

**Search strings: MEDLINE and MEDLINE In-Process & Non-Indexed Citations** (1,353 hits), **Embase** (1,291 hits), **PsycINFO** (766 hits)

1. gay OR bisexual OR homosexual OR queer OR LGBT\* OR men who have sex with men OR MSM OR exp homosexuality/ OR exp homosexuality, male/ OR exp bisexuality/ OR exp transsexualism/ OR exp transvestism/
2. drug\* OR substance\* OR alcohol\* OR marijuan\* OR cannab\* OR marihuan\* OR hashish\* OR cocaine\* OR crack\* OR GHB OR \*hydroxybutyric OR crystal\* OR n-methyl-3-4-methylenedioxyamphetamine OR ketamine OR MDMA\* OR meth\* OR alkyl nitrites OR poppers OR ecstasy OR heroin\* OR lsd\* OR lysergic acid diethylamide\* OR opiat\* OR opioid\* OR narcot\* OR illicit drug\* OR recreational drug\* OR club drug\* OR party drug\* OR sniff\* OR exp substance-related disorders/ OR exp alcohol-related disorders/ OR exp street drugs/ OR exp prescription drugs/ OR exp designer drugs/ OR exp marijuana smoking/
3. public\* OR social\* OR circuit part\* OR White Party OR Black Blue Party OR Winter Party OR dance club\* OR rave\* OR cruis\* lounge\* OR gay bar\* OR sauna\* OR bath house\* OR bathhouse\* OR tea room\* OR tea part\* OR tea dance\* OR cruis\* OR cottag\* OR sex club\* OR glory hole\* OR glory-hole\* OR backroom\* OR back room\* OR sex on premises\* OR sex-on-premises\* OR commercial sex venue\* OR marathon OR (group adj2 sex)
4. qualitative\* OR focus group\* OR focus-group\* OR interview\* OR grounded theor\* OR thematic analys\* OR framework analys\* OR hermeneutic\* OR grounded-theor\* OR phenomeno\* OR ethnograph\* OR interpretiv\* OR interpretativ\* OR realis\* OR (theoretical\* adj sampl\*) OR constructiv\* OR field research OR field-research OR exp qualitative research/ OR exp ethnography/OR exp ethnopsychology/ OR exp anthropology, cultural/ OR exp sociology/ OR exp sociology, medical/
5. 1 AND 2 AND 3 AND 4

## Questions and guidance for critical appraisal

**Were steps taken to increase rigour in the sampling?** Consider whether: a) the sampling strategy was appropriate to the questions posed in the study (e.g. was the strategy well reasoned and justified?); b) attempts were made to obtain a diverse sample of the population in question (think about who might have been excluded who may have had a different perspective to offer); c) characteristics of the sample critical to the understanding of the study context and findings were presented (i.e. do we know who the participants were in terms of for example, basic socio-demographics, characteristics relevant to the context of the study etc.)

Yes, a thorough attempt was made (please specify) +++

Yes, several steps were taken (please specify) ++

Yes, a few steps were taken (please specify) +

No, not at all/Not stated/Can't tell (please specify) -

Unclear (please specify) 0

**Were steps taken to increase rigour in the data collected?** Consider whether: a) data collection tools were piloted; b) data collection was comprehensive, flexible and/or sensitive enough to provide a complete and/or vivid and rich description of people's perspectives and experiences (e.g. did the researchers spend sufficient time at the site/with participants? Did they keep 'following up'? Was more than one method of data collection used?); c) steps were taken to ensure that all participants were able and willing to contribute (e.g., processes for consent, language barriers, power relations between adults and children/young people).

Yes, a thorough attempt was made (please specify) +++

Yes, several steps were taken (please specify) ++

Yes, a few steps were taken (please specify) +

No, not at all/Not stated/Can't tell (please specify) -

Unclear (please specify) 0

**Were steps taken to increase rigour in data analysis?** Consider whether: a) data analysis methods were systematic (e.g. was a method described/ can a method be discerned?); b) diversity in perspective was explored; c) the analysis was balanced in the extent to which it was guided by preconceptions or by the data; d) the analysis sought to rule out alternative explanations for findings (in qualitative research this could be done by, for example, searching for negative cases/exceptions, feeding back preliminary results to participants, asking a colleague to review the data, or reflexivity).

Yes, a thorough attempt was made (please specify) +++

Yes, several steps were taken (please specify) ++

Yes, a few steps were taken (please specify) +

No, not at all/Not stated/Can't tell (please specify) -

Unclear (please specify) 0

**Were study findings grounded in/supported by the data?** Consider whether: a) enough data are presented to show how the author's arrived at their findings; b) the data presented fit the interpretation/support claims about patterns in data; c) the data presented illuminate/illustrate the findings; d) quotes are numbered or otherwise identified and the reader can see that they don't just come from one or two people.

Findings are well grounded/supported ++  
Findings are fairly well grounded/supported +  
Limited grounding/support of findings -

**Please rate study findings in terms of breadth and depth.** Consider whether: a) a range of issues are covered; b) the perspectives of participants are fully explored in terms of breadth (contrast of two or more perspectives) and depth (insight into a single perspective); c) richness and complexity has been portrayed (e.g. variation explained, meanings illuminated); d) there has been theoretical/conceptual development. (NB: It may be helpful to consider 'breadth' as the extent of description and 'depth' as the extent to which data has been transformed/analysed.)

Limited breadth or depth -  
Good/fair breadth but very little depth +/-  
Good/fair depth but very little breadth -/+  
Good/fair breadth AND depth ++

**To what extent are the perspectives/experiences of MSM privileged in this study?** Consider all of the below questions and make an overall judgment: a) there was a balance between open-ended and fixed response options; b) whether MSM were involved in designing the research; c) there was a balance between the use of an *a priori* coding framework and induction in the analysis; d) the position of the researchers (did they consider it important to listen to MSM?); e) steps were taken to assure confidentiality and put MSM at their ease.

Not at all (0), A little (+), Somewhat (++), A lot (+++)

**How might the researcher's perspective have shaped data collection and analysis?** Is it clear: a) if the researcher critically examined their own role, potential bias and influence during formulation of research questions and data collection including: sample recruitment, choice of location; b) how the researcher responded to events during the study and whether they considered the implications of any changes in the research design?

Not at all (0), A little (+), Somewhat (++), A lot (+++)

**Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?** a) Are there sufficient details of how the research was explained to participants for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained? b) Has the researcher discussed issues raised by the study (e.g. issues around informed consent or confidentiality)? c) Has approval been sought from the ethics committee?

Not at all (0), A little (+), Somewhat (++), A lot (+++)

**Overall, what weight would you assign to this study in terms of the reliability/trustworthiness of its findings?** Think (mainly) about the answers you have given to the first four questions above.

Low (-), Medium (+), High (++)

**What weight would you assign to this study in terms of its findings' usefulness for this review?** Think (mainly) about the answers you have given above and consider: a) the match between the study aims and findings and the aims and purpose of the synthesis; b) its conceptual depth/explanatory power.

Low (-), Medium (+), High (++)