

Annex 8. Results of the quality assessment

Table A1. Quality assessment results: general population, chlamydia

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Adhikari 2022	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Albig 2023	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Babinská 2017	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Berhonde 2015	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Bianchi 2016	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Bozicevic 2023	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Camporiondo 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Czerwinski 2018	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Dorado Criado 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Duron 2018	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Espies 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Fischer 2021 (CT1)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Fischer 2021 (CT2)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Foschi 2016	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Frej-Madrzak 2018	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Frej-Madrzak 2020	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Grandahl 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Gravningen 2013	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Hassan 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Heijne 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Jadranin 2019	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Klavs 2022	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Korzeniewski 2019	No	No	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Ljubin-Sternak 2017	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Lopez-Corbeto 2021	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Matteelli 2016	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Muñoz Santa 2022	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Oakeshott 2019	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
O'Higgins 2017	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Op de Coul 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Panatto 2015	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Parthenis 2018	No	No	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Peuchant 2015	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Piñeiro 2016	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Reyes-Lacalle 2022	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Seraceni 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Silva 2013	No	No	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Skafté-Holm 2023	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Skaletz-Rorowski 2021	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Sonnenberg 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Tjagur 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Yuguero 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high

Table A2. Quality assessment results: general population, gonorrhoea

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Albig 2023	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Berhonde 2015	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Camporiondo 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Dorado Criado 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Duron 2018	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Espies 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Grandahl 2020	No	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Hassan 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Heijne 2019	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Klavs 2022	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Lopez-Corbeto 2021	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Matteelli 2016	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Muñoz Santa 2022	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Oakeshott 2019	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Op de Coul 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Peuchant 2015	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Piñeiro 2016	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Silva 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Skaletz-Rorowski 2021	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Sonnenberg 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	low
Tjagur 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium

Table A3. Quality assessment results: general population, trichomoniasis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Albig 2023	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Bolumburu 2020	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Camporiondo 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Dorado Criado 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Espies 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Farr 2016	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	high
Klavs 2022	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Leli 2016	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Munoz Santa 2022	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Op de Coul 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Parthenis 2018	No	No	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Silva 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Tjagur 2021	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium

Table A4. Quality assessment results: general population, syphilis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Balla 2018	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Dalmartello 2019	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	high
Duron 2018	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Ensari 2015	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Manolescu 2019	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Pageaux 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Parthenis 2018	No	No	No	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Piñeiro 2016	No	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	high
Radon-Pokracka 2017	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	high
Kayaert 2023	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	high

Table A5. Quality assessment results: MSM, chlamydia

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Achterbergh 2020	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ayerdi Aguirrebengoa 2020	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Charin 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	high
Chromy 2023	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
DeLaMora 2022	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Druckler 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Evers 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Farfour 2021	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Foschi 2018	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Hilmarsdottir 2021	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Hovaguimian 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Hoyos-Mallecot 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Jansen 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Kevlishvili 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Nozza 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ogaz 2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	medium
Pakov 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Rahib 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Reyniers 2018	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ribeiro 2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Rondeau 2019	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Schmidt 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Spinner 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Streeck 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Szetela 2023_hr	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Szetela 2023_lr	Unclear	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Taspinar Sen 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
vanAar 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Weidlich 2023	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high

Table A6. Quality assessment results: MSM, gonorrhoea

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Achterbergh 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ayerdi Aguirrebengoa 2020	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Bigler 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Charin 2023	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	high
Chromy 2023	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
DeLaMora 2022	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Druckler 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Evers 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Farfour 2021	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Foschi 2018	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Hilmarsdottir 2021	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Hovaguimian 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Hoyos-Mallecot 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Jansen 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Kevlishvili 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Nozza 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ogaz 2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	medium
Pakov 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Rahib 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	high
Reyniers 2018	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ribeiro 2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Schmidt 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Spinner 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Streeck 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Szetela 2023_hr	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Szetela 2023_lr	Unclear	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Taspinar Sen 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Weidlich 2023	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high

Table A7. Quality assessment results: MSM, trichomoniasis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Jansen 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Schmidt 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Streeck 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Taspinar Sen 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high

Table A8. Quality assessment results: MSM, syphilis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Achterbergh 2020	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Ayerdi Aguirrebengoa 2020	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Bigler 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Chromy 2023	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Druckler 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Yes	high
Evers 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Farfour 2021	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Foschi 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Gasbarrini 2021	Unclear	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Hovaguimian 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Hoyos-Mallecot 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Kevlishvili 2023	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Koksal 2020	No	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Nozza 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	high
Ogaz 2019	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	high
Pakov 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Fernandez-Lopez 2022_ES	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	high
Fernandez-Lopez 2022_LV	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	high
Fernandez-Lopez 2022_SI	Unclear	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	No	Unclear	high
Fernandez-Lopez 2022_UA	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	high
Rahib 2022	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	high
Reyniers 2018	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Schmidt 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	high
Spinner 2018	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Unclear	No	Unclear	high
Streeck 2022	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Szetela 2023_hr	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Szetela 2023_lr	Unclear	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Taspinar Sen 2023	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	high

Table A9. Quality assessment results: Sex workers, chlamydia

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Almeida 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Coorevits 2018	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Druckler 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ferrer 2022	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Sultan 2021	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
vanDulm 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Vernazza 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Verougstraete 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Vu 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high

Table A10. Quality assessment results: Sex workers, gonorrhoea

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Almeida 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Coorevits 2018	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Druckler 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Ferrer 2022	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Sultan 2021	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
vanDulm 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Vernazza 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Verougstraete 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Vu 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high

Table A11. Quality assessment results: Sex workers, trichomoniasis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Coorevits 2018	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Vernazza 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium

Table A12. Quality assessment results: Sex workers, syphilis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Almeida 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Druckler 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Yes	high
Marrone 2023	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high
Sekera 2022	No	No	No	No	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	high
Sultan 2021	No	No	No	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	high
vanDulm 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	medium
Vernazza 2020	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	medium
Vu 2020	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	high

Table A13. Quality assessment results: PWID, syphilis

Author, year	1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?	2. Were study participants sampled in an appropriate way?	3. Was the sample size adequate?	4. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?	5. Was the data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample?	6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition?	7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants?	8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis?	9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately?	RoB
Borovcanin 2019	Yes	No	No	No	Unclear	No	Yes	No	No	high
Sekera 2022	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unclear	No	Yes	No	Unclear	high