Table 58: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 4. Nutrition education versus usual care

Quality assessment								No of patients				
No of studi es	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	Nutrition education	Standar d treatme nt	Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importan ce
Chang	je in weight (k	g) (follow-ı	up 6 months; r	ange of scor	es: 1-120; B	etter indicated	by higher va	lues)				
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>3</sup>	none	23	25	-	MD 0.4 lower (4.85 lower to 4.05 higher)	VERY LOW	CRITICA L
Chang	je in weight (k	g) (follow-ı	up 1 years; rar	ige of scores	: 1-120; Bet	ter indicated by	higher valu	es)				
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	serious <sup>4</sup>	none	23	25	-	MD 0.4 lower (4.87 lower to 4.07 higher)	LOW	CRITICA L

<sup>©</sup> NICE 2017. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

Quality No of studi es	<b>y assessment</b> Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	No of patie Nutrition education	Standar d treatme	Effect Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importan ce
Chang	e in FEV₁ % p	redicted (f	ollow-up 6 mo	nths; range o	of scores: 0-	100; Better indi	cated by hig				Quanty	
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>5</sup>	none	23	25	-	MD 1.49 higher (8.84 lower to 11.82 higher)	VERY LOW	CRITICA L
Chang	e in FEV <sub>1</sub> % p	redicted (f	ollow-up 1 yea	rs; range of	scores: 0-10	0; Better indica	ted by highe	r values)				
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	very serious <sup>5</sup>	none	23	25	-	MD 0.99 higher (9.29 lower to 11.27 higher)	VERY LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ	OL, physica	al functioning	(follow-up 6	months; ran	ge of scores: 0	-100; Better i	ndicated b	y higher	values)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.05	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	OL, physica	al functioning	(follow-up 12	months; ra	nge of scores:	0-100; Better	indicated	by highe	er values)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.61	LOW	CRITICA L

<sup>©</sup> NICE 2017. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

Quality	y assessment		No of patients		Effect							
No of studi es	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	Nutrition education	Standar d treatme nt	Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importan ce
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, social f	unctioning (fo	llow-up 6 mo	nths; range	of scores: 0-10	0; Better ind	icated by	higher va	alues)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.85	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, social f	unctioning at	12 months (f	ollow-up 12	months; range	of scores: 0-	100; Bette	r indicat	ed by hig	her values)	
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.54	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, treatme	nt issues (foll	ow-up 6 mon	ths; range o	f scores: 0-100	; Better indic	cated by hi	igher val	ues)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.74	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, treatme	nt issues (foll	ow-up 12 mo	nths; range	of scores: 0-10	0; Better ind	icated by I	higher va	alues)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.68	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQC	DL, chest s	ymptoms (follo	ow-up 6 mon	ths; range o	f scores: 0-100	; Better indic	cated by hi	gher val	ues)		
1 (Wat son	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.59	LOW	CRITICA L

Quality	y assessment						No of patie	nts	Effect			Importan ce
No of studi es	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	Nutrition education	Standar d treatme nt	Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	
2008 )												
Quality	y of life: CFQ	DL, chest s	ymptoms (follo	ow-up 12 mo	nths; range	of scores: 0-10	0; Better ind	icated by I	nigher va	lues)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.62	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ	OL, emotio	nal responses	(follow-up 6	months; ran	ige of scores: 0	-100; Better	indicated	by highe	r values)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.45	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ	DL, emotio	nal responses	(follow-up 12	2 months; ra	inge of scores:	0-100; Bette	r indicated	l by high	er values	)	
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.07	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ	DL, concer	ns for the futur	re (follow-up	6 months; r	ange of scores	: 0-100; Bette	er indicate	d by higl	ner values	s)	
1 (Wat son 2008	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.46	LOW	CRITICA L

Quality	y assessment						No of patier	nts	Effect			
No of studi	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	Nutrition education	Standar d treatme nt	Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importan ce
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value 0.03:	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	OL, interpe	rsonal relation	ship (follow-	up 6 months	; range of sco	es: 0-100; Be	etter indic	ated by h	nigher val	ues)	
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.75	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	OL, interpe	rsonal relation	ship (follow-	up 12 month	ns; range of sco	ores: 0-100; E	Better indi	cated by	higher va	alues)	
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.64	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, body in	nage (follow-u	o 6 months; i	range of sco	res: 0-100; Bet	ter indicated	by higher	values)			
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.24	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	OL, body in	nage (follow-u	o 12 months;	range of sc	ores: 0-100; Be	tter indicate	d by highe	er values	)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.59	LOW	CRITICA L

Quality assessment								No of patients				
No of studi es	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectne ss	Imprecisio n	Other consideration s	Nutrition education	Standar d treatme nt	Relati ve (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importan ce
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, career i	ssues (follow-	up 6 months	; range of so	cores: 0-100; B	etter indicate	d by high	er values	s)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.15	LOW	CRITICA L
Quality	y of life: CFQ0	DL, career i	ssues (follow-	up 12 month	s; range of	scores: 0-100; E	Better indicat	ed by higl	ner value	es)		
1 (Wat son 2008 )	randomised trials	serious <sup>6</sup>	no serious inconsistenc y	serious indirectnes s <sup>2</sup>	Not calculable	none	23	25	-	p- value: 0.28	LOW	CRITICA L

## **Pulmonary exacerbations**

No evidence available

## **Adverse effects**

No evidence available

## **Patient or carer satisfaction**

No evidence available

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval; CF: cystic fibrosis; CFQOL: cystic fibrosis quality of life questionnaire; FEV<sub>1</sub>: forced expiratory volume in 1 second; kg: kilogrammes; MD: mean difference

- 1 The quality of the evidence was not downgraded despite unclear risk of bias in relation to blinding and selective reporting, because objective measures are unlikely to be influenced by the lack of blinding.
- 2 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because there was no inclusion criteria related to underweight, therefore the study population is unlikely to be representative of people who would receive this intervention in clinical practice
- 3 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because the 95% CI crossed 2 default MIDs
- 4 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because the 95% CI crossed 1 default MID
- 5 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because the 95% CI crossed 2 clinical MIDs
- 6 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 1 because of unclear risk of bias in relation to selective reporting and high risk of bias due to bad reporting (only p values and U test statistic provided)