

**Table 97: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 8. Individual segregation versus usual care**

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Individual segregation	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Patient satisfaction</b>												

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Individual segregation	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1 (Waine 2007)	observational studies	very serious 1	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	not calculable 2	none	N=48 n=30 (62.5%) said that their quality of life did not suffer as a result.	N=43 n=10 (23.3%) said that their quality of life would suffer a 'significant amount' or 'a great deal' if they were to begin avoiding others	-	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval

1 The quality of the evidence was downgraded by 2 because high risk of bias in relation to sample selection, the comparability between the groups and the outcome reporting and assessment.

2 Imprecision cannot be calculated with the data reported