	-					_				-	
Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect			
Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	CF Centr e	Local care (below CF Trust recs)	Relativ e (95% CI)	Absolute	Quali ty	Importanc
e in lung functi	on: FEV ₁	(% predicted) (follow-up 1 ye	ears; range o	f scores: 0-100;	Better in	ndicated	by highe	r values)		
observationa I studies	very serious 1	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectnes s	serious2	none	41	23	-	MD 2.7 higher (0.55 lower to 5.95 higher)	VER Y LOW	CRITICAL
unction: First t	o last FE\	/ ₁ (% per year)	(follow-up 3 y	/ears; range	of scores: 0-100	; Better	indicated	l by high	er values)		
observationa I studies	very serious 3	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectnes s	serious ²	none	67	11	-	MD 5.7 lower (10.99 to 0.41 lower)	VER Y LOW	CRITICAL
FEV₁ (% per ye	ar) (follow	v-up 3 years; ra	nge of scores	: 0-100; Bett	er indicated by I	higher va	alues)				
observationa I studies	very serious 3	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectnes s	serious ²	none	67	11	-	MD 3.3 lower (6.13 to 0.47 lower)	VER Y LOW	CRITICAL
ollow-up 1 year	; Better in	dicated by high	ner values)								
observationa I studies	very serious 1	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectnes s	no serious imprecisio n	none	41	23	-	MD 0.09 lower (0.42 lower to 0.24 higher)	VER Y LOW	IMPORTAN T
	Design e in lung function observationa I studies unction: First t observationa I studies EV1 (% per yean observationa I studies I studies	DesignRisk of biase in lung function: FEV1observationavery seriousI studiesvery serious1very seriousunction: First to last FEV observationavery seriousunction: First to last FEV seriousvery seriousobservationavery seriousI studiesvery seriousstudiesvery seriousvery seriousvery seriousobservationa l studiesvery serious seriousi studiesvery serious very seriousobservationa veryvery serious very	DesignRisk of biasInconsistenc yDesignRisk of biasInconsistenc ye in lung function: FEV1 (% predicted) (r observationa I studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyunction: First to last FEV1 (% per year) observationa I studiesvery serious no serious inconsistencyno serious inconsistencyunction: First to last FEV1 (% per year) observationa I studiesvery serious no serious inconsistencyno serious inconsistencyeEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; ra observationa I studiesvery serious ano serious inconsistencyeEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; ra observationa I studiesvery serious ano serious inconsistencyeEV1 (% per year) observationa I studiesvery serious ano serious inconsistencyeEV1 (% per year) observationa Very I studiesvery serious no serious inconsistency	DesignRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes se in lung function: FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 ye observationa I studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sobservationa I studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sunction: First to last FEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 y serious 1 studiesvery serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sobservationa I studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sFEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; range of scores observationa I studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyobservationa I studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistency inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sobservationa I studiesvery serious serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes s	DesignRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio ne in lung function: FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of observationa 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2unction: First to last FEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; range of observationa 1 studiesno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2unction: First to last FEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; range of serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2FEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 3 years; range of scores:0-100; Better observationa 1 studiesno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2observationa 1 studiesvery seriousno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2	DesignRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideratione in lung function:FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; observationa 1 studiesno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2noneobservationa 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2noneunction:First to last FEV1 (% per year)(follow-up 3 years; range of scores: 0-100; observationa 1 studiesno serious inconsistencyserious sserious2noneobservationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2noneeEV1 (% per year)(follow-up 3 years; range of scores: observationa 1 studiesvery serious ano serious inconsistencyserious sserious2noneilow-up 1 year;Better indicated by higher values) inconsistency ano serious indirectnes sno serious snoneobservationa 1 studiesvery seriousno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sno serious snone	Design biasRisk of biasInconsistency yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF Centr ee in lung function:FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better in observationa 1 studiesno serious inconsistency 1no serious indirectnes sserious2none41observationa 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2none41observationa 0 serious 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2none67etV1 (% per year) 0 serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2none41etW1 (% per year) 0 serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnes sserious2none41etW1 (% per year) 0 serious 3no serious indirectnes sserious2none	Design biasRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF Centr eLocal care (below CF Trust recs)e in lung function: FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better inticated observationa 1 studiesno serious no serious no serious no serious no serious sserious2 serious2none4123unction: First to last FEV1 (% pre year) observationa 1 studiesvery serious no serious no serious ano serious no serious no serious sserious2 serious2none6711eV1 (% per year) observationa 1 studiesfollow-up 3 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated indirectnes snone6711eV1 (% per year) observationa 1 studiesfollow-up 3 years; range of scores:0-100; Better indicated by higher values)6711eV1 (% per year) observationa 1 studiesno serious ano serious no serious aserious2none6711eV1 (% per year) observationa 1 studiesrecno serious aserious2none6711eV1 (% per year) ano serious ano serious aserious2none6711eV1 (% per year) observationa 1 studiesvery ano serious aserious2none6711eV1 (% per year) ano serious ano serious aserious2none6711eV1 (% per year) ano serious a<	DesignRisk of biasInconsistency yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF centr eLocal care (below (CF) Trust recs)Relative ea in lung function:FEV1 (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by highe observationa 1 studiesno serious no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2 snone4123-auction:First to last FEV1 (% per year) (follow-up 2 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by highe indirectnes snone6711-observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyserious2 no serious snone6711-observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyserious2 snone6711-central (% per year)no serious inconsistency ano serious sserious2 snone6711-central (% per year)no serious inconsistency ano serious sserious2 snone6711-central (% per year)no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2none6711-central (% per year)no serious inconsistencyserious2 sserious2none6711-central (% per year)no serious indirectnes sserious2none6711-central (% per year) <td>Design biasRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF centr eLocal care (below, CF recs)Relative (eg,%)Absolute (g,%)e in lung function:FEV: (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)No serious indirectnes sserious sserious sno serious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sserious snone4123-MD 2.7 higher (0.55 lower to 5.95 higher)unction: First to last FEV: (% pre year) observationa 1 studiesno serious sno serious sserious2 snone6711-MD 5.7 lower (10.99 to 0.41 lower)observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2 serious2none6711-MD 5.7 lower (10.99 to 0.41 lower)EV: (% per year) observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyserious2 seriousnone6711-MD 5.7 lower (13.10 0.47 lower)Istudies 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2 serious2none6711-MD 5.7 lower (0.41 lower)Istudies 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistency</td> <td>Design biasRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF cent sLocal cent pRelativ e (95% CI)Absolute e gDesignNoNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSerious<</td>	Design biasRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF centr eLocal care (below, CF recs)Relative (eg,%)Absolute (g,%)e in lung function:FEV: (% predicted) (follow-up 1 years; range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)No serious indirectnes sserious sserious sno serious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sno serious sserious sserious snone4123-MD 2.7 higher (0.55 lower to 5.95 higher)unction: First to last FEV: (% pre year) observationa 1 studiesno serious sno serious sserious2 snone6711-MD 5.7 lower (10.99 to 0.41 lower)observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2 serious2none6711-MD 5.7 lower (10.99 to 0.41 lower)EV: (% per year) observationa 1 studiesvery serious 3no serious inconsistencyserious2 seriousnone6711-MD 5.7 lower (13.10 0.47 lower)Istudies 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistencyno serious sserious2 serious2none6711-MD 5.7 lower (0.41 lower)Istudies 1 studiesvery serious 1no serious inconsistency	Design biasRisk of biasInconsistenc yIndirectnes sImprecisio nOther consideration sCF cent sLocal cent pRelativ e (95% CI)Absolute e gDesignNoNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousNoSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSeriousSerious<

Table 4: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 2.2. CF centre care versus local care (below CF Trust recommendations)

Abbreviations: BMI: body mass index; CI: confidence interval; CF: cystic fibrosis; FEV₁: forced expiratory volume in 1 second; IV: intravenous; MD: mean difference

© NICE 2017. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

- The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because of the differences between groups.
 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because the 95% CI crossed 1 clinical MID
 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 due to high risk of bias in relation to the selection of the population and high loss to follow-up