Cochrane
Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis (Review)

Balaguer A, González de Dios J

Balaguer A, González de Dios J.
Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis.
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2015, Issue 12. Art. No.: CD001917.
DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub4](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub4).

www.cochranelibrary.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY	2
BACKGROUND	3
OBJECTIVES	3
METHODS	3
RESULTS	5
DISCUSSION	7
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS	7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
REFERENCES	9
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES	11
ADDITIONAL TABLES	14
WHAT'S NEW	15
HISTORY	15
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	17
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	17
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	17
NOTES	17
INDEX TERMS	18

[Intervention Review]

Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis

Albert Balaguer¹, Javier González de Dios²

¹Department of Pediatrics, Hospital Universitari General de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain. ²Dept. of Paediatrics, Hospital General Universitario de Alicante, Alicante, Spain

Contact: Albert Balaguer, abalaguer@uic.es, balaguer.albert@gmail.com.

Editorial group: Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group.

Publication status and date: Stable (no update expected for reasons given in 'What's new'), published in Issue 4, 2021.

Citation: Balaguer A, González de Dios J. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015, Issue 12. Art. No.: CD001917. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub4](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub4).

Copyright © 2015 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Recurrent endobronchial infection in cystic fibrosis requires treatment with intravenous antibiotics for several weeks usually in hospital, affecting health costs and quality of life for patients and their families. This is an update of a previously published review.

Objectives

To determine whether home intravenous antibiotic therapy in cystic fibrosis is as effective as inpatient intravenous antibiotic therapy and if it is preferred by individuals or families or both.

Search methods

We searched the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group Trials Register comprising references identified from comprehensive electronic database searches and handsearches of relevant journals and abstract books of conference proceedings.

Most recent search of the Group's Trials Register: 23 November 2015.

Selection criteria

Randomized and quasi-randomized controlled studies of intravenous antibiotic treatment for adults and children with cystic fibrosis at home compared to in hospital.

Data collection and analysis

The authors independently selected studies for inclusion in the review, assessed methodological quality of each study and extracted data using a standardised form.

Main results

Eighteen studies were identified by the searches. Only one study could be included which reported results from 17 participants aged 10 to 41 years with an infective exacerbation of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. All their 31 admissions (18 hospital and 13 at home after two to four days of hospital treatment) were analysed as independent events. Outcomes were measured at 0, 10 and 21 days after initiation of treatment. Home participants underwent fewer investigations than hospital participants ($P < 0.002$) and general activity was higher in the home group. No significant differences were found for clinical outcomes, adverse events, complications or change of intravenous lines, or time to next admission. Home participants received less low-dose home maintenance antibiotic.

Quality of life measures showed no significant differences for dyspnoea and emotional state, but fatigue and mastery were worse for home participants, possibly due to a higher general activity and need of support. Personal, family, sleeping and eating disruptions were less important for home than hospital admissions.

Home therapy was cheaper for families and the hospital. Indirect costs were not determined.

Authors' conclusions

Current evidence is restricted to a single randomized clinical trial. It suggests that, in the short term, home therapy does not harm individuals, entails fewer investigations, reduces social disruptions and can be cost-effective. There were both advantages and disadvantages in terms of quality of life. The decision to attempt home treatment should be based on the individual situation and appropriate local resources. More research is urgently required.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Intravenous antibiotics given at home for people with cystic fibrosis

Review question

We reviewed the evidence about the effect of giving antibiotics at home to people with cystic fibrosis.

Background

Cystic fibrosis is a serious genetic disease linked to recurrent lung infections. As a result of these infections, the person's lung disease becomes progressively worse. Lung infections are often treated with intravenous antibiotics (given directly into a vein) in hospital for a number of weeks. This is costly and disrupts the life of people with cystic fibrosis. Treatment can be given at home if patients and their carers are given enough training and support. We looked for randomised controlled trials which compared intravenous antibiotic treatment in hospital with treatment at home. This is an update of a previously published review.

Search date

The evidence is current to: 23 November 2015.

Study characteristics

We found one study with 17 people aged 10 to 41 years who had a flare up of infection with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The people taking part were assigned to either home antibiotics or hospital antibiotics at random. Those who had home antibiotics initially spent up to four days in hospital and were taught to prepare and administer their own intravenous antibiotics. They were discharged with enough medication and equipment for the course of treatment and were visited at home. All participants received the same type of antibiotic and the course lasted at least 10 days.

Key results

There were no differences found for clinical outcomes, adverse events, or complications linked to intravenous treatment. People at home were more tired and found the treatment more difficult to master. This may be due to them being more active and needing more support. Home therapy was cheaper for families and the hospital. There were no details about indirect costs. We conclude that treatment at home does not harm people in the short term and does reduce social disruption. However, the decision in favour of this option must be made on an individual basis.

Quality of the evidence

The evidence is very limited and more research is strongly needed to recommend its use.

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

Cystic fibrosis (CF) is the most common life-threatening autosomal recessive genetic disorder in Caucasians (Kosorok 1996). It is characterised by recurrent endobronchial infection leading to progressive pulmonary deterioration. The colonisation of the airways occurs, mainly with *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) (Harrison 2007). The presence of methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) has been associated with increased mortality in patients with CF (Dasenbrook 2010), but other organisms such as *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* have been implicated in risk of severe respiratory infections and worsening of lung function (Waters 2011).

Description of the intervention

Traditional management of those pulmonary exacerbations includes aggressive airway clearance, and antibiotics administered intravenously for several weeks usually as an inpatient (David 1986). As the lung disease progresses, patients may require more frequent hospitalizations which greatly increases healthcare costs and adversely affects the individual's quality of life.

Home intravenous (IV) therapy with antibiotics is usually commenced for exacerbations of pulmonary disease. Therapy can begin in hospital or as an outpatient and requires the training of individuals and their carers alongside suitable medical support.

How the intervention might work

Home IV therapy in CF is a response to both increasing demand for hospital beds, and the need for treatment to interfere as little as possible with the individual's normal lifestyle and quality of life. Home IV therapy may also cut costs by avoiding hospital admission or reducing length of stay. Staying in hospital may be hazardous for people with CF because of the risk of contracting *Burkholderia cepacia* (*B. cepacia*), MRSA, and other multiresistant organisms (Jones 2003).

Why it is important to do this review

Although, in certain countries most healthcare centers have established protocols for home IV treatment, few of them audit the outcome of their home IV antibiotic service (Gilchrist 2009).

A paper by Sequeiros identified 16 studies (mainly observational) that compared home IV antibiotic treatment for acute pulmonary exacerbations in CF against conventional hospital IV treatment (Sequeiros 2009). Some studies showed a similar outcome for home IV therapy and hospital IV therapy (Gilbert 1988; Girón 2004; Proesmans 2009; Riethmueller 2002; Strandvik 1992; van der Laag 1995), while other studies showed an inferior outcome for home management (Bosworth 1997; Donati 1987; Esmond 2006; Nazer 2006; Thornton 2005; Wolter 1997). However, most studies were retrospective or inadequately powered to provide clear answers. The obvious question is whether patients who were treated in hospital had more severe lung disease than those treated at home.

Collaco retrospectively studied 1,535 patients with CF recruited between 2000 and 2007 in the USA (Collaco 2010). This study showed no differences in short and long-term lung function,

regardless of whether IV therapy is administered in inpatient or in outpatient settings. Lung function measurements obtained during therapy suggest that longer courses of IV antibiotics (14 to 21 days) may not confer additional improvement in lung function over shorter courses (8 to 10 days). Once again, limitations of this study prevent the drawing of more firm conclusions.

It is not known if people receiving home IV antibiotic therapy have better or equivalent health outcomes compared with people receiving inpatient care; whether the provision of home IV therapy results in a reduction in costs to the health service (Bosworth 1997; Davis 1990; Donati 1987; Pond 1994; Rucker 1974; Strandvik 1992); or whether people prefer this form of treatment.

This is an update of previously published reviews (Asensio 2000; Balaguer 2008; Balaguer 2012).

OBJECTIVES

To determine whether home IV antibiotic therapy in CF is:

1. as effective as inpatient IV antibiotic therapy, for exacerbation of lung disease;
2. preferred by individuals and/or families to inpatient IV antibiotic therapy.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Randomized and quasi-randomized controlled studies.

Types of participants

The review includes adults and children with CF diagnoses defined clinically and by sweat or genetic testing, including all ages and all degrees of severity, and who receive IV antibiotic treatment.

Types of interventions

Studies comparing home with acute hospital inpatient antibiotic therapy for people with CF requiring IV antibiotic treatment. This includes interventions where the entire course of IV antibiotic is administered at home, either by the individual, their carer, or a healthcare professional, as well as interventions where home IV follows an inpatient stay but the majority of IV therapy was delivered at home. It includes home IV where there is little or no contact with healthcare professionals, as well as home IV where a variety of methods of support is offered by healthcare professionals, including home visits and administration of the IV injections or infusions. Any duration of antibiotic courses were considered.

Studies were stratified by those where treatment was initiated in hospital but completed at home, or those where all treatment was given at home, and by severity of exacerbations.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

1. Lung function
 - a. change in per cent predicted or absolute change in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV₁)
 - b. change in forced vital capacity (FVC)
 - c. any other lung function parameters
2. Lung infection (conversion of sputum from culture positive to culture negative, reduction in colony forming units (CFU) counts for *P. aeruginosa* and other micro-organisms)
3. Improvement of clinical score, by validated instruments

Secondary outcomes

1. Weight gain
 - a. absolute weight gain
 - b. change in percentage of ideal body weight
 - c. weight standard deviation score
2. Quality of life measures examined in participants or carers or both
3. Clinical complications (this does not include adverse events which are specified below)
 - a. acquisition of new microbial infection with *B. cepacia*, MRSA or other organisms
 - b. haemoptysis
 - c. pneumothorax
 - d. acute distal intestinal obstruction syndrome
 - e. development of diabetes mellitus during the follow-up period
 - f. any other clinical complication
4. Re-admissions (unplanned re-admissions and administration of additional antibiotic courses within three months, and within any time period during the follow-up period, and time to next admission or next course of antibiotic treatment)
5. Mortality
6. Cost
 - a. direct: stay in hospital, visits of and to a general practitioner or hospital, community nursing services, drug costs, etc.
 - b. indirect: work time lost for patients or parents, travelling expenses to or from hospital, any other support (for example, domestic aids), etc.
 - c. hospital days saved from the provision of treatment at home: days on treatment with home IV that would otherwise have been spent in hospital
7. Duration of treatment
 - a. Less than 10 days
 - b. 10 days or more
8. Adverse effects
 - a. those related to the antibiotics including gastrointestinal symptoms, reduced appetite, abdominal bloating, urticaria and itching
 - b. those associated with IV treatment such as thrombophlebitis, infection, number of change of IV lines required
 - c. other adverse effects, if reported, will also be examined

9. Compliance with other treatment measures (such as chest physiotherapy, nutritional regimens etc., if measured, by objective or subjective criteria)

We planned to group outcome data into those measured at the end of the antibiotic course, one, three, six, twelve months and annually thereafter. If outcome data were recorded at other time periods then consideration would be given to examining these as well.

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

Relevant studies were identified from the Group's Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register using the terms: antibiotics AND home.

The Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register is compiled from electronic searches of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Clinical Trials) (updated each new issue of *The Cochrane Library*), quarterly searches of MEDLINE, a search of EMBASE to 1995 and the prospective handsearching of two journals - *Pediatric Pulmonology* and the *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. Unpublished work is identified by searching the abstract books of three major cystic fibrosis conferences: the International Cystic Fibrosis Conference; the European Cystic Fibrosis Conference and the North American Cystic Fibrosis Conference. For full details of all searching activities for the register, please see the relevant sections of the [Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group Module](#).

Date of the most recent search of the Group's Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register: 23 November 2015.

Searching other resources

The authors searched the abstracts books of all Spanish Conferences on CF and the European Conference in Stockholm (2000).

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

For the original review, three authors (Marco T, Gracia de J, Serra C) independently selected the studies to be included in the review. For the update, two authors (Balaguer A, González de Dios J) independently sought new studies and assessed them for inclusion in the review. Minor disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Data extraction and management

Each author independently extracted data using a standardised form, adapted from that proposed by the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group. They resolved any disagreements by discussion.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

For the original review, three authors (Marco T, Gracia de J, Serra C) independently assessed the methodological quality of each study, based on a method described by Schulz ([Schulz 1995](#)). In particular, the authors examined details of the randomization method and allocation concealment (categorised as adequate, unclear or inadequate), the level of blinding, whether intention-to-treat analyses were possible from the available data and if the number of participants lost to follow up or subsequently excluded from the study was recorded.

For the update, two authors (Balaguer A, González de Dios J) re-assessed the methodological quality of the included studies using criteria described by Jüni ([Jüni 2001](#)). In particular they looked into internal validity by evaluating possible selection bias, performance bias, detection bias and attrition bias. There were no disagreements between the authors.

Measures of treatment effect

For binary outcomes the authors planned to calculate a pooled estimate of the treatment effect for each outcome across studies.

For continuous outcomes, they planned to record either mean change from baseline for each group or mean post-treatment or intervention values and the standard deviation or standard error for each group. They planned to calculate a pooled estimate of treatment effect by calculating the weighted mean difference.

For summarizing time-to-event data, like time to next admission or time to next course of antibiotic treatment, the authors planned to use methods of survival analysis and express the intervention effect as a hazard ratio.

Unit of analysis issues

The authors planned to combine the adjusted effect sizes computed for cross-over trials, and the usual ones computed for parallel trials, by means of the inverse-variance method, under a random-effects model.

Dealing with missing data

The authors planned to seek data for an intention-to-treat analysis, that is, data on the number of participants by allocated treated group, irrespective of compliance and whether or not the participant was later thought to be ineligible or otherwise excluded from treatment or follow up.

Assessment of heterogeneity

If the authors had been able to include sufficient studies in the review, they would have tested for heterogeneity between study results with the I^2 statistic ([Higgins 2003](#)). They would have considered that values over 30% indicate substantial heterogeneity. If the authors had detected clinically relevant and statistically significant heterogeneity, they would have sought the causes of heterogeneity.

Assessment of reporting biases

The authors have assessed whether the primary authors reported data for all the outcomes and time points they stated they had measured during the trial.

The authors planned to use a funnel plot to explore publication bias ([Egger 1997](#); [Macaskill 2001](#)).

Data synthesis

The authors planned to use both a random-effects model ([DerSimonian 1986](#)) and a fixed-effect model ([DeMets 1987](#)). In case of discrepancy between the two models, they have reported both results; otherwise they have reported only the results from the fixed-effect model.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

In order to investigate any heterogeneity identified, the authors planned to carry out subgroup analyses based on the different indications for IV antibiotics (exacerbation or elective), the type of programme (without paramedical support) and partly at home versus completely at home.

Sensitivity analysis

We planned to perform a sensitivity analysis based on the methodological quality of the studies, excluding quasi-randomized studies.

RESULTS

Description of studies

Results of the search

18 studies were identified by the searches. Only one study reporting results from a total of 17 participants met our inclusion criteria and was included in the review ([Wolter 1997](#)). A total of 16 studies were excluded (see below). One study has only been published in Swedish and is currently listed as 'Awaiting classification' until we are able to obtain a translation of this and assess its eligibility for inclusion in the review ([Hjelte 1988](#)).

Included studies

Summary details of the only included study are given in the [Characteristics of included studies](#) table.

The included study was carried out in two hospitals in Brisbane (Australia) ([Wolter 1997](#)). This study provides data from a total of 17 adolescents and adults with CF, with a respiratory infective exacerbation by *P. aeruginosa*. No definition criteria are provided for the diagnosis of CF. A respiratory exacerbation was defined as an increase in dyspnoea with or without increased sputum production, fever or a drop in forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV₁). All participants had colonisation of their sputum with *P. aeruginosa*. Those with unstable disease, dwelling outside the city, a history of non-compliance, or an inability to learn treatment techniques were excluded. Participants were randomized in blocks of four, by sealed envelope, to home or hospital therapy. After initial randomization, those with recurrent episodes received alternated treatment arms. The antibiotic therapy for both arms was ceftazidime 2 g every 12 hours and tobramycin 4 to 6 mg/kg daily as a single bolus for a minimum of 10 days. All participants received physiotherapy twice daily, plus 20 minutes of aerobic exercise. Participants assigned to home therapy spent two to four days in hospital before discharge and were taught how to prepare and administer their own IV antibiotics. Assessment days were: admission (Day 0), Day 10 of therapy and 10 days after cessation of IV therapy and treatment (Rx).

Excluded studies

16 studies were excluded for a variety of reasons, as listed in the table [Characteristics of excluded studies](#).

Two studies potentially could meet our inclusion criteria ([Amelina 2000](#); [Davis 1990](#)). In both cases we have contacted the authors and we could not get further information and so they are currently listed as excluded. Nine studies were not randomized ([Donati 1987](#); [Esmond 2006](#); [Girón 2004](#); [Girón 2006](#); [Graf 1997](#); [Horvais 2006](#);

Nazer 2006; Riethmueller 2002; Thornton 2005). One study was an observational retrospective study (Bosworth 1997). A further study compared two different ways of preparing antibiotics, but did not compare the administration of them at home to hospital (Ramström 2000); and another study compared different daily dosing regimens and while participants received these either at home or in hospital, this was not a randomisation criteria (Riethmueller 2009). One study compared two oral antibiotic treatment regimens both given at home (Romano 1991). The final study was not suitable for inclusion because the participants had a range of conditions, not just CF, and we were not able to obtain individual data for just the participants with cystic fibrosis from the authors of the study after contacting them (Wolter 2004).

Risk of bias in included studies

We assessed the methodological quality of the included randomized controlled study (Wolter 1997) based on criteria discussed by Jüni (at most recent update stage) and Schulz (for the original review) (Jüni 2001; Schulz 1995). Despite the quality of the study, some methodological problems were identified as listed below. Some of them may affect its internal validity, some others limit us for generalisation to other circumstances. As a result of these limitations, we have attempted only narrative synthesis at this stage.

Allocation

After initial randomization in blocks of four, participants were alternatively assigned to home or hospital arms for subsequent episodes of respiratory infections, all episodes (initial and subsequent) being considered independent and treated equally in the analysis.

The method of allocation concealment was considered adequate. However, as stated by the contacted author, if the same person was randomizing consecutive participants, it was possible to guess by simple observation the last card in each sealed envelope.

Blinding

The researcher participated in the selection of participants and outcome measures assessment, and this was not blinded.

Incomplete outcome data

A response rate of 31% (17 out of 54 participants) was obtained. Intention-to-treat analysis was not carried out, but analysis was based on the 17 participants recruited and their 31 admissions.

Selective reporting

We did not detect any selective reporting of results.

Other potential sources of bias

No information is given on the time span between episodes to differentiate episodes from recurrences. Outcomes were measured only in the short term (21 days after admission).

Effects of interventions

The results are based on the Wolter study (Wolter 1997). Investigators enrolled 17 participants with 31 admissions: nine participants were admitted once; five participants were admitted twice; one was admitted three times; one was admitted four times; and one was admitted five times. Each admission was

considered in the analysis as an independent event. There were 18 hospital admissions and 13 home admissions. Home and hospital participants were similar at baseline regarding gender, age, admission FEV₁ and type of IV line. Ages ranged from 10 to 41 years (median 22 years).

Summary details of main results are given in the 'Additional tables' (Table 1).

Primary outcomes

1. Lung function

There were significant differences over time in changes from baseline noted for FEV₁ (4% to 7%; $P = 0.006$) and FVC (2% to 8%; $P = 0.02$). However, there were no statistical differences between home and hospital arms in overall improvement in lung function (Wolter 1997).

2. Lung infection

Sputum weight was not different between the groups. Sputum cultures were not performed at follow up (Wolter 1997).

3. Improvement of clinical score

This outcome was not reported in the study (Wolter 1997).

Secondary outcomes

1. Weight gain

No significant differences were found between the groups for improvements in body weight (Wolter 1997).

2. Quality of life

This was measured by the Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire (CRDQ), with mean score changes from baseline to Day 21 being lower for home participants than for inpatients (16.5 versus 29.5; $P = 0.03$). There were no significant differences for dyspnoea ($P = 0.25$), emotional scores ($P = 0.11$), but mean fatigue score change was lower for home participants (3.6 versus 6.8; $P = 0.04$) as were mastery scores (2.6 versus 5.5; $P = 0.03$). Absolute values for personal, family, sleeping and eating disruptions scores were reported at end of treatment where higher scores indicate a better state of well-being. These scores were higher for home than hospital admissions (total disruption score 23.9 versus 18.3; $P < 0.001$) at Day 21. (Wolter 1997).

3. Clinical complications

One participant in the hospital group had a pneumothorax associated with central line insertion. There were no significant changes in serial serum creatinine or serial audiometric measurements. A lower proportion of home participants continued on low-dose home-maintenance antibiotic until the final assessment day as compared with inpatients (46% versus 71%, $P = 0.14$) and home participants had fewer investigations performed ($P = 0.002$) (Wolter 1997).

4. Re-admissions

Time to the next admission was not significantly different between home and hospital therapies (Wolter 1997).

5. Mortality

There were no deaths and no short-term re-admissions reported. No events were attributable to the antibiotics used (Wolter 1997).

6. Cost

a. Direct costs

Direct costs were measured by calculating the hospital cost, the cost of antibiotics and equipment used by home therapy, the cost spent on education or home visits or physiotherapy, and travelling costs. At the time of the study in 1997, home therapy was cheaper for families: AUS \$15.08 (standard deviation (SD) AUS \$13.48) per day of home therapy compared to AUS \$23.77 (SD AUS \$17.77) per day of hospitalization. The savings to the hospital for home therapy were AUS \$2552.00 for each 10-day admission (Wolter 1997).

b. Indirect costs

Indirect costs were not determined since most participants were students or impaired pensioners and did not suffer financially as a result of loss of income from hospitalization (Wolter 1997).

7. Duration of treatment

The median duration of treatments was similar for the home arm to the hospital arm of the study (12 versus 11 days, $P = 0.20$; range 10 days to 24 days versus 7 days to 26 days). No significant differences were found in time to next admission between both arms, or for doses of tobramycin. Use of home maintenance antibiotics was lower for home treatment (46% versus 71%). Home participants had fewer investigations performed than hospital participants ($P < 0.002$) and general activity was higher in the home group (Wolter 1997).

8. Adverse effects

Most participants had peripheral IV lines. Three hospital participants had a central line compared to none in the home group. No differences were found for complications of IV lines nor for the number of line changes required (Wolter 1997).

9. Compliance with other treatment measures

This outcome was not reported (Wolter 1997).

DISCUSSION

This review is based only on one study including 17 participants and some important methodological limitations were identified. Assessment was not blinded but seven out of nine outcome measures were assessed by objective instruments. Two important outcome measures were not used: the culture of sputum to assess remission of lung infection; and improvement of clinical scores. Some participants in the hospital arm did not complete a 10-day course of treatment. All these factors make it difficult to draw any conclusions for practice from this review. Only adults and adolescents were included, so the results cannot be extrapolated to children. The study did not address whether the participants or their families preferred home or hospital treatment.

In the light of the available evidence, home therapy does not seem to harm individuals in the short term since clinical outcomes gave similar results at all time points used. In the short term, home IV therapy is less expensive, particularly when compared to hospital admission and treatment. Quality of life measures are

especially important in this context. The results of this review suggest that quality of life seems to be better when the treatment is administered at home. However, these results need to be interpreted with caution, as assessment of dyspnoea, fatigue, emotion and mastery gave worse results for home treatment. Two factors may have contributed to this: fatigue, which could possibly be due to a higher general activity (housework and social duties); and feelings of lower level of control over the disease and its consequences. On the other hand, no validated instruments were used for family, social, sleep and eating disruptions which may have given beneficial results for home therapy.

The importance of four elements of the treatment has been highlighted for pulmonary exacerbations: adherence to regular IV antibiotics; intensive physiotherapy; increased intake of nutrients; and adequate rest (Sequeiros 2009). Until further studies provide more conclusive answers, the assessment of home IV treatment requires the consideration of the patients' characteristics. For example, patients with co-morbidities or patients with more severe exacerbations, may be too fatigued or present too much distress to adhere to the therapies adequately. Patients may experience glucose intolerance during an exacerbation; patients with CF-related diabetes usually require increased doses of insulin (Moran 2010). Nutritional needs, elevated in most patients with CF, are even greater during an exacerbation (Bell 2000). Patients with renal dysfunction are of special concern for potential further renal deterioration and may require close drug monitoring (Flume 2009).

Finally, more studies are needed with better designs, including more participants, longer follow-up periods (one year and more) and a broad range of outcome measures. Due to the relatively small number of people with CF, well-conducted multicenter studies may shed more light on the current evidence. Cross-over designs might not be the best approach since assessment of long-term results, such as prognosis and survival is difficult.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

The current evidence is too limited to draw conclusions for practice. The limited evidence available is from participants who commenced treatment in hospital and suggests that, in the short term, home therapy is associated with less social disruption and no serious adverse events. The decision to commence home therapy should be based on the individual and be co-ordinated from units with appropriate outpatient resources. Patients should be informed of the different possible outcomes regarding home-based IV treatment in comparison to hospital-based IV treatment, in order to let them choose accordingly.

Implications for research

More research is strongly required, ideally a multicenter, properly designed RCT including a sufficient number of participants to increase statistical power and allow assessments of outcomes in the long term.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of the original review (up to April 2008) would like to thank Marta Roqué for assessing the evaluation of quality and analysis, and her methodological support in the update of the

review. To M. José Martínez for her support in the writing of the first version of the review. To contacted authors Drs. Joanne Wolter, Scott H Davis and Wolfgang Greiner for additional information they provided about their studies.

The new review team (Dr Albert Balaguer and Dr Javier González de Dios) would like to acknowledge the significant input from the original review team: Dr Oscar Asensio; Dr Montserrat Bosque; Dr Theresa Marco; Dr Javier de Gracia; and Dr Consol Serra.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

Wolter 1997 {published data only}

Wolter J, Bowler S, Nolan P, McCormack J. Intravenous home therapy: a randomised trial in adult cystic fibrosis patients [abstract]. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Medicine* 1995;**25**:567.

* Wolter JM, Bowler SD, Nolan PJ, McCormack JG. Home intravenous therapy in cystic fibrosis: a prospective randomized trial examining clinical, quality of life and cost aspects. *European Respiratory Journal* 1997;**10**(4):896-900.

References to studies excluded from this review

Amelina 2000 {published data only}

Amelina E, Senkevich N, Cherniak A, Cherniaev A, Chuchalin A. Home intravenous therapy in adult cystic fibrosis patients. The impact on lung function and quality of life [abstract]. *European Respiratory Journal* 2000;**Suppl 31**:123s.

Bosworth 1997 {published data only}

Bosworth DG, Nielson DW. Effectiveness of home versus hospital care in the routine treatment of cystic fibrosis. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 1997;**24**(1):42-7.

Davis 1990 {published data only}

Davis S, Mather F, Tankersly P, Waring W, The Home IV Antibiotic Study Group. A randomized trial of home intravenous antibiotic therapy (HIVAT) in Cystic Fibrosis (CF): Short-Term Safety and efficacy [abstract]. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 1990;**Suppl 5**:207.

* Davis S, Mather F, Waring W, The Home IV Antibiotic Study Group. A randomized trial of home intravenous antibiotic therapy (HIVAT) in Cystic Fibrosis (CF): Short-Term psychological effects [abstract]. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 1990;**Suppl 5**:338.

Donati 1987 {published data only}

Donati MA, Guenette G, Auerbach H. Prospective controlled study of home and hospital therapy of cystic fibrosis pulmonary disease. *Journal of Pediatrics* 1987;**111**(1):28-33.

Esmond 2006 {published data only}

Esmond G, Butler M, McCormack AM. Comparison of hospital and home intravenous antibiotic therapy in adults with cystic fibrosis. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2006;**15**(1):52-60. [MEDLINE: 16390524]

Girón 2004 {published data only}

Girón RM, Martínez A, Máiz L, Salcedo A, Beltrán B, Martínez MT, et al. Home intravenous antibiotic treatments in cystic fibrosis units of Madrid. *Medicina clínica* 2004;**122**(17):648-52. [MEDLINE: 15153343]

Girón 2006 {published data only}

Girón RM, Cisneros C, Nakeeb ZA, Hoyos N, Martínez C, Ancochea J. Efficiency of the home intravenous antibiotics treatment in cystic fibrosis. *Medicina clínica* 2006;**127**(15):567-71. [MEDLINE: 17145013]

Graf 1997 {published data only}

* Graf von der Schulenburg JM, Greiner W, Klettke U, Wahn U. Economic aspects in treatment of cystic fibrosis with chronic pulmonary pseudomonas infection. Ambulatory intravenous therapy in comparison with inpatient treatment [Ökonomische Aspekte der Behandlung zystischer Fibrose mit chronischer pulmonaler Pseudomonasinfektion. Ambulante intravenöse Therapie im Vergleich zur stationären Behandlung]. *Medizinische Klinik* 1997;**92**(10):626-9.

Klettke U, Maagdorf K, Staab D, Paul K, Wahn U. Ambulatory vs. inpatient intravenous antibiotic therapy in mucoviscidosis patients - a controlled study. *Pneumologie* 1999;**53**(1):31-6.

Maagdorf K, Klettke U, Staab D, Paul K, Wahn U. Home intravenous antibiotic therapy vs. hospital therapy - an alternative for patients with cystic fibrosis? *Monatsschrift Fur Kinderheilkunde* 1996;**144**:1047.

Horvais 2006 {published data only}

Horvais V, Touzet S, François S, Bourdy S, Bellon G, Colin C, et al. Cost of home and hospital care for patients with cystic fibrosis followed up in two reference medical centers in France. *International journal of technology assessment in health care* 2006;**22**(4):525-31. [MEDLINE: 16984688]

Nazer 2006 {published data only}

Nazer D, Abdulhamid I, Thomas R, Pendleton S. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for acute pulmonary exacerbations in children with cystic fibrosis. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 2006;**41**(8):744-9. [MEDLINE: 16779852]

Ramström 2000 {published data only}

Ramström H, Erwander I, Mared L, Kornfalt R, Seiving B. Pharmaceutical intervention in the care of cystic fibrosis patients. *Journal of Clinical Pharmacy and Therapeutics* 2000;**25**(6):427-34.

Riethmueller 2002 {published data only}

Riethmueller J, Busch A, Damm V, Ziebach R, Stern M. Home and hospital antibiotic treatment prove similarly effective in cystic fibrosis. *Infection* 2002;**30**(6):387-91. [MEDLINE: 12478330]

Riethmueller 2009 {published data only}

* Riethmueller J, Ballmann M, Schroeter TW, Franke P, von Butler R, Claass A, et al. Tobramycin once- vs thrice-daily for elective intravenous antipseudomonal therapy in pediatric cystic fibrosis patients. *Infection* 2009;**37**(5):424-31.

Riethmueller J, Busch A, Franke P, Ziebach R, von Butler R, Stern M. Pharmacodynamic variation of intravenous antibiotic treatment with ceftazidime and tobramycin in CF-patients is equally effective [abstract]. In: Proceedings of the 13th International Cystic Fibrosis Congress; 2000 June 4-8; Stockholm, Sweden. 2000:166.

Riethmueller J, Franke P, Schroeter TW, Claass A, Busch A, Ziebach R, et al. Optimised intravenous antibiotic treatment with ceftazidime (thrice daily vs continuous) and tobramycin (thrice vs once daily) in CF patients [abstract]. In: Proceedings

of the 24th European Cystic Fibrosis Conference; 2001 June 6-9; Vienna, Austria. 2001:P192.

Riethmueller J, Junge S, Schroeter TW, Kuemmerer K, Franke P, Ballmann M, et al. Continuous vs thrice-daily ceftazidime for elective intravenous antipseudomonal therapy in cystic fibrosis. *Infection* 2009;**37**(5):418-23.

Schroeter T, Eggert P, Riethmueller J, Stern M, Claass A. Acute-phase nephrotoxicity of tobramycin in CF patients: A prospective randomized trial of once-versus thrice-daily dosing [abstract]. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 2002;**34**(Suppl 24):289.

Schroeter TW, Eggert P, Riethmueller J, Stern M, Claass A. A prospective randomized trial on the nephrotoxicity of thrice-daily versus once-daily tobramycin in cystic fibrosis patients [abstract]. In: Proceedings of the 24th European Cystic Fibrosis Conference; 2001 June 6-9; Vienna, Austria. 2001:P190.

Romano 1991 {published data only}

Romano L, Girosi D, Spallone E, Parisi L, Minucci L, Romano C. Ofloxacin in the treatment of cystic fibrosis [Uso dell'ofloxacin nei pazienti con fibrosi cistica]. *Minerva Pediatrica* 1992;**44**(3):79-86.

* Romano L, Minicucci L, Spallone E, Girosi D, Campelli A, Fabbri A, et al. Role of home therapy with ofloxacin in patients with cystic fibrosis (CF) [Ruolo della terapia domiciliare con ofloxacin in pazienti con fibrosi cistica (FC)]. *Giornale Italiano de Chemioterapia* 1991;**38**(13):181-3.

Thornton 2005 {published data only}

Elliott RA, Thornton J, Webb AK, Dodd M, Tully MP. Comparing costs of home- versus hospital-based treatment of infections in adults in a specialist cystic fibrosis center. *International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care* 2005;**21**(4):506-10.

Thornton J, Elliott R, Tully MP, Dodd M, Webb AK. Free Full TextLong term clinical outcome of home and hospital intravenous antibiotic treatment in adults with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax* 2004;**59**(3):242-6. [MEDLINE: 14985563]

* Thornton J, Elliott RA, Tully MP, Dodd M, Webb AK. Clinical and economic choices in the treatment of respiratory infections in cystic fibrosis: comparing hospital and home care. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis* 2005;**4**(4):239-47. [MEDLINE: 16242385]

Wolter 2004 {published data only}

Wolter JM, Cagney RA, McCormack JG. A randomized trial of home vs hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy in adults with infectious diseases. *Journal of Infection* 2004;**48**(3):263-8. [MEDLINE: 15001305]

References to studies awaiting assessment

Hjelte 1988 {published data only}

Hjelte L, Widen B, Malmborg AS, Freyschuss U, Strandvik B. [Intravenous administration of antibiotics at home in patients with cystic fibrosis improves quality of life] [Intravenos antibiotikabehandling i hemmet vid cystisk fibros ger okad livskvalitet]. *Lakartidningen* 1988;**18**(18):1614-7.

Additional references

Bell 2000

Bell SC, Bowerman AM, Nixon LE, Macdonald IA, Elborn JS, Shale DJ. Metabolic and inflammatory responses to pulmonary exacerbation in adults with cystic fibrosis. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation* 2000;**30**(6):553-9.

Collaco 2010

Collaco JM, Green DM, Cutting GR, Naughton KM, Mogayzel PJ. Location and duration of treatment of cystic fibrosis respiratory exacerbations do not affect outcomes. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2010;**182**(9):1137-43.

Dasenbrook 2010

Dasenbrook EC, Checkley W, Merlo CA, Konstan MW, Lechtzin N, Boyle MP. Association between respiratory tract methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and survival in cystic fibrosis. *JAMA* 2010;**303**(23):2386-92.

David 1986

David TJ. Intravenous antibiotics at home in children with cystic fibrosis. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 1986;**82**(3):130-1.

DeMets 1987

DeMets DL. Methods for combining randomized clinical trials: strengths and limitations. *Statistics in Medicine* 1987;**6**(3):341-50.

DerSimonian 1986

DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1986;**7**(3):177-88.

Egger 1997

Egger M, Davey SG, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)* 1997;**315**(7109):629-34.

Flume 2009

Flume PA, Mogayzel PJ Jr, Robinson KA, Goss CH, Rosenblatt RL, Kuhn RJ, Marshall BC, Clinical Practice Guidelines for Pulmonary Therapies Committee. Cystic fibrosis pulmonary guidelines: treatment of pulmonary exacerbations. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2009;**180**(9):802-8.

Gilbert 1988

Gilbert J, Robinson T, Littlewood JM. Home intravenous antibiotic treatment in cystic fibrosis. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 1988;**63**(5):512-7.

Gilchrist 2009

Gilchrist FJ, Lenney W. A review of the home intravenous antibiotic service available to children with cystic fibrosis. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2009;**94**(8):647.

Harrison 2007

Harrison F. Microbial ecology of the cystic fibrosis lung. *Microbiology* 2007;**153**(Pt 4):917-23.

Higgins 2003

Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;**327**(7414):557-60. [MEDLINE: 12958120]

Jones 2003

Jones AM, Webb AK. Recent advances in cross-infection in cystic fibrosis: Burkholderia cepacia complex, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, MRSA and pandoraea spp. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 2003;**96**(Suppl 43):66-72.

Jüni 2001

Jüni P, Altman DG, Egger M. Systematic reviews in health care: Assessing the quality of controlled clinical trials. *BMJ* 2001;**323**(7303):42-6. [MEDLINE: 11440947]

Kosorok 1996

Kosorok MR, Wei WH, Farrell TM. The incidence of cystic fibrosis. *Statistics in Medicine* 1996;**15**(5):449-62.

Macaskill 2001

Macaskill P, Walter SD, Irwig L. A comparison of methods to detect publication bias in meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine* 2001;**20**(4):641-54.

Moran 2010

Moran A, Brunzell C, Cohen RC, Katz M, Marshall BC, Onady G, et al. Clinical care guidelines for cystic fibrosis-related diabetes: a position statement of the American Diabetes Association and a clinical practice guideline of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, endorsed by the Pediatric Endocrine Society. *Diabetes Care* 2010;**33**(12):2697-708.

Pond 1994

Pond MN, Newport M, Joanes D, Conway SP. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy in the treatment of young adults with cystic fibrosis. *European Respiratory Journal* 1994;**7**(9):1640-4.

Proesmans 2009

Proesmans M, Heyns L, Moons P, Havermans T, De Boeck K. Real life evaluation of intravenous antibiotic treatment in a paediatric cystic fibrosis centre: outcome of home therapy is not inferior. *Respiratory Medicine* 2009;**103**(2):244-50.

Rucker 1974

Rucker RW, Harrison GM. Outpatient intravenous medication in the management of cystic fibrosis. *Pediatrics* 1974;**54**(3):358-60.

Schulz 1995

Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality

associated with estimates of treatment in controlled trials. *JAMA* 1995;**273**(5):408-12.

Sequeiros 2009

Sequeiros IM, Jarad NA. Home intravenous antibiotic treatment for acute pulmonary exacerbations in cystic fibrosis - Is it good for the patient? *Annals of Thoracic Medicine* 2009;**4**(3):111-4.

Shepperd 2008

Shepperd S, Doll H, Angus RM, Clarke MJ, Iliffe S, Kalra L, et al. Hospital at home admission avoidance. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 4. Art. No: CD007491. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD007491](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD007491)]

Strandvik 1992

Strandvik B, Hjelte L, Malmborg AS, Widen B. Home intravenous antibiotic treatment of patients with cystic fibrosis. *Acta Paediatrica* 1992;**81**(4):340-4.

van der Laag 1995

van der Laag J, Van de Weg L. Cystic fibrosis and outpatient treatment with parenteral antibiotics in children. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents* 1995;**5**:63-5.

Waters 2011

Waters V, Yau Y, Prasad S, Lu A, Atenafu E, Crandall I, et al. Stenotrophomonas maltophilia in cystic fibrosis: serologic response and effect on lung disease. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2011;**183**(5):635-40.

References to other published versions of this review

Asensio 2000

O Asensio, M Bosque, T Marco, J de Gracia, C Serra. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2000, Issue 4. Art. No: CD001917. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001917](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001917)]

Balaguer 2008

Balaguer A, González de Dios J. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 3. Art. No: CD001917. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001917](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001917)]

Balaguer 2012

Balaguer A, González de Dios J. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2012. Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012, Issue 3. Art. No: CD001917. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub3](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD001917.pub3)]

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

Wolter 1997

Study characteristics

Methods	<p>RCT and cross-over open study.</p> <p>Participants were initially randomized in blocks of four by sealed envelopes, to home or hospital therapy. Participants experiencing recurrent episodes automatically alternated treatment arms after initial randomization.</p>
Participants	17 participants with a mean age of 22 years, with an infective exacerbation of cystic fibrosis.
Interventions	<p>1. Home therapy: spent 2 - 4 days in hospital before discharge and were taught to prepare and administer their own intravenous antibiotics; participants were discharged with medication and equipment for the duration of the proposed course of treatment; home visits were conducted.</p> <p>2. Control group: whole treatment was administered in the hospital.</p> <p>All participants received the same antibiotic therapy with ceftazidime 2 g 12 hourly and tobramycin 4 to 6 mg/kg daily as a single bolus for a minimum of 10 days in hospital or at home.</p> <p>Participants were randomly allocated to either groups at the first episode. For subsequent episodes they were alternatively allocated to home or hospital arm.</p>
Outcomes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lung function (spirometry) 2. Pulse oximetry (spot reading on room air) 3. 12 minute walking distance 4. Sputum production over 12 hours 5. Weight gain 6. Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire (CRDQ) 7. Serum creatinine levels 8. Aminoglycoside levels 9. Audiology 10. Hospital costs 11. Projected diagnostic-related group (DRG) 12. Reimbursement figures 13. Cost of antibiotics and equipment used in home therapy 14. Staff costs spent on education or home visits; travel costs 15. Indirect costs to the patient and family
Notes	All episodes, initial or recurrent, were analysed together. The statistical analysis considered recurrent episodes as independent events. Data on first randomized episodes are not currently available.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized in blocks of four.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization used sealed envelopes.
Blinding (performance bias and detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	Participants and clinicians could not be blinded due to the nature of the treatment. No information given on whether outcome assessors were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Reasons for exclusions given.

Wolter 1997 (Continued)

All outcomes

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	We were unable to detect any selective reporting.
--------------------------------------	----------	---

RCT: randomized controlled trial

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

Study	Reason for exclusion
Amelina 2000	Unclear from publication whether study meets inclusion criteria, authors of study failed to clarify details.
Bosworth 1997	Observational retrospective study comparing a group of participants who undertook intravenous treatment at home with a group of participants treated at the hospital.
Davis 1990	Unclear from publication whether study meets inclusion criteria, authors of study failed to clarify details.
Donati 1987	Controlled but not randomized trial. Participants selected to either group (home or hospital) by the distance from home to hospital. Also, those meeting inclusion criteria to receive home therapy were allocated to home treatment by their own preference. Characteristics at baseline were similar for home and hospital participants.
Esmond 2006	Controlled but not randomized trial. Thirty adults with CF (15 hospital and 15 home) were included. Participants were able to choose hospital or home intravenous treatment in discussion with their CF team.
Girón 2004	Not a randomized or quasi-randomized controlled study. Observational descriptive study in 56 people (children and adults) with CF who needed 90 home IV antibiotic treatments.
Girón 2006	Not a randomized or quasi-randomized controlled study. Single centre in Spain. Economic evaluation (cost-analysis) in 22 consecutive adults with CF who needed 85 IV antibiotic treatments (43 at home, 14 in hospital and 28 combined).
Graf 1997	Controlled but not randomized, intra-individual cross-over trial. This was confirmed after contact with author. Fourteen participants were included to receive either intravenous treatment at home or at the hospital.
Horvais 2006	Not a randomized or quasi-randomized controlled study. Study at 2 centres in France. Economic evaluation (cost-analysis) in 65 people (children and adults) with CF; global economic study, included IV antibiotic treatment.
Nazer 2006	Not a randomized or quasi-randomized controlled study. Observational retrospective study in 50 children with CF needing 143 IV antibiotic treatments (79 at home and 64 in hospital).
Ramström 2000	Randomised cross-over trial on the effect of two different ways of preparation of antibiotics in people with CF with indication of home IV antibiotic treatment. No comparison was made between the administration of antibiotics at home versus in hospital.
Riethmueller 2002	Controlled but not randomized study. Observational prospective study in people with CF and with chronic <i>P. aeruginosa</i> infection: 30 consecutive home IV antibiotic treatments were compared with 28 hospital courses.

Study	Reason for exclusion
Riethmueller 2009	Randomized trial of once versus 3 times daily IV antibiotics. Some therapy at home and some in hospital, but not randomized on this criteria.
Romano 1991	Trial of two oral antibiotic treatment regimens both given at home. Trial was cross-over, but not blinded.
Thornton 2005	Non-randomized or quasi-randomized controlled study. Single centre UK study. Economic evaluation (cost-analysis) in 116 adults with CF who needed 454 IV antibiotic treatments (213 with intention-to-treat at "home" and 241 with intention-to-treat in the "hospital").
Wolter 2004	Controlled but not adequately randomized study. Patients included had variety of infectious diseases, only 9 participants have CF.

CF: cystic fibrosis

IV: intravenous

P. aeruginosa: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

Characteristics of studies awaiting classification [ordered by study ID]

Hjelte 1988

Methods	Randomized cross-over study.
Participants	Children and adults with CF (diagnosed with sweat test) with chronic <i>P. aeruginosa</i> needing IV antibiotics and living within a radius of 10 miles of the hospital.
Interventions	IV antibiotics (a β -lactam and an aminoglycoside)
Outcomes	Lung function, oxygen saturation, weight, psychological evaluations, economic evaluations
Notes	Full paper, but only available in Swedish

CF: cystic fibrosis

IV: intravenous

P. aeruginosa: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1. Description of Results

Study ID	Participants	Outcomes	Results	Comments
Wolter 1997	Adolescents and adults with an infective exacerbation of CF	1. Mean duration treatment 2. Lung function 3. Weight gain (kg) 4. Oximetry (%) 5. Sputum weight (g) 6. 12 minutes walk 7. Quality of life (mean scores)	1. Hospital 11.0 days (range 7 to 26) versus home 12.0 days (range 10 to 24) ($P = 0.2$). For the outcomes 2. to 6. results are given home versus hospital at 3 time intervals: Day 0; Day 10; Day 21 (post-treatment) 2. FVC (%predicted): Day 0 (56 versus 58); Day 10 (58 versus 64); Day 21 (58 versus 66); $P = 0.30$ FEV1 (% predicted): Day 0 (56 versus 39); Day 10 (45 versus 50); Day 21 (43 versus 51); $P = 0.27$	The unit of analysis is the admission. The analysis is based on 17 participants and 31 admissions. 9 participants had 1 admission, 5 had 2 admissions, 1 had 3 admissions, 1

Table 1. Description of Results (Continued)

8. Direct costs	<p>3. Day 0 (53.7 versus 52.5); Day 10 (54.1 versus 53.4); Day 21 (53.9 versus 53.2); P = 0.10</p> <p>4. Day 0 (93 versus 94); Day 10 (94 versus 95); Day 21 (94 versus 96); P = 0.44</p> <p>5. Day 0 (54.7 versus 32.5); Day 10 (37.4 versus 19.3); Day 21 (29.2 versus 30.6); P = 0.09</p> <p>6. Day 0 (1254 versus 1163); Day 10 (1363 versus 1267); Day 21 (1363 versus 1326); P = 0.11</p> <p>7. Home versus hospital change between Day 0 and 21 are given, except for family, personal, sleep and eating disruptions for which only values at Day 21 are provided: Dyspnoea: 5.9 versus 8.2; P = 0.25 Fatigue: 3.6 versus 6.8; P = 0.04 Emotional: 4.4 versus 8.6; P = 0.11 Mastery: 2.6 versus 5.5; P = 0.03 Family disruption: 6.2 versus 4.5; P = 0.001 Personal disruption: 5.1 versus 3.8; P = 0.004 Sleep disruption: 6.0 versus 4.4; P = 0.005 Eating disruption: 6.6 versus 5.9; P = 0.007 Total disruption: 23.9 versus 18.3; P < 0.001</p> <p>8. Home versus hospital: mean (SD) - Cost for families 7 day: \$15.08 (\$13.48) versus \$23.77 (\$17.77). - Savings for hospital by 10 days of home therapy: \$2552.00</p>	<p>had 4 admissions, and 1 had 5 admissions. It is not known whether admissions were different episodes or recurrences.</p>
-----------------	---	---

WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
8 April 2021	Review declared as stable	Due to a lack of research in this area the Editorial Board of the Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Review Group have decided to no longer update this review.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 1, 2000

Review first published: Issue 4, 2000

Date	Event	Description
29 June 2017	Amended	Contact details updated.
8 December 2015	New search has been performed	A single trial is included in the review, but we have not identified any new relevant trials up to November 2015. We will continue to run searches to identify any potentially relevant trials; however, we do not plan to update other sections of the review until new trials are published.
8 December 2015	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	No new references have been added to the review and hence our conclusions remain the same.

Date	Event	Description
17 October 2012	Amended	Contact details updated.
8 March 2012	Review declared as stable	This review will no longer be regularly updated. Searches will still be undertaken on a two-yearly basis by the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis & Genetic Disorders Group. If, in future, relevant trials are identified, the review will be updated again.
17 January 2012	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	The title of the review has been changed from 'Home intravenous antibiotics for cystic fibrosis' to 'Home versus hospital intravenous antibiotic therapy for cystic fibrosis' to more accurately describe the content of the review.
17 January 2012	New search has been performed	A search of the Group's Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register identified six references to a single trial which was excluded since although patients were treated either at home or in hospital, this was not the criteria for randomisation (Riethmueller 2009).
3 December 2009	New search has been performed	A search of the Group's Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register did not identify any trials eligible for inclusion in this review.
4 February 2009	Amended	Contact details for both authors updated.
7 April 2008	New search has been performed	A search of the Group's Cystic Fibrosis Trials Register found one new trial which is only available in Swedish and has been listed as 'Awaiting classification' until a translation can be obtained. Additional searches by the authors identified nine studies, none of which were eligible for inclusion in the review.
7 April 2008	Amended	<p>Converted to new review format.</p> <p>The plain language summary has been updated in line with current guidance from the Cochrane Collaboration.</p> <p>The methods section 'Data collection and analysis' and the section on 'Risk of bias' of the included study have been updated.</p>
7 April 2008	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	There has been a change in lead author - Dr Oscar Asensio has stepped down and Dr Albert Balaguer has taken on lead authorship. The original co-authors have also stepped down and Dr Javier González de Dios is the new co-author.
14 February 2007	New search has been performed	One new reference was identified by the search (Romano 1991) and has been excluded.
19 August 2005	New search has been performed	<p>Change of lead author from Dr Teresa Marco to Dr Oscar Asensio.</p> <p>A new search was run in April 2005, but no new references have been found.</p> <p>Some minor amendments have been made in light of comments from the Group's medical statistician. The 'Types of outcome measures' have been divided into primary and secondary outcome measures as per guidance received from the editorial base.</p>
19 May 2004	New search has been performed	The Group's trials register was searched in April 2004. One new trial has been identified (Amelina 2000) which has been published as an abstract. This trial is currently listed under 'Studies awaiting assessment'. The review is currently being updated in

Date	Event	Description
		light of comments from the Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group's medical statistician.
13 November 2002	New search has been performed	<p>The Group's trials register was searched in April 2002.</p> <p>Excluded Studies One study - Ramström 2000 has been incorporated into the review.</p> <p>Included Studies An additional reference [abstract] was added to the existing Wolter 1997 study ID.</p> <p>Studies Awaiting Assessment An additional reference [abstract] was added to the existing Klette 1999 study ID.</p>

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

April 2008
Change of lead author

Dr Oscar Asensio has stepped down as lead author and Dr Albert Balaguer has taken on the lead authorship. The previous co-authors have also stepped down and Dr Javier González de Dios is the new co-author on the review. This new review team have updated the review in April 2008.

From this point on Dr Albert Balaguer is guarantor for the review.

August 2005
Change of lead author

Dr Teresa Marco has stepped down as lead author and Dr Oscar Asensio has taken on lead authorship.

All authors have participated in writing the protocol and the review. Consol Serra, Oscar Asensio and Montserrat Bosque have participated in the search, and Javier de Gracia, Teresa Marco and Consol Serra in the evaluation of studies and extraction of data.

Oscar Asensio and Consol Serra have updated the review. The remaining authors have reviewed this updated version. The guarantor of the review is Oscar Asensio.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None known.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- Universitat Internacional de Catalunya. Barcelona., Spain

External sources

- National Institute for Health Research, UK

This systematic review was supported by the National Institute for Health Research, via Cochrane Infrastructure funding to the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group.

NOTES

Please see related review on hospital at home admission avoidance ([Shepperd 2008](#)).

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

Anti-Bacterial Agents [*administration & dosage]; Cystic Fibrosis [*complications]; Home Care Services [*economics]; Hospitalization [*economics]; Injections, Intravenous; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic; Respiratory Tract Infections [*drug therapy] [etiology]; Self Care; Staphylococcal Infections [*drug therapy]; Staphylococcus aureus

MeSH check words

Adolescent; Adult; Child; Humans