**Evidence Table 13. Quality rating: Studies on sustained virologic response and quality of life**

| **Author, Year** | **(1) Did the study attempt to enroll all (or a random sample of) patients meeting inclusion criteria, or a random sample (inception cohort)?** | **(2) Were the groups comparable at baseline on key prognostic factors (e.g., by restriction or matching)?** | **(3) Did the study use accurate methods for ascertaining exposures, potential confounders, and outcomes?** | **(4) Were outcome assessors and/or data analysts blinded to treatment?** | **(5) Did the article report attrition?** | **(6) Did the study perform appropriate statistical analyses on potential confounders (should adjust for at least age, sex, genotype, fibrosis stage)?** | **(7) Is there important differential loss to followup or overall high loss to followup?** | **(8) Were outcomes pre-specified and defined, and ascertained using accurate methods?** | **Overall Quality** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Arora, 200682 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No (patients aware of SVR status) | No | Yes | Unclear | Yes | Poor |
| Bernstein 200283 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No (patients aware of SVR status) | No | No | Unclear | Yes | Poor |
| Bini 200684 | Unclear | Unclear | Yes | No (patients aware of SVR status) | No | No | Unclear | Yes | Poor |
| Bonkovsky 199985 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | Yes (blinded to virological status, though not histological status) | Yes | No | Yes (high) | Yes | Poor |
| Hassanein 200486 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No (patients aware of SVR status) | Yes | No | Yes (high) | Yes | Poor |
| McHutchison 200187 | Yes | No | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No | No | Yes | Poor |
| Neary 199988 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No | Yes (high) | Yes | Poor |
| Rasenack 200389 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No (patient aware of SVR status) | Yes | No | Yes (high) | Yes | Poor |
| Ware 199990 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No (patient aware of SVR status) | Yes | No | Yes (high) | Yes | Poor |