Quality assessment of RCTs.

Mosca et al, 2020	Risk of bias	Author judgment
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not Reported
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear	
Other bias	Unclear	
Khachidze et al. 2019	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not Reported
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear	
Other bias	Unclear	
Anushiravani et al. 2019	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients were allocated randomly, using a table of random permutations of 20 numbers, into five study groups.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Study pills were allocated in separate packs blinded and labeled using a four-digit code. The information on which codes correspond to what treatment was maintained by the project coordinator. Apart from the project coordinator, the patients, attending physicians and staff involved in the hepatic clinics were blinded to the intervention allocation.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	There is no incomplete outcome data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.

Other bias	Low risk	The project was supported financially by the vice chancellor for Research at Shiraz University of Medical Sciences.
Bril et al. 2019	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	The computer-generated randomization and patient allocation were performed by the research pharmacist without any stratification and using a block factor of 4, which was unknown to investigators.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The computer-generated randomization and patient allocation were performed by the research pharmacist without any stratification and using a block factor of 4, which was unknown to investigators.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Nineteen patients did not complete the 18-month study. In addition, two patients completing 18 months of therapy refused to have a second liver biopsy.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Low risk	This work was supported by a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Merit Award (1 I01 CX000167-01 to K.C.).
Zohrer et al. 2017	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients were randomized by computer.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients and investigators were blinded before intervention assignment.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Patients and investigators were blinded before and after intervention assignment.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Patients and investigators were blinded before and after intervention assignment.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Three patients did not complete the trial.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Low risk	VN is supported by the Italian Ministry of Health (Fondi di Ricerca Corrente). Lack of an end-of-study liver biopsy in the placebo group.
Aller et al. 2015	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	All patients were randomized (table of numbers).
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Data is recorded for all patients.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Unclear	

Lavine et al. 2011	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Eligible patients were randomized in permuted blocks of treatments stratified by clinical center.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Four patient were lost to follow-up and seven withdraw from study.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Low risk	The study is supported by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases grants. This study was supported in part by the Intramural Research Program of the National Cancer institute and the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
Sanyal et al. 2010	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Many patients were lost to follow up or withdraw from the study.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre specified outcomes were reported.
Other bias	Low risk	The study is Financially supported by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases grants.
Balmer et al. 2009	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The patients as well as the physicians were blinded to the treatment until completion of the whole study.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	The patients as well as the physicians were blinded to the treatment until completion of the whole study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	The patients as well as the physicians were blinded to the treatment until completion of the whole study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	High risk	Falk Pharma provided support to buy the ELISA kits and M. L. Balmer was supported by the Stiftung f¨ur die Leberkranheiten.
Wang et al. 2008	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not reported.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Single-blind study
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Single-blind study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	No missing data points.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Unclear	
Nobili et al. 2008	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	A computer-generated randomization sequence assigned participants in a 1:1 ratio.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	A statistician, who was blinded to participants' clinical data and did not participate in patients' clinical care, generated the allocation sequence and assigned participants to their group.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	High risk	Participants and investigators were blinded to drug treatment assignments for the first 12 months, and then the study continued in an open-label fashion for an additional 12 months.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Participants and investigators were blinded to drug treatment assignments for the first 12 months, and then the study continued in an open-label fashion for an additional 12 months.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Two patients had withdrawn from the study in the first 12 months. Two patients were lost to follow-up in the second 12 month.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Unclear	
Nobili et al. 2006	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not Reported
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	low risk	Double-blind placebo study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	low risk	Double-blind placebo study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Two patients were lost to the follow-up and not included in the analysis.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All prespecified outcomes were reported.
Other bias	Unclear	
Dufour et al. 2006	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	low risk	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear	Not Reported
Blinding of participants and personnel	low risk	Double-blind placebo study.

(performance bias)		
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	low risk	Double-blind placebo study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes listed in the methods section are reported in the result section.
Other bias	Unclear	
Vajro et al. 2004	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear	"No mentioning of the method of randomization."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Patients were randomly allocated to two single-blind groups.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Single-blind study.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	Single-blind study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	No missing data points.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All prespecified outcomes were reported.
Other bias	Unclear	
Harrisonet al. 2003	**Risk of bias**	**Author judgment**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Patient were randomized according to a computer-generated randomization table.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	The patients were assigned to either the vitamin group or the placebo group, based on the coded randomization table, so that only the pharmacist knew which intervention the patient was receiving.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blind, placebo-controlled trial.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Both the principal investigator and pathologist were blinded as to the patient's intervention.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Four patients did not complete the study, two in each group. Three of the four patients did not wish to have follow-up liver biopsies, and one patient moved away before completion of the study. These patients were not included in the analysis.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All prespecified outcomes were reported.
Other bias	Unclear	