

**Table 5: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 1. Deep inspiration breath-hold versus free breathing**

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Deep Inspiration Breath-Hold	Free Breathing(Supine)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Mean Heart Dose at RT (measured with: Gy; Better indicated by lower values)</b>												
4 <sup>1,2,3,4</sup>	Observational studies	No serious risk of bias	Very serious <sup>5</sup>	Serious <sup>6</sup>	Serious <sup>7</sup>	None	236	236	-	MD 1.29 lower (1.81 to 0.77 lower)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Target Coverage at RT (range of scores: 0-100; Better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 <sup>1</sup>	Observational studies	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>5</sup>	None	81	81	-	MD 0.5 higher (4.6 lower to 5.6 higher)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

CI: Confidence interval; DCIS: Ductal carcinoma in situ; Gy: Gray; MD: Mean difference; RT: Radiotherapy

<sup>1</sup> Eldredge-Hindy 2015

<sup>2</sup> Chi 2015

<sup>3</sup> Czeremczynska 2017

<sup>4</sup> Barlett 2017

<sup>5</sup> Downgraded by 2 levels for very serious inconsistency as  $I^2=89\%$

<sup>6</sup> Downgraded by 1 level for indirectness due to inclusion of women with only larger breast volumes (estimated volume >750cm<sup>3</sup>)

<sup>7</sup> Downgraded by 1 level for serious imprecision, as number of events <400