Table 11. AGREE II quality assessment of guidelines for screening for hepatocellular carcinoma

AGREE II Quality Assessment Item		AASLD	APASL	EASL-EORTC
Overall: Rate the overall quality of this guideline		**2**	**3**	**3**
		1 (strongly disagree) – 7 (strongly agree)		
Domain 1: Scope and Purpose				
1.	The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described.	6	6	7
2.	The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described.	6	6	7
3.	The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described.*	6	6	7
Domain 2: Stakeholder Involvement				
4.	The guideline development group includes individuals from all relevant professional groups.*	2	5	3
5.	The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought.*	1	1	1
6.	The target users of the guideline are clearly defined.*	4	4	6
Domain 3: Rigour of Development				
7.	Systematic methods were used to search for evidence.*	2	3	4
8.	The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described.	1	1	1
9.	The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described.	1	2	3
10.	The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described.*	2	3	3
11.	The health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations.*	2	2	2
12.	There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence.*	2	3	4
13.	The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication.*	2	5	1
14.	A procedure for updating the guideline is provided.*	1	1	1
Domain 4: Clarity of Presentation				
15.	The recommendations are specific and unambiguous.	5	5	5
16.	The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented.*	4	4	5
17.	Key recommendations are easily identifiable.*	4	5	6
Domain 5: Applicability				
18.	The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application.	2	2	2
19.	The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice.	2	2	2
20.	The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered.	2	2	2
21.	The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria.	1	1	1
Domain 6: Editorial Independence				
22.	The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline.*	1	1	1
23.	Competing interests of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed.*	3	1	1

Abbreviations = AASLD: American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases; APASL: Asian Pacific Association for the Study of the Liver; EASL-EORTC: European Association for the Study of Liver, European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer