

Table 99: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 10. Cohort segregation + individual segregation + protective equipment versus usual care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cohort segregation + individual segregation + protective equipment	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Annual incidence of <i>B cepacia</i> complex infection (percentages) (follow-up 1 year)												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cohort segregation + individual segregation + protective equipment	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1 (Chen 2001)	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	Not calculable ²	none	< 1% ³	8.8% ³	-	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval

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 post-implementation; comparison group: data from 1996. Intervention implemented in early 1997.