

**Table 85: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 3. High-intensity interval training versus standard aerobic and anaerobic exercise programme**

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High intensity interval training programme	Standard combined aerobic and anaerobic exercise programme	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Change in FEV<sub>1</sub> - Unsupervised programme</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Change in FEV<sub>1</sub>% predicted - Supervised programme (follow-up 6 weeks; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Gru ber 2014 )	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	20	23	-	MD 3.9 lower (7.61 to 0.19 lower) 5	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Change in vital capacity (VC) % predicted - Unsupervised programme</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Change in vital capacity (VC) % predicted - Supervised programme (follow-up 6 weeks; range of scores 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Gru ber 2014 )	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	20	23	-	MD 5.1 lower (11.05 lower to 0.85 higher) 5	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Change in FEV<sub>1</sub> peak</b>												
No evidence available												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High intensity interval training programme	Standard combined aerobic and anaerobic exercise programme	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Change in FEV<sub>1</sub> peak - Supervised programme (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Gru ber 2014 )	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>3</sup>	none	20	23	-	MD 0.8 lower (4.59 lower to 2.99 higher) <sup>5</sup>	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Time to next exacerbation</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Change in BMI - Unsupervised programme</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Change in BMI - Supervised programme (follow-up 6 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Gru ber 2014 )	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>4</sup>	none	21	23	-	MD 0 higher (1.34 lower to 1.34 higher) <sup>5</sup>	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
<b>Quality of life</b>												
No evidence available												
<b>Preference for training programme</b>												
No evidence available												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High intensity interval training programme	Standard combined aerobic and anaerobic exercise programme	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		

**Adverse events**

No evidence available

Abbreviations: BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; CF: cystic fibrosis; FEV<sub>1</sub>: forced expiratory volume in 1 second; VC: vital capacity; kg: kilogrammes MD: mean difference; min: minute; ml: millilitres; FEV<sub>1</sub> max/ peak: maximal oxygen consumption

1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because of high risk of bias in relation to the selection of the participants for each group and the comparability of the groups

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

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

4 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because the 95% CI crossed 2 default MIDs

5 Calculated by the NGA technical team