

**Table 60: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 5.2 Behavioural intervention *versus* education and attention control treatment**

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Behavioural intervention	Education al intervention	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Change in weight z score (follow-up 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Behavioural intervention	Educational intervention	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1 (Powers 2015)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	36	42	-	MD 0.06 higher (0.1 lower to 0.22 higher)	MODERATE	CRITICAL
<b>Change in weight z score (follow-up 18 months; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Powers 2015)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	36	42	-	MD 0.04 higher (0.2 lower to 0.28 higher)	HIGH	CRITICAL
<b>Change in height z score (follow-up 18 months; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Powers 2015)	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	36	42	-	MD 0.11 higher (0.02 lower to 0.24 higher)	MODERATE	CRITICAL
<b>Quality of life</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Pulmonary exacerbations</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Adverse effects: digestive system (follow-up 6 months Better indicated by lower values)</b>												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Behavioural intervention	Educational intervention	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	29/36 (80.6%)	21/42 (50%)	RR 1.61 (1.14 to 2.27)	305 more per 1000 (from 70 more to 635 more)	MODERATE	IMPORTANT
<b>Patient or carer satisfaction</b>												
No evidence available												

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference

1 The quality of the evidence was not downgraded although there was unclear risk of bias in relation to allocation concealment and blinding, because objective measures are unlikely to be influenced by the lack of blinding.

2 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because the 95% CI crossed 1 default MID