

Table 93: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 4. Cohort segregation by location versus no cohort segregation

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cohort segregation into different pathogens by location	No cohort segregation	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Annual incidence of <i>B cepacia</i> complex (percentages) (follow-up 1 year)												
1 (Chen 2001)	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	Not calculable ²	none	3.7% ³	5.8% ³	-	-		CRITICAL
5-month incidence of hospital-associated colonisation of <i>B cepacia</i> (follow-up 5 months)												
1 (Thomassen 1986)	observational studies	very serious ⁴	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	6/235 (2.6%) ⁵	24/308 (7.8%) ⁵	OR 0.31 (0.12 to 0.77)	52 fewer per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 68 fewer)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio

1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because of high risk of bias in relation to sample selection, comparability between groups and outcome assessment

2 Imprecision cannot be calculated with the data reported

3 Intervention group: data from 1991; comparison group: data from 1989. Intervention implemented in early 1990.

4 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because of high risk of bias in relation to the comparability between groups and outcome assessment

5 Intervention group: data for the period 1 Aug 1983 to 31 Dec 1984; comparison group: data for the period 1 Mar 1982 to 31 Jul 1983. Intervention introduced in August 1983.