7 epochs using digitized photographic plates and comparison stars with errors of ~0.05 mag. The QSO redshifts range up to 3.2 (~3 with $z_e \gtrsim 2.2$) with B$\lesssim$20. Approximately one third of the QSOs have detected variability with ΔM ~0.2 and Δv $\gtrsim$3 years (QSO rest frame). They claim an apparent decrease in variability with redshift and/or intrinsic luminosity and a slight increase in $P(\Delta \mathrm{T})$ with ΔT .

Group 4: Giallongo *et al.* (1991) analyzed the data from a study of 27 QSOs in SA 57 using digitized photographic plates and comparison stars with the KPNO 4 meter over a 11 year (7 epoch) timespan (*cf.* Trevese and Kron 1991 and Koo *et al.* 1986). The redshifts ranged up to 3.1 (~3 with $z_e \gtrsim 2.5$) with B$\lesssim$22.5 and errors of ~0.04 magnitudes. Giallongo *et al.* (1991) also included data from Bonoli *et al.* (1979) which consisted of 28 QSOs with B$\lesssim$19.2 and errors ~0.05 to 0.1 mag. The results were a ΔM ~0.4 magnitudes and Δv ~0.45 years. They also claim an increase in variability with redshift and no correlation with intrinsic luminosity.

The principle differences between these groups and our study is that we have used a CCD, and we worked primarily in *r* band (~6600Å) while the others have worked in B band (~4400Å), except for group 2 which used B and V (~5500Å) band. Also our data has a somewhat higher signal-to-noise (S/N) than the most of the other groups. We have studied mostly BALQSOs, although there was no apparent difference in the variability between BALQSOs and non-BALQSOs (see figure 8-2). However, the number of non-BALQSOs is small and the sample sets are biased since the non-BALQSOs are mainly from the FOS target– a sample which was only monitored for half as long.

Groups 3 and 4 worked with a faint set of QSOs since they were restricted to a specific area of the sky. The studies contain mainly optically selected QSOs except for group 1 which studied mostly radio selected QSOs. The high ΔM of group 1 may be due to their longer observation timespan, larger errors, or the higher concentration of radio-loud QSOs. Our own ΔM is lower than any of the groups. This may be due to our shorter observation timespans. If we assume that Δv $\gtrsim \Delta$T , then we are only seeing portions of a most of the variational periods and therefore this tends to depress the observed