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We rated the quality of the evidence for most of the effects of physical activity for LUTS/BPO as very low. We are therefore uncertain whether physical activity affects symptom scores for LUTS, response rate, and withdrawal due to adverse events. Our confidence in the estimates was lowered due to study limitations, inconsistency, indirectness, and imprecision. Additional high-quality research is necessary.

**Relevante AWMF-Leitlinien, die das Cochrane Review enthalten (CR IN) bzw. nicht enthalten (CR OUT)**

**CR IN**
**CR OUT**

The quality of evidence for all conclusions was low to very low. For children with unilateral CP, there was some evidence that CIMT resulted in improved bimanual performance and unimanual capacity when compared to a low-dose comparison, but not when compared to a high-dose or dose-matched comparison. Based on the evidence available, CIMT appears to be safe for children with CP.


The available evidence from randomised trials is limited to that comparing immobilisation in external versus internal rotation. Overall, the evidence is insufficient to draw firm conclusions about whether immobilisation in external rotation confers any benefit over immobilisation in internal rotation.

Considering that there are several unpublished and ongoing trials evaluating immobilisation in external versus internal rotation, the main priority for research on this question consists of the publication of completed trials and the completion and publication of ongoing trials. Meanwhile, evaluation of other interventions, including rehabilitation, is warranted. There is a need for sufficiently large, good-quality, well-reported randomised controlled trials with long-term follow-up. Future research should aim to determine the optimal immobilisation duration, precise indications for immobilisation, optimal rehabilitation interventions, and the acceptability of these different interventions.
Compared to control, moderate-quality evidence indicates that mixed exercise probably improves HRQL, physical function, and fatigue, but this improvement may be small and clinically unimportant for some participants; physical function shows improvement in all participants. Withdrawal was similar across groups. Low-quality evidence suggests that mixed exercise may slightly improve stiffness. Very low-quality evidence indicates that we are 'uncertain' whether the long-term effects of mixed exercise are maintained for all outcomes; all-cause withdrawals and adverse events were not measured. Compared to other exercise or non-exercise interventions, we are uncertain about the effects of mixed exercise because we found only very low-quality evidence obtained from small, very heterogeneous trials. Although mixed exercise appears to be well tolerated (similar withdrawal rates across groups), evidence on adverse events is scarce, so we are uncertain about its safety. We downgraded the evidence from these trials due to imprecision (small trials), selection bias (e.g. allocation), blinding of participants and care providers or outcome assessors, and selective reporting.
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