by which we mean any uroo monitoring), and their application	lynamic test that req	uires catheterisat	on - e.g. cyston	netry, videouro	dynamics, an		•
*1. How would you	describe you	ır current c	linical ro	le?			
C Generalist Obstetrician and	d Gynaecologist or U	rologist					
C Consultant with interest in	Urogynaecology / Fe	emale Urology					
C Subspecialist in Urogynae	C Subspecialist in Urogynaecology/ Female Urology						
C Specialist (Other) NB we a	re only seeking cons	ultant/specialist o	pinion at this st	age in our stud	ly		
(please specify)							
The research question underlying	our studies is:						
'Does invasive urodynamic testin and cost-effectiveness of treatmer					urinary incont	inence improv	e the clinical-
*2. How important	is this resear	rch auestia	n. in vour	opinion?	•		
Not at all important	Somewhat			important		Extremely im	portant
0	C)		0		0	
If our initial pilot studies indicate multicentre basis. Clearly the suc patients. The design of such a stu women with stress or stress prede	cess of such a trial vuldy is anticipated to	would be entirely be similar to that	dependent on h of our pilot stud	aving sufficier dy, i.e. a pragn	nt clinicians a natic multicen	greeable torar itre RCT, rando	ndomising their omising
• no further assessment prior to previously undergone)	surgical treatment (o	ver and above the	e basic clinical a	assessment ar	nd non-invasiv	e tests that the	ey would have
or							
invasive urodynamic tests (co the investigation results	nventional cystometr	y, videourodynan	nics or ambulate	ory urodynamio	cs), with subs	equent treatme	ent dictated by
*3. How willing wo	uld you be to	allow your	patients	to be ent	ered into	o a rando	mised
trial of this design?							40 - 4-4-11-
1 = not at all 2 willing	3 4	5	6	7	8	9	10 = totally willing
0 0	0 0	О	0	О	0	0	0

INVESTIGATE 4 OF STATE OF STAT
INVESTIGATE-1 Clinician Survey 2
Our currently proposed primary outcome for the trial is a patient reported outcome measure, the combined symptom score of the International Consultation on Incontinence female lower urinary tract symptoms questionnaire (ICIQ-FLUTS) http://www.iciq.net/ICIQ.FLUTS.html) at six months after treatment.
4. Do you feel this is an appropriate outcome to use?
C Yes
O No
C No opinion
5. What alternative primary outcome would you suggest?
5. What alternative primary outcome would you suggest:
<u>v</u>
6. The ICIQ-FLUTS questionnaire is scored between 0 and 48. What do you consider is
the minimum <u>difference</u> in ICIQ-FLUTS combined symptom score that you would
consider to be clinically important (as opposed to statistically significant)?
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion C C C C C C
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion C C C C C C C 7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion C C C C C C C 7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion C C C C C C C 7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the
1-4 5-8 9-12 13-16 17-20 21-24 >24 No opinion C C C C C C C 7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below:
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested in participating, please add your name and email address below:
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested in participating, please add your name and email address below: Name
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested in participating, please add your name and email address below: Name
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested in participating, please add your name and email address below: Name Email
7. Please feel free to enter any other comments about outcomes or other aspects of the proposed trial in the box below: 8. If we were to proceed to a mulitcentre trial of this design, and you would be interested in participating, please add your name and email address below: Name

INVESTIGATE-1 Clinician Survey 2

Paul Hilton

Urogynaecologist Newcastle upon Tyne

Malcolm Lucas Urologist Swansea

2000

Doug Tincello Chris Chapple Urogynaecologist Urologist Leicester Sheffield

Olyle Clyle

Netherl

Natalie Armstrong Social Scientist Leicester

Brian Buckley for Bladder & Bowel Foundation Elaine McColl

for Institute of Health & Society Newcastle University