Table 68: Clinical evidence profile: Motivational interviewing versus usual care in those reporting use of ≤4hours/day

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Motivational interviewing (use <4h)	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
			Quality assessment				**No of patients**		**Effect**			
Change in hearing aid use (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 3.2 higher (1.03 to 5.37 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Change in IOI-HA (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 0.8 higher (3.61 lower to 5.21 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Change in IOI-HA-SO (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 2.9 higher (4.8 lower to 10.6 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Change in WHO DASII (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised	serious[3]	no serious	no serious	serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 0.9 lower (3.08	⊕⊕OO	CRITICAL

	trials		inconsistency	indirectness						lower to 1.28 higher)	LOW	
Change in HADS - Anxiety score (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 0.27 higher (1.16 lower to 1.7 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Change in HADS - Depression score (follow-up 1 month; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	19	17	-	MD 0.1 lower (1.77 lower to 1.57 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[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
[2] Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed one MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs