Table 50: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 1. Fluticasone *versus* placebo

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect			
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Fluticasone	Placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Time to first exacerbation (follow-up 6 months)												
1 (Balfour-Lynn 2006)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[1]	none	41/84 (48.8%)[2]	40/87 (46%)[2]	HR 1.07 (0.68 to 1.6838)	23 more per 1000 (from 118 fewer to 186 more)	LOW	CRITICAL
Growth (change in height) (follow-up 12 months; measured with: SDS (standard deviation) score; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (De Boeck 2007)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	15	15	-	MD 0.37 lower (0.77 lower to 0.03 higher)	MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Growth (change in height) in paediatric participants (follow-up 8 months; measured with: cm; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (Balfour-Lynn 2006)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	42	38	-	MD 0.6 higher (0.46 lower to 1.66 higher)	MODERATE	IMPORTANT

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; MD: mean difference; SDS: standard deviation score
1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 as 95%CI crossed the null effect line, and it is very wide.
2 Calculated by the NGA technical team from percentage of participants in group with at least 1 exacerbation.
3 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because 95%CI crossed 1 default MID.