**S3: Risk of bias assessment of the included studies according to the Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (changes in the tool are marked with *italics*).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Barbee et al** | **Brook et al** | **Burchell et al** | **Chow et al** | **Debattista et al** | **Golub et al** | **Grant et al** | **Liu et al** | **Mayer et al** | **Morris et al** | **Rieg et al** | **Volk et al** |
| 1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated? *Were the cases of CT and/or NG clearly stated?* | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined? *Were all the participants MSM or separate results reported for MSM?* | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%? *Was the screening rate at least 50%?* | no | yes | no | yes | no | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study pre-specified and applied uniformly to all participants? | no | no | no | no | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided? | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | no | yes | no | no | no | no | no |
| 6. For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured? | yes | NR | yes | yes | NA | NA | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | NA |
| 7. Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed? | yes | yes | yes | yes | NA | NA | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | NA |
| 8. For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)? | NA | yes | yes | yes | NA | NA | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | NA |
| 9. Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | NA | yes | yes | yes | NA | NA | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | NA |
| 10. Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time? *Were number of patients/tests reported at all time points?* | yes | yes | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | no | yes | no |
| 11. Were the outcome measures (*CT-NG cases and number of tested or prevalence*) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | no | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes |
| 12. Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants? | yes | no | yes | yes | NA | NA | yes | yes | NR | NR | yes | NA |
| 13. Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less? | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | no | no | no | NR | NR | no | no |
| 14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)? | no | yes | yes | yes | NA | NA | no | yes | yes | yes | no | NA |
| **Quality rating** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Fair** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Poor** | **Good** | **Good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Good** | **Fair** |

NR: Not reported, NA: Not applicable