## S4 Figure: A random effects meta-analysis of urinary incontinence after cesarean delivery compared to vaginal delivery

Study or Subgroup	Odds Ratio M–H, Random, 95% CI	Odds Ratio M–H, Random, 95% CI
Abdel-fattah 2011	0.50 [0.37, 0.67]	
Gartland 2012	0.42 [0.29, 0.59]	<del></del>
Gyhagen 2013b	0.64 [0.55, 0.73]	<b>→</b>
Liang 2013	0.56 [0.35, 0.92]	
MacArthur 2011	0.80 [0.68, 0.95]	
Rortveit 2003	0.59 [0.48, 0.73]	
Schytt 2004	0.39 [0.27, 0.56]	
Woolhouse 2012	0.53 [0.38, 0.73]	<del></del>
Total (95% CI)	0.56 [0.47, 0.66]	•
Total events Heterogeneity: $Tau^2=0.04$ ; $Chi^2=24.15$ , $df=7$ ( $P=0.001$ ); $I^2=71\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z=6.75$ ( $P<0.00001$ )		0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 Favors cesarean delivery Favors vaginal delivery