

Autor(es):
Pergunta: Exercício resistido comparado a Controle (outros) para Esclerose sistêmica
Contexto:
Bibliografia:

Certainty assessment							Nº de pacientes		Efeito		Certainty	Importância
Nº dos estudos	Delineamento do estudo	Risco de viés	Inconsistência	Evidência indireta	Imprecisão	Outras considerações	Exercício resistido	Controle (outros)	Relativo (95% CI)	Absoluto (95% CI)		
Muscle strength (seguimento: média 12 semanas; avaliado com: Handgrip test)												
6	ensaios clínicos randomizados	grave ^a	não grave	não grave	grave ^b	nenhum	138	134	-	MD 2.78 Kg mais alto (1.36 mais alto para 4.21 mais alto)	⊕⊕○○ Baixa	
Physical disability (seguimento: média 12 semanas; avaliado com: HAQ-DI, SHAQ and HAQ)												
5	ensaios clínicos randomizados	não grave	muito grave ^c	grave ^d	muito grave ^{b,e}	nenhum	115	104	-	SMD 0.5 SD menor (0.78 menor para 0.23 menor)	⊕○○○ Muito baixa	
Quality of Life (seguimento: média 12 semanas; avaliado com: Mental component)												
5	ensaios clínicos randomizados	não grave	não grave	grave ^d	muito grave ^{b,e}	nenhum	125	111	-	SMD 0.2 SD mais alto (0.06 menor para 0.45 mais alto)	⊕○○○ Muito baixa	
Quality of Life (seguimento: média 12 semanas; avaliado com: Physical component)												
5	ensaios clínicos randomizados	não grave	grave ^f	grave ^d	muito grave ^{b,e}	nenhum	115	104	-	SMD 0.42 SD mais alto (0.04 mais alto para 0.81 mais alto)	⊕○○○ Muito baixa	

CI: Confidence interval; MD: Mean difference; SMD: Standardised mean difference

Explanations

- a. Of the six studies included in the meta-analysis, two (33%) had a high risk of bias.
b. Number of patients (<400)
c. i² = 64%
d. Different assessment instruments
e. Estimation of the effect on different benefit bands
f. I²=48%

Author(s):
Question: Exercício resistido compared to controle for esclerose sistêmica
Setting:
Bibliography:

Certainty assessment							Nº of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Exercício resistido	controle	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Força Muscular (follow-up: mean 12 weeks; assessed with: Handgrip dynamometer; Scale from: 0 to 60)												
6	randomised trials	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious ^a	none	138	134	-	MD 2.78 higher (1.36 higher to 4.21 higher)	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate	IMPORTANT
Capacidade funcional (follow-up: mean 12 weeks; assessed with: HAQ-DI; Scale from: 0 to 3)												
5	randomised trials	not serious	serious ^b	not serious	serious ^a	none	115	104	-	SMD 0.5 SD lower (0.78 lower to 0.23 lower)	⊕⊕○○ Low	IMPORTANT
Qualidade de vida (mental) (follow-up: mean 12 weeks; assessed with: SF-36 e SF-12; Scale from: 0 to 100)												
5	randomised trials	very serious ^c	not serious ^b	not serious	serious ^a	none	125	111	-	SMD 0.2 SD higher (0.06 lower to 0.45 higher)	⊕○○○ Very low	NOT IMPORTANT
Qualidade de vida (físico) (follow-up: 12 weeks; assessed with: SF-36 e SF-12; Scale from: 0 to 100)												
5	randomised trials	not serious	serious ^b	not serious	serious ^a	none	115	104	-	SMD 0.42 SD higher (0.04 higher to 0.81 higher)	⊕⊕○○ Low	IMPORTANT

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardised mean difference

Explanations

- a. tamanho mínimo de informação não foi atingido (400 pacientes para desfechos quantitativos)
- b. meta análise apresenta uma moderada heterogeneidade entre os estudos
- c. intervalos de confiança que ultrapassam a linha central

Author(s):
Question: RE compared to Con for ES
Setting:
Bibliography:

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		Certainty	Importance
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	RE	Con	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Força (follow-up: mean 12 weeks; assessed with: Dinamometro preensão palmar)												
6	randomised trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	138	134	-	MD 2.78 kg higher (1.36 higher to 4.21 higher)	 Low	IMPORTANT
Physical disability (follow-up: 12 weeks; assessed with: HAQ, HAQ-DI and SHAQ)												
5	randomised trials	not serious	very serious ^{b,c}	serious ^d	very serious ^{b,e}	none	115	104	-	SMD 0.5 SD lower (0.78 lower to 0.23 lower)	 Very low	IMPORTANT
Quality of life (M.C.) (follow-up: 12 weeks; assessed with: SF-36, SF-12)												
5	randomised trials	very serious ^f	not serious	serious ^d	very serious ^{b,d}	none	125	111	-	SMD 0.2 SD higher (0.6 higher to 0.45 higher)	 Very low	IMPORTANT
Quality of life (P.C.) (follow-up: 12 weeks; assessed with: SF-36, SF-12)												
5	randomised trials	not serious	serious ^g	serious ^d	very serious ^{b,e}	none	115	104	-	SMD 0.42 SD higher (0.04 higher to 0.81 higher)	 Very low	IMPORTANT

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardised mean difference

Explanations

- a. Of the six studies included in the meta-analysis, two (33%) had a high risk of bias.
- b. Number of patients (<400)
- c. I² = 64%
- d. Different assessment methods
- e. Estimation of the effect on different benefit bands
- f. Confidence intervals
- g. I²=48%