

Table 19: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 12. Oscillating device versus High Frequency Chest Wall Oscillation (HFCWO)

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Oscillating device	HFCWO	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Lung function - FEV₁ (follow-up 2-4 weeks; measured with: % predicted; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (Oerman 2001)	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	24	24	-	MD 1.6 lower (3.44 lower to 0.24 higher)	MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Lung function - FVC (follow-up 2-4 weeks; measured with: % predicted; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (Oerman 2001)	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	24	24	-	MD 1.4 lower (3.07 lower to 0.27 higher)	LOW	IMPORTANT

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; FEV₁: forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC: forced vital capacity; HFCWO: high frequency chest wall oscillation; MD: mean difference

1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 due to reporting bias.

2 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 due to serious imprecision as 95% CI crossed 1 default MID.