Table 50): Clinical I	Evidence	Profile: clinic i	rrigation follo	wing oily ear	drops versus oi	ly ear drops alon	e for ear	wax		
Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Clinic irrigation following ear drops	Ear drops alone	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute	
Hearing improved by at least 10 dB HL (assessed with: PTA)											
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	18/53 (34%)	1.6%	RR 20.72 (2.86 to 150.01)	316 more per 1000 (from 30 more to 1000 more)	MODERATE
Improvement in hearing - Improvement in hearing (Better indicated by lower values)											
1	randomised trials	- ,	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	53	61	-	MD 6.9 higher (3.8 to 10 higher)	LOW

. . **FO** . •• . . c:.. . . •

¹ Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias