**Additional file 2. Risk of bias assessment tool**

Adapted from the Risk of Bias Tool for Prevalence Studies developed by Hoy et al. (2012)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk of Bias Item** | **Answer:** **Yes (Low Risk) or No (High risk)** |
| **External Validity** |  |
| 1. Was the study target population a close representation of the HIV-infected population in relation to relevant variables?
 |  |
| 1. Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?
 |  |
| 1. Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR, was a census undertaken?
 |  |
| 1. Was the likelihood of non-participation bias minimal?
 |  |
| **Internal Validity** |  |
| 1. Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to medical records)?
 |  |
| 1. Were acceptable case definition of viral hepatitis B or C used?
 |  |
| 1. Was a reliable and accepted diagnosis method for viral hepatitis B or Cutilized?
 |  |
| 1. Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?
 |  |
| 1. Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?
 |  |
| 1. Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the calculation of the prevalence of dyslipidemia appropriate?
 |  |
| 1. Summary item on the overall risk of study bias

LOW RISK OF BIAS: 8 or more “yes” answers. Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate.MODERATE RISK OF BIAS: 6 to 7 “yes” answers. Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate and may change the estimate.HIGH RISK OF BIAS: 5 or fewer “yes” answers. Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate and is likely to change the estimate. |  |