#### Accepted Manuscript

# 

#### Title: LASER THERAPY FOR THE GENITOURINARY SYNDROME OF MENOPAUSE. A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Authors: Eleni Pitsouni, Themos Grigoriadis, Matthew E. Falagas, Stefano Salvatore, Stavros Athanasiou

PII:	S0378-5122(17)30080-4
DOI:	http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2017.06.029
Reference:	MAT 6849
To appear in:	Maturitas
Received date:	13-2-2017
Revised date:	18-6-2017
Accepted date:	22-6-2017

Please cite this article as: Pitsouni Eleni, Grigoriadis Themos, Falagas Matthew E, Salvatore Stefano, Athanasiou Stavros.LASER THERAPY FOR THE GENITOURINARY SYNDROME OF MENOPAUSE.A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS.*Maturitas* http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2017.06.029

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

# LASER THERAPY FOR THE GENITOURINARY SYNDROME OF MENOPAUSE. A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Eleni Pitsouni<sup>1</sup>, Themos Grigoriadis<sup>1</sup>, Matthew E. Falagas<sup>2</sup>, Stefano Salvatore<sup>3</sup>, Stavros Athanasiou<sup>1</sup>

 Urogynaecology Unit, 1<sup>st</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, "Alexandra" Hospital, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

2. Alfa Institute of Biomedical Sciences (AIBS), Athens, Greece; Department of Medicine-Infectious Diseases, IASO General Hospital, Athens, Greece; Department of Medicine, Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

3. Obstetrics and Gynecology Unit, Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, IRCCS San Raffaele Hospital, Milan, Italy Urogynecology Unit

**Corresponding author:** Associate Professor Stavros Athanasiou, Urogynecology Unit, 1<sup>st</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, "Alexandra" Hospital, Medical School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Vasilisis Sofias Ave. 80, 11528, Athens, Greece. **Tel:** +30 210 7213294. **E-mail:** <u>stavros.athanasiou@gmail.com</u>

#### Highlights

- Intravaginal laser-therapy appears promising for the treatment of GSM
- Available studies consistently indicate alleviation of all GSM symptoms
- Sexual function and quality of life may improve clinically meaningful
- Local pathophysiology may regain a premenopausal status
- Quality of evidence is "low" or "very low" and RCTs are not available

#### ABSTRACT

This study aimed to identify and then synthesize all available data regarding the efficacy of laser therapy for postmenopausal women with genitourinary syndrome of menopause (GSM) with/without urinary incontinence (UI). PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Cochrane Library and ClinicalTrials.gov were searched in October 2016. The keywords were "laser genitourinary syndrome of menopause", "laser vulvovaginal atrophy", "laser vaginal atrophy" and "laser women incontinence". Quality of reporting and risk of bias of the included studies were assessed according to STROBE and MINORs checklists, respectively. Quality of the body of evidence was evaluated with the GRADE approach. Fourteen studies involving 542 participants were included in this GSM systematic review and meta-analysis. All symptoms (dryness/dyspareunia/itching/burning/dysuria/urgency/frequency) and UI decreased significantly and consistently in all available publications. The pooled mean differences for the various symptoms -5.5(95%CI:-6.7,-4.4;7studies;I<sup>2</sup>:0%), were: dryness dyspareunia -5.6(95%CI:-6.8,-4.5;7 studies;I<sup>2</sup>:0%), itching -4(95%CI:-5.7,-2.2;6 studies;I<sup>2</sup>:79%), burning -3.9(95%CI:-5.9,-2;6 studies;I<sup>2</sup>:87%), dysuria -2.9(95%CI:-5.1,-0.7;4 studies;I<sup>2</sup>:90%) and UI -4.9(95%CI:-6.4,-3.4;2 studies;I<sup>2</sup>:0%). Because urgency/frequency was assessed by different methodologies the data could not be meta-analyzed. Furthermore, KHQ, UDI-6, MCS12/PCS12, FSFI, overall sexual satisfaction and measurements of the effect of laser therapy on the local pathophysiology improved significantly. In conclusion, laser therapy for postmenopausal women with GSM appears promising. It may reduce symptom severity, improve quality of life of postmenopausal women and restore the vaginal mucosa to premenopausal status. However, the quality of the body of evidence is "low" or "very low" and, thus, evidence-based modification of current clinical practice cannot be suggested.

**Keywords**: genitourinary syndrome of menopause (GSM), lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS), incontinence, dyspareunia, Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI), laser therapy

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The urinary and the genital tract systems have the same embryological origin and are both under the influence of estrogens[1]. Decline of estrogens during menopause results in symptoms and clinical signs from both systems, defining the Genitourinary Syndrome of Menopause (GSM)[2]. Depending on type and severity of symptoms, various therapeutic strategies are available[3-7].

Intravaginal laser therapy, a recently introduced treatment modality, has been proposed for the treatment of GSM and/or urinary incontinence (UI)[8-13]. Two laser-technologies, Microablative fractional CO<sub>2</sub>-laser (CO<sub>2</sub>-laser) (SmartXide<sup>2</sup> V<sup>2</sup>LR, Monalisa Touch, DEKA, Florence, Italy) and Non-ablative photothermal Erbium:YAG-laser (Er:YAG-laser) (Fotona Smooth<sup>TM</sup> XS, Fotona, Ljubljana Slovenia) have been used in postmenopausal women with GSM and/or UI[8-13].

In the current literature 3 reviews regarding the intravaginal use of  $CO_2$  or Er:YAG lasertechnologies are available[8-10]. They suggested that laser-therapy may improve the vaginal epithelium and alleviate GSM symptoms of postmenopausal women[8-10]. However, these reviews were not systematic nor meta-analyses and a critical appraisal of the evidence using validated tools was not performed. Furthermore, newer studies have been published that are not included in the above reviews.

The aim of this systematic review was to identify and meta-analyze the available evidence regarding the efficacy of intravaginal laser-therapy in postmenopausal women with symptoms and clinical signs of GSM with/without UI. Specifically, we aimed to systematically summarize-synthesize evidence on objective and subjective measurements of symptoms and clinical signs of postmenopausal women with GSM following laser-therapy compared to those not receiving or

before receiving one. We also investigated whether the available data may provide evidence-based change in current clinical practice.

#### **METHODS**

PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Cochrane Library and ClinicalTrials.gov were searched in October 2016. For each database 4 search-strategies were performed. For each search-strategy, one of the following combinations of keywords was used "laser genitourinary syndrome of menopause" or "laser vulvovaginal atrophy" or "laser vaginal atrophy" or "laser women incontinence". No limits were used for either database. Articles full texted, published in peer-reviewed journals, written in English language, using intravaginal-laser in postmenopausal women for the management of GSM with/without UI were eligible to be included in this study. Hand search of the reference lists of the eligible articles was also performed to achieve complete coverage of the literature and limit publication bias. Conference abstracts without full text publication and unpublished studies were excluded. "Grey literature" was not searched.

Data were extracted for the following aspects: First author, year of publication, study design, type of laser-technique, number of participants, baseline characteristics of postmenopausal women, therapeutic protocol, follow-up period, subjective measurements of GSM symptoms (dryness, dyspareunia, itching, burning, dysuria, frequency, urgency, urinary tract infections) and UI, tools of assessing Quality of Life, sexual function, objective measurements of the laser effect on the local pathophysiology, adverse events and drop-outs due to adverse events. Subjective measurements of GSM symptoms and UI defined the primary outcomes. All other outcomes were considered as secondary ones.

Additionally, all authors independently evaluated the studies design for quality of reporting, risk of bias and quality of evidence. Quality of reporting was assessed using Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) checklist[14]. Risk of bias assessment was performed using the methodological index for non-randomized studies (MINORS) checklist[15,16]. A study with score  $\leq$ 50% of maximum score (8 for uncontrolled before- and after-studies and 12 for controlled ones) was considered belonging in "high risk of bias" category[16]. Quality of the body of evidence was assessed by the GRADE system of rating for the outcomes that could be meta-analyzed[17]. Any discrepancies were resolved by the consensus of all authors. All types of study design, regardless of quality, were considered for this systematic review and meta-analysis. Meta-analysis of each outcome included studies with the same methodology of assessment that provided the relevant data not only p-values.

Heterogeneity between studies was assessed using I<sup>2</sup> statistic[17,18]. Publication bias was intended to be assessed by appropriate tests (i.e funnel-plot), with their known limitations[19,20]. Estimated overall laser effect despite laser-technology [pooled mean difference and 95% confidence intervals (CIs)], was computed (when  $\geq$ 2 studies were involved) using Review Manager 5.3 and data type of generic inverse variance, using inverse variance as statistical method, random effects model and difference in means as effect measure. Additionally, subgroup-analyses estimating CO<sub>2</sub>-laser or Er:YAG-laser efficacy were intended to be performed using the above described methodology.

#### RESULTS

The systematic process for identification of eligible studies to be included in the current systematic review is presented in Figure 1. Fourteen studies with 542 participants were considered eligible to be included in this review[21,34].

Main characteristics of the included studies are presented in Table 1. Ten studies used CO<sub>2</sub>-laser (SmartXide<sup>2</sup> V<sup>2</sup>LR, Monalisa Touch, DEKA, Florence, Italy), while 4 studies used Er:YAG-laser (Fotona Smooth<sup>TM</sup> XS, Fotona, Ljubljana Slovenia)[24,27-29]. Twelve studies were prospective uncontrolled before- and after-studies (10 CO<sub>2</sub>-laser and 2 Er:YAG-laser)[21-23,25-27,29-34]. Two studies were prospective controlled before- and after-studies, using estriol as control-group (both used Er:YAG-laser)[24-28].

In all studies treatment protocol involved 3 laser-therapies. Assessment of outcomes was performed before the initiation of laser-therapy and after the last laser-therapy. The time-period between last laser-therapy and assessment of outcomes was defined as follow-up period. In all but 2 studies dyspareunia and dryness were assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) 0-10[22,23,25-33], while in 1 study VAS 0-5[21] and in 1 VAS 0-3[24]. Hence, these studies[21,24] could not contribute in the meta-analysis. In all studies itching, burning and dysuria were assessed by VAS 0-10. Frequency and urgency were assessed following different methodologies such as micturition diaries[26] and questionnaires (Overactive Bladder-Questionnaire short form (OAB-Q SF)[26], the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaires (ICIQ-FLUTS) (filling domain) and the Urinary Distress Inventory-6 (UDI-6)[22]. Hence, they could not be meta-analyzed. UI was assessed by micturition dairies[26], UDI-6[22] and ICIQ-Urinary Incontinence Short Form (ICIQ-UI SF)[22,27,28]. None of the studies investigated the efficacy of laser therapy in patients with a history of UTIs or rUTIs.

Outcome data of included studies are presented in Table 1. The "high risk of bias" category of the quality assessment did not apply to any of the studies. Tests for publication bias although intended to be assessed, were not assessed following the recommendations on testing funnel-plot asymmetry by Cochrane[19]. The quality of the body of evidence is reported in Supplementary Table 1.

#### **1.1 Primary outcomes**

All primary outcomes are presented in Table 2. The forest plots of the meta-analyses at 1-month follow-up are presented in Figure 2. All primary outcomes decreased significantly in all relevant studies. Overall UI decreased significantly at 1-month follow-up and the result maintained up to 6-months follow-up[22,26-28]. Quality of the body of evidence rated "low" for dryness, dyspareunia and UI. Quality of evidence rated "very low" for itching, burning and dysuria (Supplementary Table 1).

In subgroup-analysis of CO<sub>2</sub>-laser the pooled mean difference of dryness and dyspareunia was -5.5 (95%CI:-6.6, -4.4;p<0.00001, I<sup>2</sup>:0%;n=255) and -5.5 (95%CI:-6.6, -4.4;p<0.00001; I<sup>2</sup>:0%;n=229), respectively[22,26,30-33]. At 3-months follow-up (VAS 0-10) mean difference of dryness and dyspareunia was -6.1 and -5.4, respectively (n=27)[25].

Subgroup-analysis of Er:YAG-laser group was not performed due to lack of data of 2[27,29] out of 3 relevant studies. However, in all studies the significant improvement of dryness and dyspareunia maintained up to 18-months follow-up. Estriol-group maintained the significant improvement up to 6-months after last application with a subsequent significant worsening of symptoms at 18-months post-estriol treatment.

#### 1.2 Secondary outcomes

Female Sexual Function Index (FSFI) and overall sexual satisfaction of participants (as evaluated by a VAS 0-10), Vaginal Health Index (VHIS) and Vaginal Maturation Value (VMV) increased significantly in all relevant studies (Table 3, Figure 3). At 1-month follow-up 85%-98% of participants that were not sexually active at baseline resumed their sexual activity[22,31]. Quality of

the body of evidence rated "low" for FSFI, overall sexual satisfaction and VHIS and "very low" for MCS12, PCS12 and VMV (Supplementary Table 1).

In subgroup-analysis of the CO<sub>2</sub>-laser effect on VHIS the pooled mean difference was 10.8 (95%CI:8.7-12.9;p<0.00001, I<sup>2</sup>:0%;n=231)[21,22,26,30,32,33]. VHIS increased significantly in breast-cancer survivors irrespectively of receiving or not adjuvant therapy (aromatase inhibitors or tamoxifen) (n=50)[30]. Furthermore, VMV increased significantly by Er:YAG-laser and estriol application but the mean VMV values were higher following laser-therapy[28]. At 1 month-follow-up Er:YAG-laser and estriol improved VHIS similarly, but at 3-months follow-up Er:YAG-laser was superior to estriol as regards VHIS[28].

King's Health Questionnaire (KHQ) total score decreased significantly from mean 235.9 before laser-therapy to 114.1 at 1-month follow-up[22]. A change from baseline of at least 5 points on King's Health Questionnaire domains (minimal clinically important difference -MCID[35], was exceeded in all KHQ domains of all participants (n=35)[22]. Additionally, UDI-6 scores decreased significantly (total score, Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4)[22].

Histopathological changes of vaginal mucosa were observed up to 12-months follow-up (2 studies, n=11)[24,34]. Specifically, there was increase of the vaginal epithelium thickness as well as improvement in vascularization and angiogenesis penetrating the new papillary formation. Fibroblasts number and synthesis of fibrilar components of extracellular matrix was also increased. Additionally, the histopathological study evaluating the CO<sub>2</sub>-laser effect reported high levels of glycogen, stored in large epithelial cells and augmented exfoliation of superficial epithelial cells.

A microbiological study using Gram-stain as a method of assessment, reported significant increase of vaginal epithelial cells (n=53)[23]. Vaginal microenvironment changed, with significant improvement of normal vaginal flora, increase of lactobacilli and decrease of *E. coli* and *Mobiluncus*. Specifically, prevalence of normal flora and lactobacilli rose from 45% to 90% and from 30% to 79%, respectively. In 2 studies (n=78), vaginal fluid's pH decreased significantly from mean 5.5 to 4.7 and from 5.0 to 4.1 (before, 1- and 3-months follow-up, respectively)[23,24]. However, in 1 study (n=27) a trend of pH increase at 3-months follow-up was observed[25].

The Patients Global Impression of Improvement (PGI-I) rated "very much better/much better" at 1and 3-months follow-up in 90% and 73% of participants, respectively (n=80)[22,25]. At 1-month follow-up, 5-point Likert scale rated "very satisfied/satisfied" in 61% to 100% of participants (n=188)[21,25,30,32,33]. Moreover, 76% and 52% of breast cancer survivors were 'Very satisfied/satisfied" at 1- and 11-months' follow-up, respectively (n=50)[21]. Additionally, 85%-95% stated that laser procedure was "excellent/excellent-good" (n=108), while for 84% of participants estriol procedure was "excellent-good" (n=19)[27,28].

Six studies (n=230) reported that no adverse events were noted. Adverse events included pain during probe insertion[21], discomfort related to first application[27], mild irritation of the introitus starting immediately after laser-therapy and resolving spontaneously in about 2 hours[22,23], mild or moderate pain lasting 2-3 days[25,28], minor bleeding or spotting[24,25], sensation of warmth and slight edema[24]. Two out of the 542 participants discontinued therapy due to discomfort related to first application/burning sensation that started 36 hours post-therapy and lasted for 2 days. Both women received Er:YAG-laser therapy.

#### DISCUSSION

Intravaginal laser-therapy, is a recently proposed treatment modality for the management of GSM with/without UI. This systematic review and meta-analysis assessed the efficacy and safety of laser-therapy in postmenopausal women with GSM/UI and evaluated also the quality of evidence. Decrease of GSM symptoms and UI severity, has been indicated by current literature consistently. The described symptoms' relief or amelioration appeared to be in accordance with the reported histopathological changes of vaginal mucosa, restoration of the vaginal flora and increase of VHIS and VMV. Quality of life, sexual function and overall satisfaction with sexual life of women receiving laser-therapy seemed to improve significantly not only in statistically but also in clinically meaningful levels. The implied beneficial effects of laser-therapy were ratified by the PGI-I and 5-point Likert scale with the clear majority of participants stating "very much better/better" and "very satisfied/satisfied" following 3 laser-sessions, respectively. However, no Randomized Controlled Trials were retrieved. The preponderance of studies was uncontrolled before- and after-studies and quality of the body of evidence rated "low" or "very low".

Dryness and dyspareunia are considered the most common and bothersome GSM symptoms[36-38]. They tend to worsen in time with their initial appearance to be estimated at about 1-year after the last menstrual period[37]. Low-dose vaginal estrogens are the gold standard of local therapy and the available quality of evidence, comparing estrogens to placebo, has been rated "moderate"[39]. However, for breast-cancer survivors' estrogens should be retained as second line therapy[40]. In this review although the quality of evidence was low, dryness and dyspareunia consistently improved in all studies, regardless of the laser-technique. Controlled studies comparing Er:YAG-laser therapy to estriol found similar effect in both groups of participants with laser-group maintaining the beneficial effect for longer period[24,28]. Nevertheless, no safe conclusions can be deducted as in one of these studies estriol cream was applied prior to laser-therapy and different range of VAS for the assessment of symptoms' severity was used. A future evaluation of combined therapy using low-

dose estriol and Er:YAG-laser could be of great interest. In a study including postmenopausal breastcancer survivors' dyspareunia decreased significantly in similar manner to the other studies included in this review[21]. These results were also in accordance to a study evaluating CO<sub>2</sub>-laser therapy in breast cancer survivors of all ages[41].

Itching, burning and dysuria decreased significantly following CO<sub>2</sub>-laser therapy but quality of evidence rated "very low" for all of them. Heterogeneity of laser effect between the various studies could possibly be explained by the criteria of participants' inclusion in the analysis of each study. In 1 study[22], all participants were included in the analysis regardless of presence or not of these symptoms prior to laser-therapy. In other studies, only the participants with the above mentioned symptoms at baseline were analyzed[26,30-33]. This discrepancy, indicates that significant improvement of itching, burning and dysuria following the CO<sub>2</sub>-laser is apparent, even when underestimated. Likewise, amelioration of these symptoms was observed at 3-months' follow-up[25].

Moreover, symptoms from the lower genital tract system are strongly interrelated to LUTS[3], while vaginal dryness was found to be associated with greater prevalence of UI[42]. Vaginal estrogens could be proposed for postmenopausal women with UI, especially when GSM symptoms coexist[43]. Quality of evidence for vaginal-estrogens efficacy compared to placebo is of "low-quality" for urgency, "very low-quality" for frequency/nocturia, "low-quality" for SUI and "moderate-quality" for UUI[39]. Quality of evidence for laser-therapy rated "very low" for dysuria and "low" for UI overall, while heterogeneity of urgency/frequency assessment, did not allow meta-analysis of the data or defining the quality of evidence. Available studies did not provide data of objective UI measures. However, the results seemed to be promising with all relevant studies reporting significant improvement of all LUTS regardless of method of assessment. Mean difference

of ICIQ-UI SF of women with SUI was -6.5 and maintained up to 6-months follow-up[28], while meta-analysis of ICIQ-UI SF for women having UI was -4.89 (95% CI -6.38, -3.41). Threshold of MCID of ICIQ-UI SF for women with SUI has been reported to be (-5)[44], (-4)[44] or (-2.52)[45] depending on follow-up period and type of treatment. Although the results of our study concerned follow-up period up to 6 months, it would be of great interest to see whether this clinically important effect will be confirmed by large controlled trials with a long-term follow-up.

Furthermore, the validated questionnaires for LUTs (KHQ and UDI-6), seemed having a statistically and clinically meaningful improvement but the number of evaluated participants was small[22]. All scores of the KHQ domains exceeded the 5-point threshold of MCID, implying further a promising impact of laser-therapy in quality of life of postmenopausal women with UI and possibly a positive effect in UI pathophysiology. Likewise, UDI-6 indicated an analogue influence[22]. Nevertheless, the evidence is scarce and further research is warranted.

GSM and UI has a negative effect on sexual function[46,47]. Improvement of FSFI was consistent in all studies but the quality of evidence "low". An FSFI threshold of 26.55 is considered to define sexual dysfunction[48]. The highest the score the better is sexual function. Although FSFI scores were higher after 3 laser-therapies indicating better sexual function following laser-therapy, the clinically meaningful threshold of sexual dysfunction was not achieved in all studies. However, sexual function is impaired by many psychological and social factors[49] and is encouraging that almost all women not having sexual activity due to symptoms' severity, after the laser-therapy resumed their sexual life with a clinically meaningful improvement of their overall satisfaction with sexual life.

Histopathological, microbiological, cytological and macroscopical findings indicated the possible effect of laser-therapy on the vaginal mucosa and microenvironment[21-30,32-34]. Although the quality of evidence of VHIS increase was low, there was consistency of results, with the threshold of 15 (which defines vaginal atrophy) exceeded in all studies. Moreover, lactobacilli and normal vaginal flora appeared to increase, while pathogens i.e *E. coli* and *Mobiluncus* appeared to decrease at 1-month follow-up. Vaginal colonization with pathogens is considered the predisposing factor for presence and recurrence of UTIs[50]. Hence, indirectly, assumptions of laser's preventive ability for UTIs may be made based on restoration of local pathophysiology after 3 laser-therapies. However, PCR studies identifying the *Lactobacillus* species and the whole vaginal microbiota are needed for determination of the possible vaginal protection following laser-therapy.

This study has several limitations. Includes only full text articles, published in English language in peer-reviewed journals and although several databases were searched incomplete retrieval of identified studies cannot be overruled. Moreover, publication bias could not be assessed. The clear majority of identified studies were uncontrolled before- and after-studies. Hence, possible placebo effect of the treatment cannot be overruled. Moreover, the 2 controlled studies using estriol as control group, could not be meta-analyzed. Finally, samples used for histopathological evaluation were narrow and statistical analysis was not presented.

In conclusion, laser-therapy seems a promising and safe non-pharmaceutical therapeutic option for GSM in both clinical and pathophysiological aspect. However, quality of the body of evidence is "low" or "very low", the possible placebo effect of the treatment has not yet been ruled out or estimated, while there is scarce data regarding the use of laser in women with GSM and UI. Well-designed controlled studies with standardized laser settings and therapeutic protocols, long duration of follow-up, consistent outcome evaluations, comparing laser-therapy to placebo or other treatment

modalities and/or evaluating the pathway and mechanism of action on the vaginal mucosa are essential to be performed for safe conclusions to be derived. Currently, evidence-based change in clinical practice for the management of GSM with/without UI, cannot be proposed.

#### Contributors

All five authors contributed to the conception of the review, the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data, and the drafting of the manuscript. All authors saw and approved the final version of the manuscript.

#### **Conflict of interest**

Stefano Salvatore has had financial relations (expert testimonies and lectures) with DEKA Laser. The other authors report no potential conflict of interest.

**Funding** No funding was received for this review.

#### Provenance and peer review

This article has undergone peer review.

#### References

- [1] Marshall FF. Embryology of the lower genitourinary tract. Urol Clin North Am 5 (1978) 3-15.
- [2] Portman DJ, Gass MLS, on behalf of the Vulvovaginal Atrophy Terminology Consensus
- Conference Panel. Genitourinary syndrome of menopause: new terminology for vulvovaginal

atrophy from the International Society for the Study of Women's Sexual Health and The North American Menopause Society. Menopause 21 (2014) 1063-8.

[3] Sturdee DW, Panay N, on behalf of the International Menopause Society Writing Group. Recommendations for the management of postmenopausal vaginal atrophy, Climacteric 13 (2010) 509-22.

[4] Edwards D, Panay N. Treating vulvovaginal atrophy/genitourinary syndrome of menopause: how important is vaginal lubricant and moisturizer composition? Climacteric 19 (2016) 151-61.

[5] Bachmann G, Lobo RA, Gut R, Nachtigall L, Notelovitz M. Efficacy of low-dose estradiol vaginal tablets in the treatment of atrophic vaginitis: a randomized controlled trial. Obstet Gynecol 111 (2008) 67-76.

[6] Labrie R, Archer DF, Koltun W, Vachon A, Young D, Frenette L, et al;VVA Prasterone Research Group. Efficacy of intravaginal dehydroepiandrosterone (DHEA) on moderate to severe dyspareunia and vaginal dryness, symptoms of vulvovaginal atrophy, and of the genitourinary syndrome of menopause. Menopause 23 (2016) 243-56.

[7] Chapple C, Khullar V, Nitti VW, Frankel J, Herschorn S, Kaper M, et al. Efficacy of the  $\beta$ 3adrenoceptor agonist mirabegron for the treatment of overactive bladder by severity of incontinence at baseline: a post hoc analysis of pooled data from three randomized phase 3 trials. Eur Urol 67 (2015) 11-4.

[8] Hutchinson-Colas J, Segal S. Genitourinary syndrome of menopause and the use of laser therapy. Maturitas (2015) http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.maturitas.2015.08.001.

[9] Salvatore S, Athanasiou S, Candiani M. The use of pulsed CO<sub>2</sub> lasers for the treatment of vulvovaginal atrophy. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol 6 (2015) 504-8.

[10] Vizintin Z, Lukac M, Kazic M, Tettamanti M. Erbium laser in gynecology. Climacteric 18(Suppl1) (2015) 4-8.

[11] Tien YW, Hsiao SM, Lee CN, Lin HH. Effects of laser procedure for female urodynamic stress incontinence on pad weight, urodynamics, and sexual function. Int Urogynecol J (2016) doi:10.1007/s00192-016-3129-y

[12] Pardo JL, Sola VR, Morales AA. Treatment of female stress urinary incontinence with Erbium-YAG laser in non-ablative mode. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 204 (2016) 1-4.

[13] Hardy LA, Chang CH, Myers EM, Kennelly MJ, Fried NM. Computer simulations of thermal tissue remodeling during transvaginal and transurethral laser treatment of female stress urinary incontinence. Lasers Surg Med (2016) doi:10.1002/lsm.22491.

[14] Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pokock SJ, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): Explanation and Elaboration. Epidemiology 18 (2007) 805-35.

[15] Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. ANZ J Surg 73 (2003) 712-6.

[16] Zeng X, Zhang Y, Kwong JS, Zhang C, Li S, Sun F, et al. The methological quality assessment tools for preclinical and clinical studies, systematic review and meta-analysis, and clinical practice guideline: a systematic review. JEBM 8 (2015) 2-10.

[17]GRADEHandbook.Availableat:http://gdt.guidelinedevelopment.org/app/handbook/handbook.html#h.wsfivfhuxv4r.(Accessed20.11.16).

[18] Identifying and measuring heterogeneity. Available at: http://handbook.cochrane.org/chapter 9/9 5 2 identifying and measuring heterogeneity.htm .(Accessed 20.11.16).

[19] Recommendations on testing for funnel plot asymmetry. Available at:

16

http://handbook.cochrane.org/chapter\_10/10\_4\_3\_1\_recommendations\_on\_testing\_for\_funnel\_plot\_ asymmetry.htm . (Accessed 20.11.16).

[20] Rothstein HR, Sutton AJ, Borenstein M. Publication bias in Meta-Analyses: Prevention, Assessment and Adjustements. 376:WILEY;ISBN: 978-0-470-87014-3;2005.

[21] Pieralli A, Fallani MG, Becorpi A, Bianchi C, Corioni S, Longinotti M, et al. Fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser for vulvovaginal atrophy (VVA) dyspareunia relief in breast cancer survivors. Arch Gynecol Oncol (2016) doi:10.1007/s0040-016-4118-6.

[22] Pitsouni E, Grigoriadis T, Tsiveleka A, Zacharakis D, Salvatore S, Athanasiou S. Microablative
Fractional CO<sub>2</sub>-Laser and the Genitourinary Syndrome of Menopause: An Observational study.
Maturitas 94 (2016) 131-6.

[23] Athanasiou S, Pitsouni E, Antonopoulou A, Zacharakis D, Salvatore S, Falaggas ME, et al. The effect of Microablative Fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser on vaginal flora of postmenopausal women. Climacteric 19 (2016) 512-8.

[24] Gaspar A, Brandi H, Gomez V, Luque D. Efficacy of Erbium:YAG Laser Treatment Compared to Topical Estriol Treatment for Symptoms Of Genitourinary Syndrome of Menopause. Laser Surg Med (2016) doi:10.1002/Ism.22569.

[25] Sokol E, Karram M. An assessment of the safety and efficacy of a fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser system for the treatment of vulvovaginal atrophy. Menopause 23 (2016) 1102-7.

[26] Perino A, Cucinella G, Gugliotta G, Saitta S, Polito S, Adile B, et al. Is vaginal fractional CO<sub>2</sub>laser treatment effective in improving overactive bladder symptoms in post-menopausal patients?Preliminary results. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol 20 (2016) 2491-7.

[27] Gambacianni M, Levancini M. Short-term effect of vaginal erbium laser on the genitourinary syndrome of menopause. Minerva Ginecol 67 (2015) 97-102.

[28] Gambacianni M, Levancini M, Cervigni M. Vaginal erbium laser: the second-generation thermotherapy for the genitourinary syndrome of menopause. Climacteric 18 (2015) 757-63.

[29] Gambacianni M, Levancini M. Vaginal Erbium Laser: the Second Generation Thermotherapy for the Genitourinary Syndrome of Menopause (GSM) in Breast Cancer Survivors. A preliminary report of a pilot study. Int J Gynecol Obstet 27 (2015) 9-11.

[30] Perino A, Calligaro A, Forlani F, Tiberio C, Cucinella G, Svelato A, et al. Vulvo-vaginal atrophy: A new treatment modality using thermo-ablative fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser. Maturitas 80 (2015) 296-301.

[31] Salvatore S, Nappi RE, Parma M, Chionna R, Lagona F, Zerbinati N, et al. Sexual function after fractional microablative CO<sub>2</sub> laser in women with vulvovaginal atrophy. Climacteric 18 (2015) 219-25.

[32] Salvatore S, Nappi RE, Zerbinati N, Calligaro A, Ferrero S, Origoni M, et al. A 12-week treatment with fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser for vulvovaginal atrophy: a pilot study. Climacteric 17 (2014) 363-9.

[33] Salvatore S, Maggiore ULB, Origoni M, Parma M, Quaranta L, Sileo F, et al. Microablative fractional CO<sub>2</sub> laser improves dyspareunia related to vulvovaginal atrophy: a pilot study. J Endom Pelv Pain Disord (2014) doi: 10.5301/je.5000184.

[34] Zerbinati N, Serati M, Origoni M, Candiani T, Ianniti T, Salvatore S, et al. Microscopic and ultrastructural modifications of postmenopausal atrophic dioxide treatment. Laser Med Sci (2014) doi:10.007/s10103-014-1677-2.

[35] Kelleher CJ, Pleil AM, Reese PR, Burgess SM, Brodish PH. How much is enough and who says so? BJOG 111 (2004)605–12.

[36] Wysocki S, Kingsberg S, Krychman M. Management of Vaginal Atrophy: Implications from the REVIVE Survey. Clin Med Insights Reprod Health 8 (2014) 23-30.

[37] Nappi RE, Particco M, Biglia N, Cagnacci A, Di Carlo C, Luisi S, et al. Attitudes and perceptions towards vulvar and vaginal atrophy in Italian post-menopausal women: Evidence from the European REVIVE survey. Maturitas 91 (2016) 74-80.

[38] Nappi RE, Palacios S, Panay N, Particco M, Krychman ML. Vulvar and vaginal atrophy in four European countries: Evidence from the European REVIVE survey. Climacteric 19 (2016) 188-97.

[39] Rahn DD, Carberry C, Sanses TV, Mamik MM, Ward RM, Meriwether KV, et al;Society of Gynecologic Surgeons Systematic Review Group. Vaginal estrogen for genitourinary syndrome of menopause: a systematic review. Obstet Gynecol 124 (2014) 1147-56.

[40] Committee on Gynecologic Practice. The Use of Vaginal Estrogen in Women With a History of Estrogen-Dependent Breast Cancer. Obstet Gynecol 127 (2016) e93-6.

[41] Pagano T, De Rosa P, Vallone R, Schettini F, Arpino G, De Placido S, et al. Fractional microablative  $CO_2$  laser for vulvovaginal atrophy in women treated with chemotherapy and/or hormonal therapy for breast cancer: a retrospective study. Menopause 23 (2016) 1108-13.

[42] Juliato CR, Baccaro LF, Pedro AO, Gabiatti JR, Lui-Filho JF, Costa-Paiva L. Factors associated with urinary incontinence in middle-aged women: a population-based household survey. Int Urogynecol J (2016) doi:10.1007/s00192-016-3139-9.

[43] Lucas MG, Bedretdinova D, Berghmans LC, Bosch JLHR, Burkhard FC, Cruz F, et al. Guidelines on Urinary Incontinence. European Association of Urology 2015.

[44] Nystroem E, Sjoestroem M, Stenlund H, Samuelsson E. ICIQ symptom and quality of life instruments measure clinically relevant improvements in women with stress urinary incontinence. Neurourol Urodyn 34 (2015) 747-51.

[45] Sirls LT, Tennstendt S, Brubaker L, Kim HY, Nygaard I, Rahn DD, et al. The minimum important difference for the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Urinary Incontinence Short Form in women with stress urinary incontinence. Neurourol Urodyn 34 (2015) 183-7.

[46] Nappi RE, Palacios S. Impact of vulvovaginal atrophy on sexual health and quality of life at postmenopause. Climacteric 17 (2014) 3-9.

[47] Salonia A, Zanni G, Nappi RE, Briganti A, Dehoe F, Fabbri F, et al. Sexual dysfunction is common in women with lower urinary tract symptoms and urinary incontinence: results of a cross-sectional study. Eur Urol 45 (2004) 642-8.

[48] Jara D, Fuenzalida A, Fiqueroa R, del Prado M, Flores D, Blumel JE, et al. Is the Menopause Rating Scale accurate for diagnosing sexual dysfunction among climacteric women? Maturitas 62 (2009) 321-3.

[49] McCabe MP, Sharlip ID, Lewis E, Atalla E, Balon R, Fisher AD, et al. Risk Factors for Sexual Dysfunction Among Women and Men: A Consensus Statement From the Fourth International Consultation on Sexual Medicine 2015. J Sex Med 13 (2016) 153-67.

[50] Stamey TA. The role of introital enterobacteria in recurrent urinary infections. *J Urol* 109 (1973) 467-72

Table 1. Main characteristics reported in the studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis.									
First Author [Ref]	Study design <sup>*</sup>	Type of laser <sup>*</sup>	No of patients	Baseline characteristics of postmenopausal women*	Therapeutic protocol*	Follow- up <sup>*</sup>	STROBE*	MINORS*	
Pieralli[21]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	50	Mean age 53.3 (range41-66), current or previous breast cancer, dyspareunia	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	Mean 11m <sup>†</sup>	20/3/11	13/16	
Pitsouni[22]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	53	Mean age 57.2±5.4, moderate to severe symptoms of GSM	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	27/1/6	14/16	
Athanasiou[23]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	53	Mean age 57.2 $\pm$ 5.4, $\geq$ 1 moderate to severe symptoms of GSM, vaginal pH>4.5, superficial epithelial cells<5%	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	25/4/5	15/16	
Gaspar[24] <sup>†</sup>	PCBA	Erbium:YAG laser vs estriol	50 25 vs 25	Non-smokers, estradiol level≤20pg/ml, >1symptoms: dyspareunia, vaginal dryness, vaginal burning or irritation, chronic leukorrhea	0.5mg estriol ovules for 2wks (3/wk) and then 3 laser-therapies in 8 wks	18m	18/4/12	20/24	
Sokol[25]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	27	Mean age 58.6±8.8, healthy, with bothersome GSM symptoms (pain, burning, itching, dryness, dyspareunia, dysuria), non-smokers	3 laser-therapies (1/6 wks)	3m	20/6/8	11/16	
Perino[26]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	30	Median age 56, $\geq$ 1symptoms of GSM(itching, burning, reduced lubrication, superficial and/or severe dyspareunia) and symptoms of OAB $\geq$ 3m ( $\geq$ 8 times micturition/24h, $\geq$ 3 episodes of urgency (grade 3 or 4) with or without incontinence in 3-day voiding diary)	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	20/4/10	13/16	
Gambacianni[27]	PUBA	Erbium:YAG laser	65	Mean age 62.9±8.1, presence of a GSM (vaginal dryness or dyspareunia), FSH>40, Estradiol<25	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	22/6/6	13/16	
Gambacianni [28] <sup>‡</sup>	PCBA	Erbium:YAG laser vs estriol	62 43 vs 19	Mean age 60.9±8.1 and 63±4.5, GSM symptoms (vaginal dryness and dyspareunia), SUI, FSH>40, estradiol<25	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	бm	26/2/6	17/24	
Gambacianni[29]	PUBA	Erbium:YAG laser	13	Mean age 55.7±7.7, successful treatment for breast cancer, severe GSM symptoms (vaginal dryness and dyspareunia), FSH>40, estradiol<25	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	3m	17/5/12	13/16	
Perino[30]	PUBA	CO2-laser	48	Median age 56, $1 \ge \text{GSM}$ symptoms (itching, burning, reduced lubrication, superficial and/or severe dyspareunia)	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	16/6/12	13/16	
Salvatore[31]	PUBA	CO2-laser	75	Mean age 60.6±6.2, moderate/severe vaginal dryness and/or dyspareunia	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	24/1/9	14/16	
Salvatore[32]	PUBA	CO2-laser	49	Mean age 59.6±5.8, moderate/severe vaginal dryness and/or dyspareunia	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	19/3/12	13/16	
Salvatore[33]	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	15	Mean age 57.3 $\pm$ 3.0, sexually active with dyspareunia related to GSM	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	1m	19/3/12	13/16	
Zerbinati[34]§	PUBA	CO <sub>2</sub> -laser	5	Mean age 57±1.7, severe GSM symptoms (vaginal dryness, burning itching dyspareunia)	3 laser-therapies (1/m)	2m	15/4/14	11/16	

burning, itching, dysuria, dyspareunia). <sup>\*</sup>PUBA: Prospective Uncontrolled Before (the initiation of the laser-therapy) and After (the last laser-therapy). PCBA: Prospective Controlled Before (the initiation of the laser-therapy); CO<sub>2</sub>-laser: Microablative Fractional CO<sub>2</sub>-laser ((SmartXide<sup>2</sup> V<sup>2</sup>LR, Monalisa Touch, DEKA: Florence, Italy), Erbiam: YAG-laser: Non-ablative thermal Erbiam: YAG-laser (Forona Smooth<sup>TM</sup> XS, Fotona, Ljubijana Slovenia); GSM: Geniourinary Syndrome of Menopause. SUI: Stress Urinary Incontinence, OAB:Overactive Bladder; mionths, wks:weeks; Follow-up: the time following the last laser-therapy in which outcomes assessment was performed; STROBE checklist was used for the Quality of Reporting of studies. Each item of the STROBE checklist could take one of the following values: Yes/No/Not applicable. The numbers presented are the sum for each of these values. MINORS checklist was used for the assessment of the Risk of Bias of the included studies. Scores of 0, 1 or 2 are applied when the items are not reported, inadequately reported, respectively. The numbers presented are the sum of these scores. \*Range 3-25m

<sup>+</sup>Women included in the Estriol group followed the protocol: 8 wks 0.5mg estriol ovules (1/d for the first wk, 3/wk in 2-4wks, 2/wk in wks 4-8

<sup>§</sup>This study presented the histopathological data of 5 women participating in the study of Salvatore et al [32].

Table 2. Primary outcomes of the studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis.										
First	Dryness*	Dyspareunia <sup>*</sup>	Itching*	Burning <sup>*</sup>	Dysuria*	Urgency*	Frequency*		Urinary Incontinence*	
Author[Ref]										
Pieralli[21]	NA	B:5(1-5) A:3 (1-5)(1m)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	
Pitsouni[22]	B:6.1±3.1	B:7.7±2.5	B:1.7±3.2	B:1.3±2.9	B:0.9±1.7	B:1.2±1.0	Day-freq	Nocturia	UI (ICIO-UI SF)	
	A:1.7±1.9	A: 2.3±2.2	A:0.3±1.2	A:0.3±0.9	A:0.3±0.7	A:0.3±0.5	B:0.9±0.9	B:1.3±1.0	B:8.1±5.6	
	(1m)	(1m)	(1m)	(1m)	(1m)	(1m)	A:0.6±0.7	A:0.6±0.7	A: 3.4±4.3(1m)	
							(1m)	(1m)	SUI: B:1.6±1.5/A:0.5±0.9(1m)	
									UUI: B:1.6±1.7/A: 0.7±1.3(1m)	
Gaspar[24] <sup>§</sup>	B:2.2±0.6	B:2.4±0.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	
1	A:1.1±0.8(1m)	A:1.5±0.8(1m)								
	1.0±0.7(12m)	0.9±0.9(12m)								
	1.5±0.7(18m)	1.6±0.7(18m)								
Sokol[25]	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	NA	NA		NA	
	6.1±2.7(3m)	5.4±2.9(3m)	1.3±1.9(3m)	$1.4\pm2.9(3m)$	$1.0\pm 2.4(3m)$					
Perino[26]	B:8(3)	B:9.5(1.3)	B:8(2)	B:8(2.3)	NA	B:3(0) <sup>†</sup>	B:10(2.5)		UUI (micturition dairy)	
	A: 2(1.3)(1m)	A: 2(1.3)(1m)	A:1(1)(1m)	A:1(1)(1m)		A:0(1)(1m)	A: 6(2)(1m)		B:3(1)	
						B:18.5±4.3 <sup>‡</sup>			A: 1(1.5)(1m)	
						A:8±2.3(1m)				
Gambacianni	Decrease (1m)	Decrease (1m)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		SUI (ICIQ-UI SF)	
[27]									decrease (1m)	
Gambacianni	B:8.3±1.3	B:8.2±1.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		SUI (ICIQ-UI SF)	
[28]	A: $2.9 \pm 0.6(1m)$	A: $2.8 \pm 1(1m)$							$B: 12\pm 1.8$	
	5.5±0.9(011)	$5.3\pm1.1(011)$							A: $3.3\pm 2.6(111)$	
Gambacianni	Decrease (1m	Decrease (1m	NΛ	NΛ	NΛ	NΛ	NΛ		$5\pm 2.0(011)$	
[20]	and 3m)	and 3m)		INA .	INA	INA	INA .		NA .	
Perino[30]	$B\cdot 8(2)$	$B\cdot 8(2)$	B.6(1.8)	B.6(2)	NA	NA	NA		NA	
renno[50]	A: 2(1)(1m)	A: 3(1)(1m)	A: 2(0.8)(1m)	A: 2(1)(1m)	1111	1 1 1 1	1111		1 1 1 1	
Salvatore[31]	$B: 8.4 \pm 2.0$	B: 8.4+2.4	B: 6.4+2.1	B: 6.2+2.7	B: 5.7±2.8	NA	NA		NA	
	A:2.8±1.8(1m)	A:2.8±2.1(1m)	A:2.1±2(1m)	A:2.2±2.8(1m)	A:2.6±1.9(1m)					
Salvatore[32]	B:8.3±2.1	B:8.1±2.8	B:6.1±3	B: 6.4±2.7	B:5±2.4	NA	NA NA		NA	
	A:2.7±1.9(1m)	A:3.3±2.3(1m)	A:1.5±1.7(1m)	A:2.9±2.4(1m)	A:1.1±1.1(1m)					
Salvatore[33]	B:7.2±1.1	B:8.7±1	B:5.6±1.3	B:6.9±2.7	B:5.1±0.9	NA	NA		NA	
	A:1.7±0.9(1m)	A:2.2±1(1m)	A:1.6±0.7(1m)	A:1.5±1.9(1m)	A:0.8±1(1m)					

\* All p-values for all outcomes at all follow-up periods were statistically significant ±p<0.005); Be Before ±the initiation of laser-therapy, A: After ±the last laser-therapy, NA: Not applicable, UI: Urinary Incontinence, SUI: Stress Urinary Incontinence; In all but 3 studies data were reported as mean ±standard deviation. In 1 study [21] data were reported as median and range (range is presented in the parenthesis) and in 2 studies [26, 30] data were reported as median and interquartile (interquartile is presented in the parentheses). The time of outcome assessment after the last laser-therapy is presented in the parenthesis (e.g. 1m, 12m) (m: months); In all but 2 studies symptoms severity was assessed using Visual Analogue Scale ±VAS) 0-10, while in 1 study VAS 0-5 [21] and in 1 study VAS 0-3 [24]; In one study the calculation of day frequency/nocturia, UI, UUI/SUI, was assessed using ICIQ-FLUTS ±filling domain), ICIQ-UI SF and UDI-6, respectively[22]. In one study the calculation of frequency, urge episodes were performed by micturition dairy and Overactive Bladder-questionnaire ±OAB-q) [26]. In 2 studies the calculation of SUI was performed by the ICIQ-SF [27,28]. <sup>1</sup>Number of urge episodes was assessed using micturition dairy. <sup>1</sup>Urgency was assessed using OAB-q.

<sup>10</sup> The data presented concern the laser-therapy. Estriol-group: Dryness decreased significantly up to 6m [from 2.3 ±0.5 to 1.3 ±0.9(1m) and 1.7±0.8 (6m)]. At 12 and 18m dryness was 2.4±0.7). Dyspareunia decreased significantly up to 6m [from 2.3 to 1.8±0.8(1m) and 1.9±0.8(6m). At 12 and 18m dryness was 2.4±0.7).

respectively. The data presented concern the laser-therap. Dryness: Estriol group had similar decrease during the treatment period and no significant differences between groups. After the end of treatment small but significant increase. At 6m the estriol group was significantly different from laser-therapy group. Dyspareunia: Similar decrease during the treatment period and no significant differences between groups. After the end of treatment small but significant increase. At 6m the estriol group was significantly different from laser-therapy group.

Table 3. Secondary outcomes of the studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis.										
First Author[Ref]	KHQ*	UDI-6*	FSFI*	MCS12*	PCS12*	pH*†	VHIS*	$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{V}^*$		
Pieralli[21]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:8.9±1.7 A:21.6±1.6(1m)	NA		
Pitsouni[22]	B:235.9±226.1 A:114.1+165.8(1m)	B:30.2±21.4 A:11.9+16.6(1m)	B:13.7±8.1 A: 25.9+4.6(1m)	NA	B:0.9±1.7 A:0.3±0.7(1m)	B:2.7±1.1 A:4.2±1.7(1m)	B:8.4±2.5 A:20.1±3(1m)	B:11.7±15.6 A:44.2+13.7(1m)		
Athanasiou[23]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:5.5±0.8 A: 4.7±0.5(1m)	NA	NA		
Gaspar[24] <sup>‡</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:5±0.4 A:4.1±0.4(3m) 4.4±0.6(6m)	NA	B:20.8±5.4 A:33.3±13.3(1m) 52.2±8.5(12m)		
Sokol[25]	NA	NA	Improvement 8.8±7.3(3m)	NA	NA	B:5.5±0.7 A: 5.7±1.4(3m)	B:14.4±2.9 A:21.4±2.9(3m)	NA		
Perino[26]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:11±3 A:22±3.3(1m)	NA		
Gambacianni [27]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Increase (1m)	NA		
Gambacianni [28] <sup>§</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:10.6±3.6 A:20±1.4(1m) 19.0±1.4(6m)	NA		
Gambacianni [29]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Increase (1m and 3m)	NA		
Perino[30]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B:10.5±3 A:21.5±2(1m)	NA		
Salvatore[31]	NA	NA	B:14.8±7.7 A:27.2±5.6(1m)	B:43.2±8.3 A:46.1±7.6(1m)	B:48.8±6.4 A:50.7±6.5(1m)	NA	NA	NA		
Salvatore[32]	NA	NA	NA	B:42.6±10.6 A:47±6.9(1m)	B:44.6±11 A:50±5.9(1m)	NA	B:13.1±2.5 A:23.1±1.9(1m)	NA		
Salvatore[33]	NA	NA	B:12.2±1 A:27.3+0.9(1m)	B:41.9±11.7 A:50.7±1.1(1m)	B:43.8±10.9 A:55.7+0.3(1m)	NA	B:12.9±3 A:22.1+2.3(1m)	NA		

<sup>\*</sup> In all but 1 study all outcomes at all follow-up periods improved statistically significant  $\pm p < 0.005$ ; In 1 study pH did not decrease [25]; VHIS: Vaginal Health Index Score  $\pm$  VHIS is calculated by adding the scores of the 5 components: Elasticity, fluid volume, pH, epithelial integrity and moisture. Each component could receive a score from 1  $\pm poorest$ ) to 5  $\pm best$ ). The sum of the 5 components could receive an upper bound score of 25 and lower bound of 5. A Score of  $\leq 15$  defined the presence of vaginal atrophy), VMV: Vaginal Maturation Value  $\pm \pm Parabasal e$  pithelial cells, Intermediate epithelial cells and superficial epithelial cells and superficial epithelial ells were quantified as per-therapy, A: After  $\pm$  the last laser-therapy, NA:Not Applicable; In all studies data were reported as mean  $\pm$ standard deviation. The time of outcome assessment after the last laser-therapy is presented in the

VMV was calculated using the formula ±1,twsuperricial ±10,xsuperricial ±10,xsuperiricial ±10,xsuperricial ±10,xsuperricial ±10,xsuperricial ±1

#### **Figure legends**

**Fig. 1.** Flow diagram of the identification process of the studies eligible to be included in this systematic review and meta-analysis.



**Fig. 2**. Forest plots of mean differences between mean values of before the initiation of laser-therapy and 1-month after the last laser-therapy (1-month follow-up) for the primary outcomes: Dryness n=298, Dyspareunia n=270, Itching n=272, Burning n=281, Dysuria n=185 (assessed by Visual Analogue Scale 0-10) and Urinary Incontinence (n=54) (assessed by the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaires-Urinary Incontinence Short Form)

				Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
2.1 Dryness						
Salvatore et al [32]	-5.6	1.6	12.9%	-5.60 [-8.74, -2.46]	2014	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Salvatore et al [33]	-5.5	1.3	19.5%	-5.50 [-8.05, -2.95]	2014	
Salvatore et al [31]	-5.6	1.6	12.9%	-5.60 [-8.74, -2.46]	2015	
Campacianni et al (20) Perino et al (20)	-2.4	14	16.8%	-5.40 [-9.52, -1.46]	2015	
Pitsouni et al (221	-4.4	16	12.9%	-4 40 [-7 54 -1 26]	2016	
Perino et al (261	-6	1.4	16.8%	-6.00 [-8.743.26]	2016	<b>⊷</b>
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	-5.54 [-6.67, -4.42]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.73, df	= 6	(P = 0.99)	3); 1 <sup>2</sup> = 0%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 9.66 (P < 0.0000	(1)				
2.2 Dyspareunia						
Salvatore et al (32)	-4.8	14	17.2%	-4.80 (-7.54 -2.06)	2014	
Salvatore et al [33]	-6.5	1.6	13.1%	-6.50 [-9.64, -3.36]	2014	<b>←</b>
Salvatore et al [31]	-5.6	1.6	13.1%	-5.60 [-8.742.46]	2015	·
Perino et al [30]	-5	1.2	23.4%	-5.00 [-7.35, -2.65]	2015	
Gambacianni et al (28)	-5.4	2	8.4%	-5.40 [-9.32, -1.48]	2015	·
Perino et al [26]	-7.5	1.7	11.6%	-7.50 [-10.83, -4.17]	2016	•
Pitsouni et al [22]	-5.4	1.6	13.1%	-5.40 [-8.54, -2.26]	2016	·
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	-5.62 [-6.76, -4.48]		•
Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.	00; Chif = 2.17, df	= 6	(P = 0.90	$();  ^2 = 0\%$		
rest for overall effect. 2 :	= 9.69 (P < 0.0000	11)				
2.3 Itching						
Salvatore et al [32]	-4.6	1.3	15.3%	-4.60 [-7.15, -2.05]	2014	
Salvatore et al [33]	-4	1.2	16.1%	-4.00 [-6.35, -1.65]	2014	
Salvatore et al [31]	-4.3	1.3	15.3%	-4.30 [-6.85, -1.75]	2015	
Perino et al (30)	-4	0.9	18.4%	-4.00 [-5.76, -2.24]	2015	
Pitsouni et al [22]	-1.4	0.4	21.7%	-1.40 [-2.18, -0.62]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-/	1.6	100.0%	-7.00 [-10.14, -3.86]	2016	
Heterogeneity Tau <sup>2</sup> = 3	55: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 24.34 r	if = 5	(P = 0.0	0021: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 79%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 4.43 (P < 0.0000	01)				
2.4 Burning			15 101	5 40 4 7 05 - 2 051	2014	
Salvatore et al [33]	-5.4	1.5	17.4%	-5.40 [-7.95, -2.85]	2014	
Salvatore et al [32]	-3.0	1 2	16.0%	-3.50 [-5.46, -1.54]	2014	
Perino et al (30)	-4	1.2	17.7%	-4.00 [-5.35, -1.03]	2015	
Pitsouni et al [22]	-1	0.3	20.2%	-1.00[-1.59]-0.411	2015	·
Perino et al (26)	-7	1.6	13.6%	-7 00 [-10 14 -3 86]	2016	••••
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	-3.93 [-5.91, -1.95]		-
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 4.	94; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 37.47, d	df = 5	6 (P < 0.0	00001); I <sup>2</sup> = 87%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.89 (P < 0.0001	D				
2.5 Dysuria						
Salvatore et al (321	-3.9	11	22.6%	-3 90 [-6 06 -1 74]	2014	
Salvatore et al (331	-4.3	0.9	24.4%	-4.30 [-6.062.54]	2014	
Salvatore et al [31]	-3.1	0.9	24.4%	-3.10 [-4.86, -1.34]	2015	
Pitsouni et al [22]	-0.6	0.2	28.6%	-0.60 [-0.99, -0.21]	2016	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	-2.86 [-5.07, -0.65]		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 4.	41; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 29.81, c	3f = 3	C(P < 0.0	00001); l <sup>2</sup> = 90%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.53 (P = 0.01)					
2.6 Urinary Incontiner	nce					
Gambacianni et al [28]	-6.5	2.3	10.8%	-6.50 [-11.01, -1.99]	2015	·
Pitsouni et al [22]	-4.7	0.8	89.2%	-4.70 [-6.27, -3.13]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	-4.89 [-6.38, -3.41]		<b>•</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.55, df	- 1	(P = 0.46)	5); I <sup>2</sup> = 0%		
Test for overall effect: Z	= 6.48 (P < 0.0000	(1)				
						-4 -2 0 2 4

**Fig. 3.** Forest plots of mean differences between mean values of before the initiation of laser-therapy and 1-month after the last laser-therapy (1-month follow-up) for the secondary outcomes: FSFI: Female Sexual Function Index n=143, MCS12: Mental Component Summary-12 n=139, PCS12: Physical Component Summary-12 n=139), VHIS: Vaginal Health Index Score n=274 (above 15 is considered the threshold of non-atrophic values, VMV: Vaginal Maturation Value n=78 [is calculated by (1x% superficial)+(0.5x% intermediate)+(0x% parabasal)]

				Mean Difference		Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean Difference	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	Year	IV, Random, 95% CI
3.1 FSFI						
Salvatore et al (33)	15.1	3.7	31.5%	15.10 [7.85, 22.35]	2014	
Salvatore et al (31)	12.4	3.6	33.3%	12.40 [5.34, 19.46]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)	12.2	3.5	35.2% 100.0%	12.20 [5.34, 19.06] 13.18 [9.11, 17.25]	2016	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.39, dt	= 2	(P = 0.82)	?);   <sup>2</sup> = 0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.35 (P < 0.0000	01)				
3.2 MCS12						
Salvatore et al (33)	8.8	2.6	17.5%	8 80 [3 70 13 90]	2014	<b>_</b>
Salvatore et al (32)	4.4	1.3	36.9%	4.40 [1.85, 6.95]	2014	
Salvatore et al (31)	2.9	0.9	45.7%	2.90 [1.14, 4.66]	2015	
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	4.48 [1.94, 7.02]		<b>•</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	2.87; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.91, df	'= 2	(P = 0.05)	9); I <sup>2</sup> = 59%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.46 (P = 0.0005)	5)				
3.3 PCS12						
Salvatore et al (32)	5.4	1.5	33.3%	5.40 [2.46, 8.34]	2014	_ <b>_</b>
Salvatore et al (33)	11.9	2	30.8%	11.90 [7.98, 15.82]	2014	
Salvatore et al (31)	1.9	0.8	35.9%	1.90 [0.33, 3.47]	2015	-
Subtotal (95% CI)			100.0%	6.15 [0.82, 11.48]		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	19.96; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 23.16,	df =	2 (P < 0	.00001); l² = 91%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.26 (P = 0.02)					
3.4 VHIS						
Salvatore et al (32)	10	2.9	12.7%	10.00 [4.32, 15.68]	2014	
Salvatore et al (33)	9.2	2.2	22.1%	9.20 [4.89, 13.51]	2014	
Perino et al (30)	11.5	2.6	15.8%	11.50 [6.40, 16.60]	2015	
Gambacianni et al (28)	9.4	3.5	8.7%	9.40 [2.54, 16.26]	2015	
Perino et al (26)	11	2.4	18.6%	11.00 [6.30, 15.70]	2016	
Pieraili et al (21) Diteouri et el (22)	12.7	2.9	12.7%	12.70 [7.02, 18.38]	2016	
Subtotal (95% CI)	11.7	3.4	9.5%	10 70 [8 67 12 72]	2010	
Heteroneneity Tau <sup>2</sup> =	$0.00^{\circ}$ Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.33 dt	= 6	(P = 0.97)	10110 [0107, 12172]		•
Test for overall effect:	Z = 10.34 (P < 0.000)	001)	(, 0.5)	"· · · · · · ·		
3.5 VMV						
Pitsouni et al (22)	32.5	9.3	40.5%	32.50 [14.27, 50.73]	2016	
Gaspar et al (24) Subtotal (95% CI)	12.5	3.3	59.5% 100.0%	12.50 [6.03, 18.97] 20.61 [1.36, 39.86]	2016	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	151.31; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.11.	df =	1 (P = 0	04); I <sup>2</sup> = 76%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.10 (P = 0.04)					
						-20 -10 0 10 20
						Decrease Increase