

Table 86: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 4. Inspiratory muscle training (80% of maximal effort) versus usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Inspiratory muscle training (80% of maximal effort) programme	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Change in FEV₁ (litres) (Follow up: 2-6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (Enrig)	randomised trials	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	9	10	-	MD 0 higher (0.9 lower to	LOW	CRITICAL

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Inspiratory muscle training (80% of maximal effort) programme	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
htt 2004)										0.9 higher)		
Change in FVC (litres) (Follow up: 2-6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1 (Enrigh tt 2004)	randomise d trials	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	9	10	-	MD 0.1 higher (0.9 lower to 1.1 higher)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
FEV₁ peak												
No evidence available												
Time to next exacerbation												
No evidence available												
Body composition												
No evidence available												
Quality of life												
No evidence available												
Preference for training programme												
No evidence available												
Adverse events												
No evidence available												

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; CF: cystic fibrosis; FEV₁: forced expiratory volume in 1 second; FVC: forced vital capacity; MD: mean difference

1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because of high risk of bias in relation to blinding (performance bias and detection bias), and unclear risk of bias in relation to random sequence generation, allocation concealment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, and other bias.

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