

**Table 94: Clinical evidence profile: Comparison 5. Individual segregation by location 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's satisfaction</b>												
1 (Russo 2006)	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	Not calculable <sup>2</sup>	none	92% of children supported segregated treatment	-	-	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Parents' satisfaction</b>												
1 (Russo 2006)	observational studies	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	Not calculable <sup>2</sup>	none	91% of parents supported segregated treatment	-	-	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Abbreviations: CI: confidence interval

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

2 The imprecision cannot be calculated with the data reported