

Supplementary file

Study Reference	Quality Score	Study design	Power calculations	Sampling	Response/ Attrition Rate	Stigma scale validity	Process evaluation	Population involvement
Individual Level Intervention								
Low 2013	56.8%	Randomised experiment	Not reported, sample size >400	Random sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	No	Unclear
Mundell 2006	43.2%	Controlled non-experimental study – with analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Convenience sampling in healthcare facilities	Not reported	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Involved in intervention design
Rongkavilit 2015	56.8%	Randomised experiment	Not reported, sample size <400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Loss to follow-up 8% in intervention and 30% in control group, although not statistically significant, participants lost to follow-up more likely to have risky sexual behaviour	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Unclear
Tshabalala 2011	54.1%	Randomised experiment	Not reported, sample size <400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Intervention was developed based on formative qualitative research with the population of interest
Van Tam 2012	59.5%	Randomised experiment	Not reported, sample size <400	Random sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	No	Involved in intervention delivery
Relational + Individual Level Intervention								
Go 2015	65.0%	Randomised experiment	Power calculations based on assumed effect size	Snowball sampling (former and current drug users)	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	Yes	Involved in participant recruitment
Peltzer 2017	67.6%	Randomised experiment	Power calculations based on effect size from prior study	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Attrition $>10\%$ and differential, participants with higher education levels less likely to drop out	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Unclear
Prinsloo 2017	45.9%	Study without a comparison group, with analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Convenience sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Involved in intervention delivery

Supplementary file

Study Reference	Quality Score	Study design	Power calculations	Sampling	Response/ Attrition Rate	Stigma scale validity	Process evaluation	Population involvement
Structural + Individual Level Intervention								
Bhatta 2017¹	78.4%	Randomised experiment	Power calculations based on effect size from prior study	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	180 eligible participants refused to join the study, giving a response rate of 42%	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	Yes	Unclear
Chidrawi 2016¹ & 2014 (reporting on same sample)	37.8%	Inadequately controlled study – No analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Not reported	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	No	Involved in intervention design and delivery
Ghosal 2015	51.4%	Randomised experiment	Not reported, sample size >400	Random sampling via NGOs	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Newly developed scale, no reliability statistics reported	Yes	Unclear
Lifson 2017	40.5%	Study without comparison group with analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability for study sample not reported	Yes	Involved in intervention delivery and research
Maluccio 2017	54.1%	Controlled non-experimental study – with analysis of change	Not reported, sample size >400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Unclear
Nyamathi 2013	70.3%	Randomised experiment	Power calculations based on assumed effect size	Random sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	No	Unclear
Turan 2014	40.5%	Inadequately controlled study – No analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Random sampling in healthcare facilities	Attrition rate 32%, but not differential	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	No	Unclear
Uys 2009	29.7%	Study without comparison group, no analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Convenience sampling in healthcare facilities	Not reported	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	Yes	Population involved in intervention design and delivery
Structural Interventions								
Makoae 2009	35.3%	Study without a comparison group – With analysis of change	Not reported, sample size >400	Convenience sampling in healthcare facilities	Loss during follow-up was 31%, but not differential by gender, age, marital status, taking and not taking ARVs	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	No	Unclear

Supplementary file

Study Reference	Quality Score	Study design	Power calculations	Sampling	Response/ Attrition Rate	Stigma scale validity	Process evaluation	Population involvement
Peltzer 2011	43.2%	Study without a comparison group – With analysis of change	Not reported, sample size >400	Random sampling in healthcare facilities	>30% lost to follow-up due to transfers, deaths, refusals	Use of validated, standardised scale, but stigma score in study sample <0.7	No	Unclear
Tsai 2013	35.1%	Study without comparison group, no analysis of change	Not reported, sample size <400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	No	Unclear
Wagner 2012¹	54.1%	Controlled non-experimental study – with analysis of change	Not reported, sample size >400	Purposive sampling in healthcare facilities	Response and retention rates $\geq 70\%$ and differential attrition $\leq 10\%$	Validated, standardised scale used, reliability coefficient >0.7 for study sample	No	Unclear