Published in final edited form as:

Am J Gastroenterol. 2015 January ; 110(1): 127–136. doi:10.1038/ajg.2014.396.

Epidemiology, pathophysiology, and classification of fecal incontinence: State of the Science Summary for the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) Workshop

Adil E. Bharucha, M.B.B.S., M.D.¹, Gena Dunivan, M.D.², Patricia S. Goode, M.S.N., M.D.³, Emily S. Lukacz, M.D., M.A.S.⁴, Alayne D. Markland, D.O., M.Sc.³, Catherine A. Matthews, M.D.⁵, Louise Mott, R.N.⁶, Rebecca G. Rogers, M.D.², Alan R. Zinsmeister, PhD⁷, William E. Whitehead, Ph.D.^{5,8}, Satish S.C. Rao, MD, PhD⁹, and Frank A. Hamilton, M.D.¹⁰

¹Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM

²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM

³Department of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL

⁴Department of Reproductive Medicine, UC San Diego Health Systems, La Jolla, CA

⁵Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

⁶Simon Foundation, Langley, British Columbia, Canada

⁷Division of Biomedical Statistics and Informatics, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

⁸Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

⁹Department of Gastroenterology, Georgia Regents University, Augusta, GA

¹⁰National Institutes of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD

Abstract

In August 2013, the National Institutes of Health sponsored a conference to address major gaps in our understanding of the epidemiology, pathophysiology, and management of fecal incontinence (FI) and to identify topics for future clinical research. This article is the first of a two-part summary of those proceedings. FI is a common symptom, with a prevalence that ranges from 7 to 15% in community-dwelling men and women, but is often underreported as providers seldom screen for FI and patients do not volunteer the symptom, even though the symptoms can have a devastating impact on quality of life. Rough estimates suggest that FI is associated with a

Address correspondence and reprints requests to Dr. Bharucha at, Mayo Clinic, 200 First Street S.W., Rochester, MN 55905, Tel: 507-284-2687, Fax: 507-538-5820.

Specific author contributions: All authors presented at the symposium, participated in writing, and reviewed the final submitted version of this manuscript.

substantial economic burden, particularly in patients who require surgical therapy. Bowel disturbances, particularly diarrhea, the symptom of rectal urgency, and burden of chronic illness are the strongest independent risk factors for FI in the community. Smoking, obesity, and inappropriate cholecystectomy are emerging, potentially modifiable risk factors. Other risk factors for FI include advanced age, female gender, disease burden (co-morbidity count, diabetes), anal sphincter trauma (obstetrical injury, prior surgery), and decreased physical activity. Neurological disorders, inflammatory bowel disease, pelvic floor anatomical disturbances (rectal prolapse) are also associated with FI. The pathophysiological mechanisms responsible for FI include diarrhea, anal and pelvic floor weakness, reduced rectal compliance, and reduced or increased rectal sensation; many patients have multi-faceted anorectal dysfunctions. The type (urge, passive or combined); etiology (anorectal disturbance, bowel symptoms or both); and severity of FI provide the basis for classifying FI; these domains can be integrated to comprehensively characterize the symptom. Several validated scales for classifying symptom severity and its impact on quality of life are available. Symptom severity scales should incorporate the frequency, volume, consistency, and nature (urge or passive) of stool leakage. Despite the basic understanding of FI, there are still major knowledge gaps in disease epidemiology and pathogenesis, necessitating future clinical research in FI.

Keywords

Fecal incontinence; functional bowel disorders

Introduction

Fecal incontinence (FI) is defined by the unintentional loss of solid or liquid stool and anal Incontinence (AI) includes leakage of gas and/or FI. The emotional consequences of AI often exceed the physical manifestations. Many individuals report withdrawing from their social lives and hide the problem from their families, friends, and even their doctors. This has led to difficulties for healthcare providers in identifying those affected by FI. Since FI is strongly associated with age its incidence will likely increase as the population ages. Disease prevention has been hindered by limited research and incomplete knowledge about the biological causes and interacting social and environmental factors.

To address these issues, the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) organized a workshop in August 2013, where a panel of experts in epidemiology, gastrointestinal physiology, gastroenterology, colorectal surgery, urogynecology, and psychology were invited to identify and discuss major issues in the diagnoses and treatment of FI/AI. We examined the barriers encountered in addressing FI/AI, and identified research priorities in both basic and clinical research to further advance treatment of the condition. This two-part document will summarize the principal findings of the workshop.

Prevalence

Many studies that evaluated the prevalence of FI were conducted in selected populations. For example, only 8 of 34 surveys in a review from 2004 were community-based and

sampled the entire population i.e. were unrestricted by age, residence, or underlying disease (1). However, 4 of these 8 studies surveyed fewer than 750 subjects, and only two studies, which were conducted in a market mailing sample and in Wisconsin households (2, 3), were from the United States. Table 1, which summarizes the large population-based studies on the epidemiology of FI, includes studies that were summarized in that review (2–7) and 6 others published thereafter (8–13). These studies suggest that FI is common with a prevalence ranging from 7 to 15% in community-dwelling women. The prevalence is comparable in men (6, 13).

Besides true differences, the variations in prevalence across studies may reflect differences in survey methods (e.g., by phone or in person), the screening questions, the reference timeframe, and the definition of incontinence. In particular, the prevalence of anal incontinence, which includes incontinence for flatus as well as feces, is higher than FI. An internet-based survey suggests that women prefer the term 'accidental bowel leakage' (ABL) over fecal or bowel incontinence (14). Indeed, some surveys were anchored by the validated question "How often have you experienced accidental leakage of solid or liquid stool over the past year" (8, 15)? Other surveys assessed prevalence over the preceding month (13).

The prevalence of FI is higher among care-seeking populations, home-care populations, and adults in long-term care settings (1). In some (9, 11, 16, 17) but not all (13, 18) studies, the prevalence is lower in African American relative to white women, but is equal in African American and white men (13, 18).

The incidence rate of FI in a population has only been evaluated in two studies (16, 19). In a study of community-dwelling adults aged 65 and older, the incidence rate of FI over 4 years was 17% (13.7, 20.1), with 6% (4.0, 8.3) developing FI at least monthly (16). Controlling for age, comorbidity count, and BMI, significant independent risk factors for incident FI in women were white race, depression, chronic diarrhea, and urinary incontinence (UI). UI was the only significant risk factor for incident FI in men. In a study of community-dwelling women aged 50 years and older the incidence rate of FI was 7.0% (5.0–9.6) ten years after the initial survey. At baseline, self-reported diarrhea (odds ratio [OR]=3.8 [1.5, 9.4]), incomplete evacuation (OR=3.4 [1.2, 9.8]), and pelvic radiation (OR=5.1 [1.01, 25.9]) predicted development of FI. Development of urgency was the primary predictor among the set of predictors reflecting changes in bowel symptoms that were associated with the onset of FI (OR=24.9 [10.6, 58.4]). However, the natural history of FI is unknown.

Finally, some, but not all studies suggest that FI is associated with increased mortality (20–22). However in the studies which link FI with increased mortality, it is unclear whether increased mortality is related to FI per se or conditions associated with FI since the number of chronic illnesses is known to be a risk factor for FI (13).

Patient Suffering and Caregiver Burden

FI can have a devastating impact on daily life. The inability to control an important bodily process results in a loss of confidence, self-respect, modesty, and composure (23). These consequences are compounded by the social stigma attached to FI and the secrecy attached to the condition. Hence, many people with FI do not share the condition with their closest

friends and relatives, let alone care providers. Indeed, sometimes they tend to withdraw from family, friends, and even their spouses. Providers who did not screen for FI considered it less important to screen for FI compared with other health issues such as increased triglyceride levels, diabetes, excessive use of alcohol, and urinary incontinence (24).

Caregiver burden is also significantly greater for FI than for urinary incontinence as measured by hours of care (25), emotional distress and health deterioration in family caregivers (26), and willingness to consider admitting the incontinent relative to a nursing home (26, 27).

Healthcare Seeking Behavior in FI

Recognizing FI is a prerequisite to managing the symptom and providing support to patients. However, FI is under recognized; for example, in one study less than one third of patients with FI had disclosed this to a provider (28). This occurs because providers seldom screen for FI and patients do not volunteer the symptom. Among women presenting for benign gynecologic care, only 17% with FI were asked about the symptom by their health care provider (29). Only 2.7 percent of patients with selfreported FI also had a medical diagnosis (30). The extent to which this problem is explained by limited awareness of the prevalence, burden, and management of FI, by insufficient time during visits or by other factors is unknown (31). There is a lack of consensus on how to screen for FI.

Factors that are associated with care seeking for FI include more frequent and severe FI symptoms (8, 30, 32), symptoms that are perceived as dangerous (e.g., pain) (33), loss of solid stool, having an established primary care provider, and having knowledge of FI (32). Conversely, less frequent and less severe FI (8), and lower embarrassment as measured by the FIQOL questionnaire (29) are associated with lower rates of consulting. Barriers to seeking care include a lack of understanding of the term fecal incontinence, embarrassment, the belief that FI is a normal part of aging, unfamiliarity with whom to discuss this problem, priority of other medical conditions, concerns that there are no options to treat FI, and pessimism that physicians will be able to help (8, 29, 31). For example, an internet-based survey observed that only 30% of nearly 1100 community dwelling women with FI had heard the term “fecal incontinence”; a majority (71%) preferred the term “accidental bowel leakage” to describe their condition (14). A more patient centered term (e.g., accidental bowel leakage) may expand opportunities for sufferers to seek care, as was seen when the term “impotence” was replaced by “erectile dysfunction” or ED.

Economic Impact

The burden and economic impact of FI includes direct (personal hygiene products, ambulatory care visits, diagnostic testing, medical and surgical management) and indirect (loss of productivity and necessary alterations in living environments such as nursing home placement) costs. Because the disease is chronic, it is challenging to measure the economic impact particularly as the efficacy of treatments declines over time; data on both direct and indirect costs are extremely limited. In addition, FI rarely occurs as an isolated condition and therefore, attributing costs to the appropriate disease state can be very difficult. FI increases the likelihood that an older patient will be admitted to a nursing home rather than cared for

at home (34–36). This factor, in addition to the indirect costs of lost productivity, likely represents the largest economic burden of FI.

Two studies have attempted to evaluate the full cost burden of FI. The total per patient annual cost of FI, adjusted to 2012 dollars, was higher in the US (i.e., \$4,111) than the Netherlands (i.e., \$3,521) (37, 38). Data from a health management organization suggest that in 2005, health care visits and the annual actual cost was \$2,897 higher in people with than without FI (30). However it is unclear if this difference is related to FI per se or comorbid medical conditions.

The current surgical costs of FI are similarly difficult to estimate. Based on a review of approximately 3,500 surgeries performed over a 5-year interval for FI, the total hospital costs were \$34.1 million (adjusted to \$2012) which is relatively low compared to the surgical management of urinary incontinence. This surgical cost estimate, however, was derived before the Food and Drug Administration approved newer surgical modalities for FI management including sacral nerve stimulation (SNS) and perianal bulking agents.

The potential economic impact of these new surgical treatment modalities is sizable. For example, in Europe, the estimated 5-year cumulative cost for SNS is seven times higher than conservative treatment (39). Expressed differently, in the United Kingdom, they calculated that each increment in quality-adjusted life year gained with SNS for FI cost over \$35,000. No such calculation has yet been reported in the US but would likely be even higher as the cost of performing the procedure, even for Medicare patients (i.e., approximately \$16,500 for the device and \$6800 for surgical fees) is greater in the US than in Europe. For those with commercial insurance, the costs are even higher. In summary, while diagnostic investigations for FI are relatively inexpensive, our understanding of the direct cost of FI is incomplete particularly since the introduction of the high-cost treatment modality of SNS. There are no prospective studies comparing the cost effectiveness of SNS and conservative therapy. Relatively little is known about the indirect costs of FI. Cost effectiveness should be considered when developing and evaluating diagnostic and treatment algorithms. As the population ages, the prevalence of FI and the associated financial burden will likely increase (9).

Symptom Severity and Impact on Quality of Life

There are over 20 scales for rating the severity of FI. Those developed prior to 1992 are reviewed elsewhere (40) and are rarely used. Thereafter, 6 other scales – the Pescatori, Wexner (Cleveland Clinic), Vaizey (St Marks), Rockwood, Modified Manchester Health Questionnaires, and the Fecal Incontinence and Constipation Assessment (FICA) FI symptom severity instrument – have been developed and used in clinical studies to rate the severity of FI (8, 15, 40–51). The Bowel version of the International Consultation of Incontinence questionnaire (ICIQ-B) and the Revised Fecal Incontinence scale are the most recently developed and validated instruments; however, they have not been widely used in clinical studies (52–54). These 8 scales which have been at least partly validated are summarized in Table 2.

All scales for rating the severity of FI incorporate the type and frequency of leakage. Some scales (i.e., Vaizey, FICA, and ICIQ-B) also incorporate rectal urgency (8, 43, 44, 52), which is often unpredictable, and causes much distress to people with FI (23). Patients with urge FI and rectal hypersensitivity have more frequent stools, use more pads, and report more lifestyle restrictions compared to patients with normal rectal sensation (55). Only one scale (i.e., the FICA FI symptom severity scale) incorporates the amount of leakage, which we deem essential for characterizing the severity of FI (52) (Table 2). Indeed, absent an assessment of the amount of leakage, the severity of FI would be rated as identical for two subjects, one of whom had minor staining and the other a large liquid incontinent bowel movement once a week.

FI can have a devastating impact on quality of life (QOL), which can be evaluated by generic or disease-specific instruments. Some symptom severity scales also include typically one (41, 43, 53), sometimes more (52) questions related to impact of FI on QOL. The alternative approach is to use dedicated instruments with more questions that provide a more refined assessment of the impact of FI on QOL (e.g., Rockwood Fecal Incontinence Quality of Life Scale, modified Manchester Health Questionnaire, and FICA QOL scale) (44, 45, 56). There is a significant correlation between symptom severity and QOL in FI (42, 44). The Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Incontinence Sexual Questionnaire—IUGA Revised is validated in women with FI, allowing for measurement of sexual function with a condition-specific measure (57).

A recent study highlighted patients perspectives of the severity of FI and its impact on quality of life. Patients reported that poor bowel control restricted social life; other issues pertained to toilet location, hygiene/odor issues, coping strategies, fear, physical activities, embarrassment and unpredictability of bowel habits (52). Certain QOL instruments (e.g., Rockwood Fecal Incontinence Quality of Life Scale), comprehensively address issues identified by patients.

Bowel diaries are a commonly used research tool for objective measurement of condition severity but can be limited by poor patient adherence. These limitations to paper diaries can be mitigated by internet and telephone-based daily reporting of symptoms, although older people who are at greatest risk of FI may not be comfortable with these technologies. Given the limitations in objective, global, and diary measures, FI assessment is likely to remain reliant on symptom severity and QOL scales.

Etiology, Associated Conditions, and Risk Factors

Knowing which clinical conditions and patient characteristics are strongly associated with FI is important because these identify patients who are at risk for FI and who should be targeted for screening and prevention strategies (Table 3). In general, the term “etiology” is used in clinical practice while epidemiological studies identify associated conditions and risk factors. Only epidemiological studies that assess the temporal relationship between FI and associated conditions can identify risk factors, which precede the onset of FI.

Few epidemiological studies have comprehensively evaluated the risk factors for FI in the community. In community surveys, bowel disturbances, particularly diarrhea, the symptom

of rectal urgency, and burden of chronic illness rather than obstetric history (e.g., forceps use, complicated episiotomy) are by far the most important independent risk factors for fecal incontinence (13, 19, 58–61). Specifically, in a community-based cohort of 176 randomly selected women with and 176 without FI, independent risk factors for FI were diarrhea (53 [6.1–471], mean odds ratio [95% CI]), cholecystectomy (4.2 [1.2–15]), current smokers (4.7 [1.4–15]), rectocele (4.9 [1.3–19]), stress urinary incontinence (3.1 [1.4–6.5]), and BMI (per unit, 1.1 [1.004–1.1]). A history of smoking and obesity are emerging and potentially modifiable risk factors (9, 11, 17, 60, 61); smoking is also a risk factor for external sphincter atrophy by MRI (61). The mechanisms by which obesity predisposes to FI are incompletely understood (62). Other conditions associated with FI include advanced age, disease burden (co-morbidity count, diabetes), anal sphincter trauma (obstetrical injury, prior surgery), and decreased physical activity (3, 9, 13, 17, 63).

Several diseases that can cause anorectal sensorimotor dysfunctions and/or altered bowel habits are associated with FI in clinical practice (Table 3). Some of these conditions do not emerge as risk factors in community studies possibly because their prevalence is relatively low. Consistent with the findings of community-based studies, the vast majority of women with FI who consult a physician do not have a neurological or inflammatory disorder but rather bowel disturbances, typically diarrhea, perhaps associated with a history of obstetric risk factors.

Obstetric trauma

The relationship between obstetric anal sphincter injury and FI may be summarized as follows. The incidence of FI following vaginal delivery appears to be declining from rates of 13% of primiparous women two decades ago (64) to 8% in the most recent series (65). This may reflect improvements in obstetrical practices including decreased use of instrumented vaginal delivery (forceps and vacuum extraction), and more selective use of episiotomy. Obstetric anal sphincter injury is a significant risk factor for postpartum FI (66). However, and similar to urinary incontinence, the available studies indicate that obstetric anal sphincter injury is not, after adjusting for bowel disturbances (60), a major risk factor for FI occurring many decades after vaginal delivery in women. Among women in the community the median age of onset of FI is the 7th decade, i.e., many decades after vaginal delivery (60, 61). Moreover, the prevalence of FI is similar in men and women. Post partum AI results from vaginal delivery rather than pregnancy or labor. Epidemiologic studies show similar rates of AI and FI between nulligravid and nulliparous women, and prospective observational studies demonstrate that rates of AI do not significantly change throughout pregnancy (67–70). Similarly, comparisons of rates of AI in labored and unlabored cesarean sections show no significant differences in either epidemiologic surveys or prospective observational trials (68, 71, 72). Third degree (i.e., involving the external anal sphincter) and fourth degree lacerations (i.e., extending through the external and internal anal sphincters) are strong risk factors for anal and fecal incontinence. A prospective trial conducted by the NIH/NICHD Pelvic Floor Disorders Network matched women with sphincter injury to a vaginal delivery without recognized sphincter injury control group and identified a nearly twofold increase in the odds of FI (73). Among deliveries requiring instrumentation, the risk is highest for instrumented (forceps and vacuum) deliveries with increased odds of 1.5 for

AI and higher risk with forceps than vacuum (74). Cesarean delivery obviously minimizes the risk of anatomic anal sphincter injury, but does not universally protect against development of FI/AI. The 2006 NIH consensus conference on cesarean delivery on maternal request concluded that there was insufficient evidence to support a practice of elective Cesarean delivery for the prevention of pelvic floor disorders, including FI. Thus, there are likely inherent predispositions (i.e., genetic) in some women, that when exposed to an event such as childbirth or other factors (i.e., obesity and age) results in expression of the disorder. Our understanding of the relationship between obstetric injury and FI/AI is based on cross-sectional and case-control studies because randomized trials are not feasible.

FI in the Elderly

The prevalence of FI is 15% in community dwelling older people (13), 18–33% in hospitals, 38% in home health, and 50–70% in nursing homes (75–77). Among community dwelling elderly, the incidence of FI (i.e., new onset FI), ranges from 7% over 10 years to 17% over 4 years (16, 19). Within 10 months of admission to nursing homes, 20% of those continent at admission develop FI (20), suggesting that nursing home practices may contribute to FI but may also be related to the high comorbidity burden and low functional status of persons admitted to nursing homes. Older adults frequently do not report FI. Providers screen for FI among patients in nursing homes but not in the community (78).

Dementia (20, 28, 79), mobility impairment (80, 81), and comorbid chronic diseases (18, 20) are more significant risk factors for FI in older adults. Constipation with fecal impaction is a significant risk in nursing homes (20, 81). Cross-sectional studies suggest that age is associated with alterations in anorectal functions (i.e., lower anal resting and squeeze pressures, anal sphincter denervation, increased rectal compliance, and decreased rectal sensation) (82–85). These changes may predispose to FI.

Several studies have evaluated the effects of various interventions in nursing home residents. Prompted toileting and regular fitness training reduced the frequency of FI from 8% to 0% of incontinence checks and increased the proportion of continent bowel movements from 0% to 75% (86). In a separate study, a program of prompted toileting, fitness training, and increased fluid intake was accompanied by more bowel movements and continent stools but there was no change in the number of incontinent bowel movements (87). However, 89% of these patients had an underlying evacuation disorder. In a trial comparing lactulose alone to lactulose plus glycerin suppositories, residents who had complete rectal emptying as determined by a rectal examination, also had fewer FI episodes and soiled less frequently (88). Finally, a perineal washcloth with dimethicone reduced incontinence-associated dermatitis from 22% to 8%; while water and pH neutral soap had no effect (89).

Mechanisms of Normal Fecal Continence and Pathophysiology of Fecal Incontinence

Fecal continence is maintained by anatomical factors, recto-anal sensation, and rectal compliance (90) (Figure 1). The internal anal sphincter, which is made of circular smooth muscle, maintains approximately 70% of anal resting tone. The external anal sphincter,

comprised of striated muscle, accounts for the remaining component of resting tone. The puborectalis is a U-shaped component of the levator ani complex that also helps maintain the rectoanal angle at rest. The external sphincter, puborectalis, and levator ani can be voluntarily contracted further to preserve continence. Rectal distension by stool induces rectal contraction, the sensation of urgency, and reflex relaxation of the internal anal sphincter. Thereafter, if socially convenient, the pelvic floor muscles relax followed by defecation. If not, rectal contractions and the sensation of urgency generally subside as the rectum accommodates to continued distention. This, together with voluntary contraction of the external anal sphincter and puborectalis muscles, permits defecation to be postponed when necessary.

Bowel disturbances, typically diarrhea, and/or anorectal dysfunctions (i.e., anal sphincter weakness, reduced rectal compliance, increased or reduced rectal sensation) can cause FI (91, 92). Many patients have more than one disturbance (93). A majority of older women with FI have reduced anal resting and/or squeeze pressures, reflecting weakness of the internal and/or external anal sphincters respectively (94). Anal sphincter damage, which is most frequently caused by obstetric or iatrogenic trauma, or neurogenic injury can cause anal weakness. The association between sphincter injury documented by imaging and weakness is incompletely understood. Neurogenic lesions can occur at any level of the axis extending from the central nervous system to the external anal sphincter (85). The most common causes of neurogenic injury include a peripheral neuropathy (e.g., due to diabetes mellitus), pudendal nerve stretch injury, or obstetric injury. Moreover, recent studies suggest that even asymptomatic older nulliparous women have anal sphincter neurogenic injury, which partly explained weak squeeze pressures (85). Since needle EMG is the only available technique for documenting neurogenic injury, newer, and preferably less invasive approaches are necessary (95).

In addition to anal sphincter injury, FI is also associated with atrophy, denervation, and impaired function of the puborectalis muscle (94). Excessive straining may cause increased perineal descent, which can stretch and thereby damage the pudendal nerve and also make the anorectal angle more obtuse.

Patients with FI may have normal, reduced, or increased rectal sensation (94, 96). When rectal sensation is reduced, the external anal sphincter may not contract promptly when the rectum is distended by stool, predisposing to FI. Conversely, rectal hypersensitivity in FI may be partly secondary to an exaggerated contractile response to distention, and/or reduced rectal capacity, and may explain the symptom of rectal urgency (93, 94, 97–99). The pathogenesis of a smaller rectal reservoir, which may predispose to FI particularly when associated with anal weakness, is unknown. Finally, some patients with fecal seepage have high anal pressures and impaired rectal evacuation (100). Such patients may benefit from biofeedback retraining not only to improve rectal sensation and rectal coordination, but also to improve abdomino-pelvic coordination during defecation.

In summary, multiple physiological mechanisms preserve continence. Deficits in any of these mechanisms may contribute to FI, and as a consequence no single physiological measure is consistently associated with FI. Treatments that target only one mechanism (such

as sphincter weakness) are unlikely to benefit all patients with FI. It is unknown if the phenotype based on symptoms and pathophysiological mechanisms is useful for guiding therapy for FI.

Classification of Fecal Incontinence

An ideal system for classifying FI would preferably be user friendly and preferably require less testing, provide discrete categories with minimal overlap among categories, be related to underlying mechanisms, and guide therapy and also predict the response to therapy. In contrast to urinary incontinence, there is no widely-accepted approach for classifying FI. Currently, FI is classified by separate systems based on etiology (Table 3), pathophysiology (i.e., bowel disturbances, anorectal dysfunctions), type of leakage (urge, passive, or combined), or symptom severity scales. At this meeting, it was proposed that these domains can be incorporated into a new system to comprehensively characterize FI. Consideration should be given to further developing this classification.

Suggestions for Future Research

Table 4 summarizes the topics for future research in the epidemiology and pathophysiology of fecal incontinence. These topics are an extension of the gaps in our current knowledge identified in this document.

Summary

FI is a common, but often under-recognized symptom, which can affect both men and women. Patient centered terms such as accidental bowel leakage may be preferable to medical terms (e.g., fecal incontinence) in communication with the public. Particularly when severe, the symptom can substantially impair quality of life and based on limited data, have a substantial economic impact. Symptom severity and quality of life can be quantified by questionnaires. Community studies suggest that bowel disturbances, particularly diarrhea, are the strongest risk factors for FI. Deficits in any of the multiple physiological mechanisms that preserve continence may also contribute to FI. There is considerable scope for enhancing our understanding of these issues, thereby facilitating identification of FI and improving the lives of people who have the symptom.

Acknowledgments

Financial support:

Dr. Bharucha was partly supported by NIH Grants R01 DKDK78924 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Dr. Whitehead was partly supported by Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality grant R01 HS018695 and NIH grant R21 DK096545.

Conflicts of interest:

Dr. Whitehead received research support from Salix Pharmaceuticals.

References

1. Nelson RL. Epidemiology of fecal incontinence. *Gastroenterology*. 2004; 126:S3–S7. [PubMed: 14978632]

2. Drossman DA, Li Z, Andruzzi E, et al. U.S. householder survey of functional gastrointestinal disorders. Prevalence, sociodemography, and health impact. *Dig Dis Sci*. 1993; 38:1569–1580. [PubMed: 8359066]
3. Nelson R, Norton N, Cautley E, et al. Community-based prevalence of anal incontinence. *JAMA*. 1995; 274:559–561. [PubMed: 7629985]
4. Talley NJ, O'Keefe EA, Zinsmeister AR, et al. Prevalence of gastrointestinal symptoms in the elderly: a population-based study. *Gastroenterology*. 1992; 102:895–901. [PubMed: 1537525]
5. Reilly W, Talley N, Pemberton J. Fecal incontinence: prevalence and risk factors in the community. *Gastroenterology*. 1995; 108:A32.
6. Perry S, Shaw C, McGrother C, et al. Prevalence of faecal incontinence in adults aged 40 years or more living in the community. *Gut*. 2002; 50:480–484. [PubMed: 11889066]
7. Walter S, Hallbook O, Gotthard R, et al. A population-based study on bowel habits in a Swedish community: prevalence of faecal incontinence and constipation. *Scand J Gastroenterol*. 2002; 37:911–916. [PubMed: 12229965]
8. Bharucha AE, Zinsmeister AR, Locke GR, et al. Prevalence and burden of fecal incontinence: A population based study in women. *Gastroenterology*. 2005; 129:42–49. [PubMed: 16012933]
9. Melville JL, Fan MY, Newton K, et al. Fecal incontinence in US women: a population-based study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2005; 193:2071–2076. [PubMed: 16325618]
10. Quander CR, Morris MC, Melson J, et al. Prevalence of and factors associated with fecal incontinence in a large community study of older individuals. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2005; 100:905–909. [PubMed: 15784039]
11. Varma MG, Brown JS, Creasman JM, et al. Fecal incontinence in females older than aged 40 years: who is at risk? *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2006; 49:841–851. [PubMed: 16741640]
12. Nygaard I, Barber MD, Burgio KL, et al. Prevalence of symptomatic pelvic floor disorders in US women. *JAMA*. 2008; 300:1311–1316. [PubMed: 18799443]
13. Whitehead WE, Borrud L, Goode PS, et al. Fecal incontinence in US adults: epidemiology and risk factors. *Gastroenterology*. 2009; 137:512–517. [PubMed: 19410574]
14. Brown HW, Wexner SD, Segall MM, et al. Accidental bowel leakage in the mature women's health study: prevalence and predictors. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2012; 66:1101–1108. [PubMed: 23067034]
15. Bharucha AE, Locke GR, Seide B, et al. A New Questionnaire for Constipation and Fecal Incontinence. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*. 2004; 20:355–364. [PubMed: 15274673]
16. Markland AD, Goode PS, Burgio KL, et al. Incidence and risk factors for fecal incontinence in black and white older adults: a population-based study. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010; 58:1341–1346. [PubMed: 20533967]
17. Matthews CA, Whitehead WE, Townsend MK, et al. Risk factors for urinary, fecal, or dual incontinence in the nurses' health study. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2013; 122:539–545. [PubMed: 23921863]
18. Goode PS, Burgio KL, Halli AD, et al. Prevalence and correlates of fecal incontinence in community-dwelling older adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2005; 53:629–635. [PubMed: 15817009]
19. Rey E, Choung RS, Schleck CD, et al. Onset and risk factors for fecal incontinence in a US community. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2010; 105:412–419. [PubMed: 19844202]
20. Chassagne P, Landrin I, Neveu C, et al. Fecal incontinence in the institutionalized elderly: incidence, risk factors, and prognosis. *Am J Med*. 1999; 106:185–190. [PubMed: 10230748]
21. Nakanishi N, Tataru K, Shinsho F, et al. Mortality in relation to urinary and faecal incontinence in elderly people living at home. *Age Ageing*. 1999; 28:301–306. [PubMed: 10475868]
22. Alameel T, Basheikh M, Andrew MK. Digestive symptoms in older adults: prevalence and associations with institutionalization and mortality. *Can J Gastroenterol*. 2012; 26:881–884. [PubMed: 23248787]
23. Norton NJ. The perspective of the patient. *Gastroenterology*. 2004; 126:S175–S179. [PubMed: 14978658]
24. Kunduru L, Kim SM, Heymen S, et al. Factors that affect consultation and screening for fecal incontinence. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014. 2014 Aug 19. [Epub ahead of print].

25. Finne-Soveri H, Sorbye LW, Jonsson PV, et al. Increased work-load associated with faecal incontinence among home care patients in 11 European countries. *Eur J Public Health*. 2008; 18:323–328. [PubMed: 17766995]
26. Noelker LS. Incontinence in elderly cared for by family. *Gerontologist*. 1987; 27:194–200. [PubMed: 3583011]
27. Ouslander JG, Zarit SH, Orr NK, et al. Incontinence among elderly community-dwelling dementia patients. Characteristics, management, and impact on caregivers. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1990; 38:440–445. [PubMed: 2329252]
28. Johanson JF, Lafferty J. Epidemiology of fecal incontinence: the silent affliction. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 1996; 91:33–36. [PubMed: 8561140]
29. Boreham MK, Richter HE, Kenton KS, et al. Anal incontinence in women presenting for gynecologic care: prevalence, risk factors, and impact upon quality of life. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2005; 192:1637–1642. [PubMed: 15902170]
30. Dunivan GC, Heymen S, Palsson OS, et al. Fecal incontinence in primary care: prevalence, diagnosis, and health care utilization. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2010; 202:493.e1–493.e 6. [PubMed: 20223447]
31. Bliss DZ, Norton C, Vodusek DB. Raising awareness about fecal incontinence. *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2010; 29:612–615. [PubMed: 20432322]
32. Brown HW, Wexner SD, Lukacz ES. Factors associated with care seeking among women with accidental bowel leakage. *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg*. 2013; 19:66–71. [PubMed: 23442502]
33. Stenzelius K, Westergren A, Hallberg IR. Bowel function among people 75+ reporting faecal incontinence in relation to help seeking, dependency and quality of life. *J Clin Nurs*. 2007; 16:458–468. [PubMed: 17335521]
34. Friedman SM, Steinwachs DM, Rathouz PJ, et al. Characteristics predicting nursing home admission in the program of all-inclusive care for elderly people. *Gerontologist*. 2005; 45:157–166. [PubMed: 15799980]
35. Grover M, Busby-Whitehead J, Palmer MH, et al. Survey of geriatricians on the effect of fecal incontinence on nursing home referral. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010; 58:1058–1062. [PubMed: 20487073]
36. Tsuji I, Whalen S, Finucane TE. Predictors of nursing home placement in community-based long-term care. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 1995; 43:761–766. [PubMed: 7602027]
37. Deutekom M, Dobben AC, Dijkgraaf MGW, et al. Costs of outpatients with fecal incontinence. *Scand J Gastroenterol*. 2005; 40:552–558. [PubMed: 16036507]
38. Xu X, Menees SB, Zochowski MK, et al. Economic cost of fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2012; 55:586–598. [PubMed: 22513438]
39. Hetzer FH, Bieler A, Hahnloser D, et al. Outcome and cost analysis of sacral nerve stimulation for faecal incontinence. *Br J Surg*. 2006; 93:1411–1417. [PubMed: 17022014]
40. Pescatori M, Anastasio G, Bottini C, et al. New grading and scoring for anal incontinence. Evaluation of 335 patients. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1992; 35:482–487. [PubMed: 1568401]
41. Jorge JM, Wexner SD. Etiology and management of fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1993; 36:77–97. [PubMed: 8416784]
42. Rockwood TH, Church JM, Fleshman JW, et al. Patient and surgeon ranking of the severity of symptoms associated with fecal incontinence: the fecal incontinence severity index. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 1999; 42:1525–1532. [PubMed: 10613469]
43. Vaizey CJ, Carapeti E, Cahill JA, et al. Prospective comparison of faecal incontinence grading systems. *Gut*. 1999; 44:77–80. [PubMed: 9862829]
44. Bharucha AE, Zinsmeister AR, Locke GR, et al. Symptoms and quality of life in community women with fecal incontinence. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2006; 4:1004–1009. [PubMed: 16630766]
45. Kwon S, Visco AG, Fitzgerald MP, et al. Validity and reliability of the Modified Manchester Health Questionnaire in assessing patients with fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2005; 48:323–331. discussion 331–4. [PubMed: 15616750]

46. Markland AD, Richter HE, Burgio KL, et al. Outcomes of combination treatment of fecal incontinence in women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2008; 199:699.e1–699.e7. [PubMed: 19084101]
47. Rothbarth J, Bemelman WA, Meijerink WJ, et al. What is the impact of fecal incontinence on quality of life? *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2001; 44:67–71. [PubMed: 11805565]
48. Deutekom M, Terra MP, Dobben AC, et al. Impact of faecal incontinence severity on health domains. *Colorectal Dis*. 2005; 7:263–269. [PubMed: 15859965]
49. Bharucha AE, Fletcher JG, Camilleri M, et al. Effects of clonidine in women with fecal incontinence. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2014; 12:843–851.e2. quiz e44. [PubMed: 23891925]
50. Hull T, Giese C, Wexner SD, et al. Long-term durability of sacral nerve stimulation therapy for chronic fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2013; 56:234–245. [PubMed: 23303153]
51. Pucciani F, Iozzi L, Masi A, et al. Multimodal rehabilitation for faecal incontinence: experience of an Italian centre devoted to faecal disorder rehabilitation. *Tech Coloproctol*. 2003; 7:139–147. discussion 147. [PubMed: 14628156]
52. Cotterill N, Norton C, Avery KNL, et al. A patient-centered approach to developing a comprehensive symptom and quality of life assessment of anal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2008; 51:82–87. [PubMed: 18008106]
53. Sansoni J, Hawthorne G, Fleming G, et al. The revised faecal incontinence scale: a clinical validation of a new, short measure for assessment and outcomes evaluation. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2013; 56:652–659. [PubMed: 23575406]
54. Cotterill N, Norton C, Avery KNL, et al. Psychometric evaluation of a new patient-completed questionnaire for evaluating anal incontinence symptoms and impact on quality of life: the ICIQ-B. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2011; 54:1235–1250. [PubMed: 21904138]
55. Chan CL, Scott SM, Williams NS, et al. Rectal hypersensitivity worsens stool frequency, urgency, and lifestyle in patients with urge fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2005; 48:134–140. [PubMed: 15690670]
56. Rockwood TH, Church JM, Fleshman JW, et al. Fecal incontinence quality of life scale: quality of life instrument for patients with fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum*. 2000; 43:9–16. discussion 16–7. [PubMed: 10813117]
57. Rogers RG, Rockwood TH, Constantine ML, et al. A new measure of sexual function in women with pelvic floor disorders (PFD): the Pelvic Organ Prolapse/Incontinence Sexual Questionnaire, IUGA-Revised (PISQ-IR). *Int Urogynecol J*. 2013; 24:1091–1103. [PubMed: 23632798]
58. Bharucha AE, Zinsmeister AR, Locke GR, et al. Risk Factors for Fecal Incontinence: A Population Based Study in Women. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2006; 101:1305–1312. [PubMed: 16771954]
59. Bharucha AE, Seide B, Zinsmeister AR, et al. Relation of bowel habits to fecal incontinence in women. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2008; 103:1470–1475. [PubMed: 18510612]
60. Bharucha AE, Zinsmeister AR, Schleck CD, et al. Bowel disturbances are the most important risk factors for late onset fecal incontinence: a population-based case-control study in women. *Gastroenterology*. 2010; 139:1559–1566. [PubMed: 20708007]
61. Bharucha AE, Fletcher JG, Melton LJ 3rd, et al. Obstetric Trauma, Pelvic Floor Injury And Fecal Incontinence: A Population-Based Case-Control Study. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2012; 107:902–911. [PubMed: 22415196]
62. Bharucha AE. Incontinence - An Underappreciated Problem In Obesity And Bariatric Surgery. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2010; 55:2428–2430. [PubMed: 20521110]
63. Rommen K, Schei B, Rydning A, et al. Prevalence of anal incontinence among Norwegian women: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2012; 2
64. Sultan AH, Kamm MA, Hudson CN, et al. Anal-sphincter disruption during vaginal delivery. *N Engl J Med*. 1993; 329:1905–1911. [PubMed: 8247054]
65. Rogers RG, Leeman L, Borders A, et al. Does cesarean delivery protect against pelvic floor dysfunction at 6 months postpartum? *Female Pelvic Med Reconstr Surg*. 2012; 18:S73.
66. Bols EMJ, Hendriks EJM, Berghmans BCM, et al. A systematic review of etiological factors for postpartum fecal incontinence. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2010; 89:302–314. [PubMed: 20199348]
67. Chaliha C, Sultan AH, Bland JM, et al. Anal function: effect of pregnancy and delivery. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2001; 185:427–432. [PubMed: 11518904]

68. Lukacz ES, Lawrence JM, Contreras R, et al. Parity, mode of delivery, and pelvic floor disorders. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2006; 107:1253–1260. [PubMed: 16738149]
69. McKinnie V, Swift SE, Wang W, et al. The effect of pregnancy and mode of delivery on the prevalence of urinary and fecal incontinence. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2005; 193:512–517. discussion 517–8. [PubMed: 16098879]
70. Solans-Domenech M, Sanchez E, Espuna-Pons M, et al. Urinary and anal incontinence during pregnancy and postpartum: incidence, severity, and risk factors. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2010; 115:618–628. [PubMed: 20177295]
71. Liebling RE, Swingler R, Patel RR, et al. Pelvic floor morbidity up to one year after difficult instrumental delivery and cesarean section in the second stage of labor: a cohort study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2004; 191:4–10. [PubMed: 15295337]
72. MacLennan AH, Taylor AW, Wilson DH, et al. The prevalence of pelvic floor disorders and their relationship to gender, age, parity and mode of delivery. *BJOG.* 2000; 107:1460–1470. [PubMed: 11192101]
73. Borello-France D, Burgio KL, Richter HE, et al. Fecal and urinary incontinence in primiparous women. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2006; 108:863–872. [PubMed: 17012447]
74. Pretlove SJ, Thompson PJ, Tooze-Hobson PM, et al. Does the mode of delivery predispose women to anal incontinence in the first year postpartum? A comparative systematic review. *BJOG.* 2008; 115:421–434. [PubMed: 18271879]
75. Nelson R, Furner S, Jesudason V. Fecal incontinence in Wisconsin nursing homes: prevalence and associations. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 1998; 41:1226–1229. [PubMed: 9788384]
76. Bliss DZ, Harms S, Garrard JM, et al. Prevalence of incontinence by race and ethnicity of older people admitted to nursing homes. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2013; 14:451.e1–451.e7. [PubMed: 23623144]
77. Wagg, AS.; Chen, LK.; Kirschner-Hermanns, Rea. Incontinence in the Frail Elderly. In: Abrams, P.; Cardozo, L.; Khoury, S., et al., editors. *Incontinence.* 5th ed.. Paris, France: International Continence Society; 2013.
78. Nyrop KA, Grover M, Palsson OS, et al. Likelihood of nursing home referral for fecally incontinent elderly patients is influenced by physician views on nursing home care and outpatient management of fecal incontinence. *J Am Med Dir Assoc.* 2012; 13:350–354. [PubMed: 21450249]
79. Shamliyan TA, Bliss DZ, Du J, et al. Prevalence and risk factors of fecal incontinence in community-dwelling men. *Rev Gastroenterol Disord.* 2009; 9:E97–E110. [PubMed: 20065920]
80. Akpan A, Gosney MA, Barret J. Factors contributing to fecal incontinence in older people and outcome of routine management in home, hospital and nursing home settings. *Clin Interv Aging.* 2007; 2:139–145. [PubMed: 18044086]
81. Schnelle JF, Simmons SF, Beuscher L, et al. Prevalence of constipation symptoms in fecally incontinent nursing home residents. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2009; 57:647–652. [PubMed: 19392956]
82. Read NW, Abouzekry L, Read MG, et al. Anorectal function in elderly patients with fecal impaction. *Gastroenterology.* 1985; 89:959–966. [PubMed: 4043676]
83. Bannister JJ, Abouzekry L, Read NW. Effect of aging on anorectal function. *Gut.* 1987; 28:353–357. [PubMed: 3570039]
84. Fox JC, Fletcher JG, Zinsmeister AR, et al. Effect of aging on anorectal and pelvic floor functions in females. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2006; 49:1726–1735. [erratum appears in *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2007 Mar;50(3):404]. [PubMed: 17041752]
85. Bharucha AE, Daube J, Litchy W, et al. Anal sphincteric neurogenic injury in asymptomatic nulliparous women and fecal incontinence. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol.* 2012; 303:G256–G262. [PubMed: 22575218]
86. Ouslander JG, Simmons S, Schnelle J, et al. Effects of prompted voiding on fecal continence among nursing home residents. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 1996; 44:424–428. [PubMed: 8636590]
87. Schnelle JF, Leung FW, Rao SSC, et al. A controlled trial of an intervention to improve urinary and fecal incontinence and constipation. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2010; 58:1504–1511. [PubMed: 20653804]
88. Chassagne P, Jeco A, Gloc P, et al. Does treatment of constipation improve faecal incontinence in institutionalized elderly patients? *Age Ageing.* 2000; 29:159–164. [PubMed: 10791451]

89. Beeckman D, Verhaeghe S, Defloor T, et al. A 3-in-1 perineal care washcloth impregnated with dimethicone 3% versus water and pH neutral soap to prevent and treat incontinence-associated dermatitis: a randomized, controlled clinical trial. *J Wound Ostomy Continence Nurs.* 2011; 38:627–634. [PubMed: 21952346]
90. Bharucha AE. Pelvic floor: anatomy and function. *Neurogastroenterol Motil.* 2006; 18:507–519. [PubMed: 16771766]
91. Rao SS. Pathophysiology of Adult Fecal Incontinence. *Gastroenterology.* 2004; 126:S14–S22. [PubMed: 14978634]
92. Andrews CN, Bharucha AE. The etiology, assessment, and treatment of fecal incontinence. *Nat Clin Pract Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2005; 2:516–525. [PubMed: 16355157]
93. Sun WM, Donnelly TC, Read NW. Utility of a combined test of anorectal manometry, electromyography, and sensation in determining the mechanism of 'idiopathic' faecal incontinence. *Gut.* 1992; 33:807–813. [PubMed: 1624164]
94. Bharucha AE, Fletcher JG, Harper CM, et al. Relationship between symptoms and disordered continence mechanisms in women with idiopathic fecal incontinence. *Gut.* 2005; 54:546–555. [PubMed: 15753542]
95. Rao SSC, Coss-Adame E, Tantiphlachiva K, et al. Translumbar and transsacral magnetic neurostimulation for the assessment of neuropathy in fecal incontinence. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 2014; 57:645–652. [PubMed: 24819106]
96. Andrews CN, Seide B, Zinsmeister AR, et al. Effect of Distention Rate on Rectal Sensory Thresholds in Health and Fecal Incontinence. *Gastroenterology.* 2005; 128:A-264.
97. Siproudhis L, El Abkari M, El Alaoui M, et al. Low rectal volumes in patients suffering from fecal incontinence: what does it mean? *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2005; 22:989–996. [PubMed: 16268974]
98. Andrews C, Bharucha AE, Camilleri M, et al. Rectal sensorimotor dysfunction in women with fecal incontinence. *Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol.* 2007; 292:G282–G289. [PubMed: 16950762]
99. Deutekom M, Dobben AC, Terra MP, et al. Clinical presentation of fecal incontinence and anorectal function: what is the relationship? *Am J Gastroenterol.* 2007; 102:351–361. [PubMed: 17100975]
100. Parellada CM, Miller AS, Williamson ME, et al. Paradoxical high anal resting pressures in men with idiopathic fecal seepage. *Dis Colon Rectum.* 1998; 41:593–597. [PubMed: 9593241]

Study Highlights

What is current knowledge?

- FI is a common symptom and can have a devastating impact on quality of life but is often underreported.
- The strongest independent risk factors for FI in the community are bowel disturbances, especially diarrhea, the symptom of rectal urgency, and burden of chronic illness.
- Diarrhea, anal and pelvic floor weakness, reduced rectal compliance, and reduced or increased rectal sensation contribute to FI; many patients have multifaceted anorectal dysfunctions.
- Symptom severity in FI and its impact on quality of life can be classified by validated scales. Symptom severity scales should incorporate the frequency, volume, consistency, and nature (urge or passive) of stool leakage.

What is new here?

- Despite the basic understanding of FI, there are still major knowledge gaps in epidemiology and pathogenesis, necessitating future clinical trials.
- Several topics for future research were identified in this conference and summarized in this article.

Figure 1. Mechanisms of Normal and Disordered Fecal Continence

In addition to formed stools, anatomical factors, recto-anal sensation, and rectal compliance contribute to fecal continence. Conditions which affect stool consistency, impair rectal capacity or sensation, weaken the anal sphincters and pelvic floor weakness, limit mobility or mental faculties result in FI.

Table 1**Epidemiology of Fecal Incontinence: Community-Based Studies**

Survey	Respondents; Instrument	Response Rate (Number Respondents)	Prevalence
Talley (1992) (4)	Olmsted County residents 65 years; Mailed questionnaire	66% (328)	FI once per week over past year – 3.1% (F); 4.5% (M)
Drossman (1993) (2)	US householder marketing list; Mailed questionnaire	66% (5,430)	Soiling – 6.9 % (F); 7.4 % (M) Gross incontinence – 0.9% (F); 0.5% (M)
Nelson (1993) (3)	Wisconsin residents of all ages; Phone interview with 1 member in each household	73% (6,959)	Any FI over past year – 2.2% (overall) 7.5% (aged 65)
Reilly (1994) (5)	Olmsted County residents 50 years; Mailed questionnaire	64% (1,540)	Any FI – 17.8% (F); 12.8% (M)
Walter (2002)(7)	County of Ostergotland (Sweden); aged 31–76 years; Mailed questionnaire	81% (1610)	Liquid FI > 1/month – 10.9% (F); 9.7% (M) Solid FI > 1/month – 1.4% (F); 0.4% (M)
Perry (2002)(6)	Leicestershire Health Authority (UK) patient register; Mailed questionnaire	70% (10,226)	Any FI – 5.7% (F); 6.2% (M)
Bharucha (2005)(8)	Olmsted County residents 20 years; Mailed questionnaire	53% (2800)	Any FI – 14% (F)
Melville (2005)(9)	HMO population, 30–90 years, Washington State; Mailed questionnaire	64% (3536)	Loss of liquid or stolid stool once/month – 7.7% (F)
Quander (2006)(10)	Chicago Health and Aging Project, 65 years, door-to-door survey of 1 household member	79% (6158)	Any FI (“past few months”) – 9.6%. No differences between men and women
Varma (2006)(11)	Reproductive Risks for Incontinence Study at Kaiser, 40 years with 50% of deliveries at Kaiser, mailed questionnaire	2109	Any fecal incontinence in past 12 months – 25% (F)
Nygaard (2008) (12) and Whitehead (2009) (13)	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (2005–2006), men and women 20 years, door-to-door interview	64% (4308)	Loss of liquid or stolid or mucus stool during the last 30 days – 8.9% (F); 7.7% (M)

Prevalence rates for males (M) and females (F) are provided separately where available

FI = fecal incontinence.

Reproduced with permission from Bharucha AE. Epidemiology of Fecal Incontinence. In: Talley NJ, Locke GR III, Moayyedi P, West J, Ford AC, Saito YA, eds. GI Epidemiology: Diseases and Clinical Methodology, 2nd ed. Chichester (UK): Wiley Blackwell, 2013, p. 285–295.

Table 2

Validation of Instruments for Rating Severity of Fecal Incontinence

Item	Pescatori (40)	Wexner (41)	St Mark's (43)	FISI (42)	FTCA (8, 15, 44)	Modified Manchester Health Questionnaire	ICIQ-B (52, 54)	Revised FI Scale (53)
Content*	Urge - Volume -	Urge - Volume -	Volume -	Urge - Volume -	A	Urge - Volume -	Volume -	Urge - Volume -
Construct	A (43)	A (43, 53)	A (53)	B	A	A (45)	A	A
Criterion validity	B	A (47)	A (48)	A	A	A (45)	A	B
Internal Consistency	B	A(53)	A (53)	B	B	A (45)	A	A
Reliability (Test-retest)	A (43)	A(43)	A	A (45)		A (45)	A	B
Responsiveness	B	A(51)	A (48)	A (50)	A (49)	A (46)	B	A

A refers to attributes that have been partly or adequately validated. B refer to attributes that have not been validated.

* Items which are not incorporated in the instrument are indicated by a - sign

For cells with an "A" rating that do not include a citation, the citation is provided in the column heading.

Table 3**Pathogenesis and Etiology of Fecal Incontinence****Anal sphincter weakness**

Injury - obstetric trauma, related to surgical procedures, e.g. hemorrhoidectomy internal sphincterotomy, fistulotomy,

Non-traumatic – scleroderma, internal sphincter thinning of unknown etiology

Neuropathy - stretch injury, obstetric trauma, diabetes mellitus

Anatomical Disturbances of Pelvic Floor – fistula, rectal prolapse, descending perineum syndrome

Anorectal inflammation - Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, radiation proctitis, anorectal infection

Central nervous system disease – Dementia, stroke, brain tumors, spinal cord lesions, multiple system atrophy (Shy Drager's syndrome), multiple sclerosis

Bowel disturbances - diarrhea (eg, irritable bowel syndrome, post-cholecystectomy diarrhea) and constipation with or without fecal impaction/overflow diarrhea.

More than one mechanism may be contributory in some patients.

Reproduced with permission Bharucha A. Fecal Incontinence. *Gastroenterology*. 2003;124(6):1672–85.

Table 4

Suggestions for Future Research in Fecal Incontinence

Area	Topics
Epidemiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the natural history of FI* Assess the impact of modifying risk factors on incidence and natural history of FI* Assess the patient's perspective in the measurement of FI Further validate psychometric properties of instruments for evaluating symptom severity and QOL in FI Develop novel methods of administering questionnaires using IRT and CAT that may improve the measurement of FI with less burden for patients
Low rates of consulting and low rates of screening by providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate screening for FI by providers (e.g., effective tools, educate providers) and health-seeking behavior in those with FI (e.g., reduce the stigma associated with FI, and identify a well known personality to advocate for FI)* Assess if specific materials and methods are more successful in promoting health-seeking behavior in persons with FI in minority racial and ethnic groups.
Burden and Economic Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the associated costs of FI and incorporate cost effectiveness in diagnostic and treatment algorithms
Pathophysiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refine approaches for classifying FI. Assess whether the "phenotype" facilitates targeted therapy for FI. A better understanding of the interaction between stool consistency and anorectal functions, which contribute to FI. Identify the mechanisms of sphincter weakness in women without injury by imaging. Refine the ability of available imaging techniques to define the type (e.g., tear or scar) of anal sphincter injury and its functional consequences. Develop newer techniques to identify neurogenic anal sphincter injury. Clarify the mechanisms of increased rectal stiffness and develop pharmacological approaches to restore rectal reservoir function in FI. Elucidate the mechanisms by which obesity predisposes to FI. Understand the contributions of age, menopause, and chronic straining to anorectal dysfunctions and FI

* These issues can also be evaluated specifically in the elderly

IRT – Item response theory

CAT – computerized adaptive testing