***Supplementary Appendix 5| Reasons for disagreements in cases of a different interpretation of the same information; focus on "low" versus "high" disagreements.***

| *Risk of bias item* | Main reasons for disagreements | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| ***random sequence generation*** | Consider differently incomplete or unclear description | *"The names of communities within each group of three were written on individual cards, mixed and selected randomly: the first from each group was assigned to arm A (IEC alone), the second to arm B (IEC and STI management) and the third to arm C";* Low risk of bias<br>*"Names of communities within each triplet were written on separate cards and shuffled.";* High risk of bias |
| ***allocation concealment*** | Consider differently envelopes description | *"Closed envelopes";* Low risk of bias<br>*"Closed envelopes, although not opaque.";* High risk of bias |
| | Confusion in the definition of the item | *"pg. 2 - Methods - randomisation was done centrally to preserve allocation concealment"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"904 patients were eligible for the study. 446 patients were randomised (49%). Due to the number of patients declining screening, there is an increased risk of inclusion bias."*; High risk of bias |
| | Confusion with blinding | *"States used "preprogrammed laptop computer". Remote site";* Low risk of bias<br>*"participants were told to which compound they had been allocated*.";* High risk of bias |
| ***blinding of participants and personnel*** | Assess risk differently if blinding was not feasible because of the type of intervention | *"Not possible to blind participants";* Low risk of bias<br>*"Participants were not blinded for provided treatment. This is inherent to study design";* High risk of bias |
| | Outcome considered not influenced by blinding | *"Not possible to blind but most of the outcomes not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding.";* Low risk of bias<br>*"Not blinded due to nature of intervention."*; High risk of bias |
| | Confusion with allocation concealment | *"participants were randomly allocated to either intervention or control group by an independent party";* Low risk of bias<br>*"Control group did not receive the comparable non-exercise related attention to the intervention group"*; High risk of bias |

| ***Risk of bias Item*** | **Main reasons for disagreements** | **Examples** |
|---|---|---|
| ***blinding of outcome assessment*** | outcome considered not influenced by blinding | *"No information given about whether patients or assessors were blind to physician allocation but primary outcomes (treatment outcome and patient reported physician cultural competency) judged unlikely to be affected by lack of blinding"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"Unblinded."*; High risk of bias |
| | Consider differently patient reported outcomes when patients are blinded or not to the intervention | *"Insufficient information available to assess"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"Comment: depression assessed by patient self-report"*; High risk of bias |
| | Assess risk differently if blinding was not feasible because of the type of intervention | *"Unclear blinding of outcome assessment"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"blinding not possible due to intervention"*; High risk of bias |
| ***incomplete outcome data*** | Use different cut-off for the rate of missing data | *"11 withdrawals (10%)."*; Low risk of bias<br>*"Comment: there were post-randomisation drop-outs"*; High risk of bias |
| | Focus on number vs reasons/precise report of missing data | *"Numbers and reasons for dropouts and withdrawals in all intervention groups were described."*; Low risk of bias<br>*"20 drop-outs (27.2%) with 4 deaths (3 males, 1 female) from cardiovascular events"*; High risk of bias |
| | Consider differently incomplete or unclear description | *"Women who were untraceable or unsuitable for follow-up were excluded, other losses included as smokers"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"167/1287 (12.9%) (C = 83, I = 84) excluded from analysis due to moving away, being untraceable or deemed unsuitable for follow-up (e.g. miscarriage). 1120 in sample. 51/1287 non-responders were included as continuing smokers."* High risk of bias |
| | Use different cut-off for difference in the rate missing data between different arms/comparisons | *"Similar rates of withdrawal between arms. Withdrawals: 36 BUD, 51 placebo"*; Low risk of bias<br>*"Dropout higher in placebo group (35% vs 25% in budesonide group). ITT used."*; High risk of bias |