

Table 16. Swallowing function measured by clinical assessment

				Intervention group (N=22)				Control group (N=21)				Comparison between groups	
Study	Measure	Timing of measurement	Comparison	N0–N1 > 1 excellent	N0–N1 = 1 effective	N0–N1 = 0 ineffective	N0–N1 < 0 deteriorated	N0–N1 > 1 excellent	N0–N1 = 1 effective	N0–N1 = 0 ineffective	N0–N1 < 0 deteriorated	Change Mean (95% CI)	CR
Tang, 2011	Water swallowing test	3 months	Exercise vs. usual care	0	17	5	0	0	9	8	4	The percentage of patients with excellent and effective result of the rehabilitation group was higher than that of the control group (77% vs. 43%, respectively)	
Study	Measure	Timing of measurement	Comparison	N	Baseline Mean (SD)/ N (%)	Follow-up Mean (SD)/ N (%)	Difference Mean (95%CI) / %	N	Baseline Mean (SD) / N (%)	Follow-up Mean (SD) / N (%)	Difference Mean difference(SD) / (%)	Change Mean (95% CI) / (%)	CR
Petersson, 2023	Mouth opening (trismus; ≤ 35 mm)	Baseline (6–36 months after completion of (chemo)radiotherapy)	Exercise vs. usual care	25 (baseline)/ 19 (follow-up)	3 (12)	4 (21)	9%	27(baseline)/ 24 (follow-up)	5 (19)	5 (21)	0%	9%	No

		py)-12 months follow-up											
	Hyposalivation (≤ 0.7 ml/min)	Baseline (6–36 months after completion of (chemo)radiotherapy)-12 months follow-up	Exercise vs. usual care	25 (baseline)/ 19 (follow-up)	11 (44)	2 (11)	33%	27(baseline)/ 24 (follow-up)	7 (26)	4 (17)	11%	22%	No
Tang, 2011	Mouth opening (IID), in cm	Baseline-3 months	Exercise vs. usual care	22	1.89 (0.69)	1.7 (0.68)	0.19 (0.5)	21	1.8 (0.56)	1.1 (0.36)	0.69 (0.56)	-0.50 (-0.82, -0.18)	No

CI, confidence intervals; CR, clinically relevant; IDD, interincisor distance; MD, mean difference; N, number of patients; nr, not reported; SD, standard deviation