

Table 98: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 9. Cohort segregation + individual segregation versus cohort segregation

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cohort segregation + individual segregation	Cohort segregation	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Yearly prevalence 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	Cohort segregation	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1 (Chen 2001)	observational studies	very serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	not calculable ²	none	7% ³	15% ³	-	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Yearly prevalence of <i>Burkholderia</i> species (percentages) (follow-up: 5 years)												
1 (France 2008)	observational studies	very serious ⁴	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	not calculable ²	none	9.3% ⁵	31.2% ⁵	-	-	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 from 1999; comparison group: data from 1992. Intervention introduced in 1996.

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

5 Intervention group: data from 2005; comparison group: data from 1994. Intervention implemented in 2000.