Table 1: GRADE table for adherence overall

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	2.38 (0.59, 9.65)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.06 (0.73, 1.56)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT vs. SOC	1.30 (0.94, 1.78)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.34 (0.97, 1.90)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + CBT vs. SOC	1.60 (0.79, 3.21)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.19 (0.62, 2.31)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.34 (0.52, 3.45)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.95 (0.92, 4.47)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT vs. SOC	0.96 (0.75, 1.25)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.18 (0.91, 1.56)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.48 (0.67, 3.29)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.13 (0.69, 1.86)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Incentives vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.56 (0.52, 13.62)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Supporter vs. SOC	0.61 (0.29, 1.30)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.97 (0.50, 1.96)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Device reminder vs. SOC	1.26 (0.84, 1.89)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.39 (0.89, 2.21)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Multimedia BST/MAT vs. SOC	1.47 (0.89, 2.41)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.53 (0.84, 2.74)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
SMS vs. SOC	**1.49 (1.17, 1.89)**	0	-1	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.70 (1.16, 2.49)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter vs. SOC	1.28 (0.90, 1.82)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.25 (0.98, 1.63)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.32 (0.60, 2.89)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.45 (0.66, 3.20)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**6.25 (2.88, 13.60)**	0	0	-1	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**4.91 (2.05, 12.52)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Telephone vs. SOC	1.25 (0.66, 2.34)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.20 (0.82, 1.85)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
SMS + CBT vs SOC	**2.64 (1.13, 6.16)**	0	0	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.99 (0.72, 5.68)	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT vs. eSOC	0.82 (0.44, 1.54)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.28 (0.81, 2.00)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT + CBT vs. eSOC	1.35 (0.50, 3.65)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.12 (0.56, 2.29)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.85 (0.80, 4.43)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. eSOC	1.24 (0.59, 2.60)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.12 (0.76, 1.68)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	1.09 (0.47, 2.51)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.07 (0.61, 1.91)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Incentives vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.42 (0.48, 13.22)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Supporter vs. eSOC	1.38 (0.30, 6.26)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.92 (0.45, 1.94)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.32 (0.74, 2.35)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Multimedia BST/MAT vs.	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕	1.44	--	--	⊕⊕

F3.1 Interventions to improve adherence

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC							Low	(0.71, 2.86)			Low
SMS vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.62 (0.93, 2.69)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter vs. eSOC	1.45 (0.82, 2.55)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.19 (0.78, 1.78)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.38 (0.57, 3.21)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**4.63 (1.76, 12.65)**	--	--	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.14 (0.67, 1.99)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
SMS + CBT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.89 (0.64, 5.79)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates
High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 2: GRADE table for adherence in developing countries

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.25 (0.60, 2.63)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT vs. SOC	1.19 (0.81, 1.77)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.18 (0.73, 1.92)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.28 (0.50, 3.28)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.23 (0.49, 3.38)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT vs. SOC	0.50 (0.19, 1.33)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.90 (0.40, 2.11)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.29 (0.17, 9.76)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.70 (0.74, 3.79)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Supporter vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.27 (0.50, 16.52)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Device reminder vs. SOC	1.02 (0.61, 1.72)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.78 (0.44, 1.32)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
SMS vs. SOC	**1.49 (1.17, 1.90)**	0	-1	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.49 (1.04, 2.09)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter vs. SOC	1.42 (0.95, 2.12)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.64 (1.04, 2.74)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**5.95 (2.75, 12.88)**	0	0	-1	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**6.59 (2.95, 16.06)**	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Telephone vs. SOC	0.75 (0.52, 1.09)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.74 (0.42, 1.35)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
SMS + CBT vs. SOC	**2.64 (1.13, 6.14)**	0	-1	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**2.69 (1.04, 7.14)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.97 (0.39, 2.23)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.00 (0.30, 3.51)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.73 (0.24, 2.14)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	1.11 (0.48, 2.56)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.36 (0.62, 2.96)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Supporter vs. eSOC	1.30 (0.29, 5.70)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.80 (0.44, 12.61)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.63 (0.24, 1.51)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
SMS vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.20 (0.52, 2.69)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter vs. eSOC	1.44 (0.81, 2.54)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.32 (0.70, 2.54)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	**5.34 (1.77, 16.68)**	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.60 (0.23, 1.51)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
SMS + CBT vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.19 (0.64, 7.42)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.

The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates

High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 3: GRADE table for viral suppression overall

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	8.18 (0.86, 78.05)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.85 (0.53, 1.45)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT vs. SOC	0.97 (0.57, 1.65)	-1	-1	0	-1	0	⊕ Very Low	0.97 (0.66, 1.50)	0	0	⊕ Very Low
BST/MAT + CBT vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.83 (0.20, 3.30)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.82 (0.22, 3.08)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + Incentives vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.77 (0.85, 9.65)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. SOC	**1.44 (1.04, 2.00)**	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.46 (1.05, 2.12)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Device reminder vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.32 (0.46, 4.05)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Incentives vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.08 (0.20, 5.97)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Supporter vs. SOC	0.71 (0.34, 1.49)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.72 (0.31, 1.69)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Device reminder vs. SOC	1.10 (0.55, 2.20)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.19 (0.66, 2.24)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Multimedia BST/MAT vs. SOC	**5.38 (1.10, 26.35)**	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.91 (0.66, 6.10)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
SMS vs. SOC	1.34 (0.95, 1.89)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.34 (0.65, 2.81)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter vs. SOC	**1.32 (1.03, 1.69)**	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.28 (1.01, 1.71)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Device reminder vs. SOC	2.19 (0.97, 4.92)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	2.07 (0.88, 5.91)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	1.06 (0.42, 2.70)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.06 (0.34, 3.28)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Telephone vs. SOC	1.24 (0.85, 1.81)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.31 (0.85, 2.19)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT vs. eSOC	1.22 (0.60, 2.51)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.15 (0.64, 2.01)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT + CBT vs. eSOC	0.97 (0.32, 2.93)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.98 (0.26, 3.44)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.98 (0.25, 3.74)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT + Incentives vs. eSOC	**3.20 (1.33, 7.71)**	0	0	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**3.25 (1.13, 9.88)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT vs. eSOC	**2.05 (1.21, 3.46)**	0	-1	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.72 (1.08, 2.70)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.55 (0.48, 5.06)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Incentives vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.27 (0.22, 6.97)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

F3.1 Interventions to improve adherence

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
CBT + Supporter vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.85 (0.32, 2.15)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.39 (0.64, 3.04)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Multimedia BST/MAT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.23 (0.71, 7.59)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
SMS vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.59 (0.63, 3.70)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter vs. eSOC	0.89 (0.22, 3.57)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.51 (0.87, 2.58)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	2.42 (0.88, 7.87)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.25 (0.35, 4.24)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.53 (0.78, 3.07)	--	--	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates

High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 4: GRADE table for viral suppression in developing countries

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.67 (0.39, 7.91)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
BST/MAT vs. SOC	1.02 (0.66, 1.58)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.02 (0.66, 1.58)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT vs. SOC	0.71 (0.25, 2.00)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.61 (0.25, 1.49)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Device reminder vs. SOC	0.82 (0.47, 1.42)	-1	-1	0	-1	0	⊕ Very Low	0.85 (0.50, 1.44)	0	0	⊕ Very Low
SMS vs. SOC	1.34 (0.95, 1.89)	-1	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.34 (0.96, 1.89)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter vs. SOC	1.17 (0.90, 1.51)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.17 (0.90, 1.51)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	1.06 (0.42, 2.70)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.06 (0.41, 2.72)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Telephone vs. SOC	1.00 (0.65, 1.53)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.00 (0.65, 1.54)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
BST/MAT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.61 (0.12, 2.82)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.37 (0.06, 2.02)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.51 (0.10, 2.41)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
SMS vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.81 (0.16, 3.60)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Supporter vs. eSOC	0.73 (0.18, 2.96)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.70 (0.15, 2.95)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.63 (0.10, 3.62)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.60 (0.12, 2.75)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates

High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 5: GRADE table for adherence overall in peer network

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.68 (0.17, 2.63)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. SOC	0.73 (0.34, 1.57)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.82 (0.28, 2.40)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Peer supporter vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.04 (0.10, 13.77)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Treatment supporter vs. SOC	0.59 (0.28, 1.34)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.62 (0.16, 2.42)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter vs. SOC	1.04 (0.72, 1.51)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.03 (0.55, 1.94)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter + Device reminder vs. SOC	1.28 (0.58, 2.80)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.29 (0.35, 4.83)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**4.66 (1.79, 12.13)**	0	0	-1	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**4.87 (1.02, 23.76)**	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. SOC	1.53 (0.87, 2.69)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.51 (0.92, 2.79)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**9.40 (2.55, 34.67)**	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	**10.69 (1.86, 74.00)**	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.21 (0.24, 6.35)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Peer supporter vs. eSOC	1.30 (0.29, 5.70)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.50 (0.24, 13.98)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.91 (0.14, 6.22)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter vs. eSOC	1.41 (0.79, 2.51)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.52 (0.43, 5.57)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.91 (0.32, 11.85)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	7.15 (0.91, 58.16)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	3.06 (0.10, 96.74)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	2.22 (0.57, 10.28)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Treatment supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	**15.88 (1.70, 168.30)**	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates

High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 6: GRADE table for adherence in developing countries in peer network

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.12 (0.38, 3.10)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Peer supporter vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.70 (0.30, 14.62)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter vs. SOC	1.78 (0.72, 4.41)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.64 (0.65, 3.86)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**4.66 (1.79, 12.13)**	0	0	0	0	0	⊕⊕⊕⊕ **High**	**4.83 (1.88, 13.55)**	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Treatment supporter vs. SOC	1.34 (0.85, 2.10)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.41 (0.90, 2.19)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Treatment supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	**9.40 (2.55, 34.67)**	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**10.46 (3.05, 50.96)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Peer supporter vs. eSOC	1.30 (0.29, 5.70)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.49 (0.39, 10.45)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter vs. eSOC	1.41 (0.79, 2.51)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.46 (0.83, 2.61)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	**4.35 (1.07, 19.01)**	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	3.06 (0.10, 96.74)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.25 (0.43, 3.97)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Treatment supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	**9.52 (1.86, 62.32)**	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates

High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 7: GRADE table for viral suppression overall in peer network

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.97 (0.36, 12.29)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT vs. SOC	1.42 (0.63, 2.23)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.06 (0.43, 2.65)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT + Treatment supporter vs. SOC	0.71 (0.34, 1.46)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.61 (0.20, 1.85)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter vs. SOC	1.25 (0.90, 1.57)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.34 (0.67, 2.67)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Device reminder vs. SOC	2.16 (0.96, 2.97)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	2.43 (0.82, 7.35)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	1.06 (0.42, 2.00)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.06 (0.29, 3.93)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. SOC	**1.40 (1.01, 1.72)**	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	**1.39 (1.00, 2.07)**	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
CBT vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.53 (0.07, 3.73)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
CBT + Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.31 (0.04, 2.34)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.68 (0.09, 4.29)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter + Device reminder vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.22 (0.15, 9.57)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.54 (0.06, 4.56)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	0.73 (0.18, 2.13)	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.71 (0.12, 3.80)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates
High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

Table 8: GRADE table for viral suppression in developing countries in peer network

Comparison	Uncombined Estimates							Combined Estimates			
	Direct Effect	Risk of Bias	Inconsist-ency	Indirect-ness	Imprec-ision	Publica-tion Bias	Quality of direct evidence	NMA Effect	Indirect evidence precision	Network Transit-ivity	Overall quality of evidence
eSOC vs. SOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.54 (0.36, 7.53)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter vs. SOC	1.28 (0.90, 1.82)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.27 (0.89, 1.81)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. SOC	1.06 (0.42, 2.70)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	1.06 (0.41, 2.73)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate
Treatment supporter vs. SOC	1.05 (0.72, 1.53)	0	-1	0	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	1.07 (0.74, 1.55)	0	0	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.82 (0.16, 3.68)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Peer supporter + Telephone vs. eSOC	--	0	0	-1	-1	0	⊕⊕ Low	0.69 (0.11, 3.88)	--	--	⊕⊕ Low
Treatment supporter vs. eSOC	0.73 (0.18, 2.96)	0	0	0	-1	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate	0.69 (0.15, 2.85)	0	0	⊕⊕⊕ Moderate

Legend: Uncombined estimates represent either direct estimates, if available, or indirect NMA estimates otherwise. Combined estimates are NMA estimates for comparisons where direct estimates were available. For uncombined estimates start with high quality evidence. -1 symbolizes a choice to rate down (e.g. high quality to moderate quality evidence); 0 symbolizes choice to not rate down; -- = not applicable because the NMA estimate is the only estimate.
The final quality of evidence updates that of the uncombined evidence. The quality can be moved up if the uncombined score was penalized for precision, which was overcome in network estimates. It can be moved down if the estimates are no longer precise or if there is evidence of inconsistency in loops containing the comparison (i.e. violation of transitivity).

Precision – We rated down for precision if the confidence interval crossed the minimally important difference and rated down when there were less than 50 events. ***Consistency*** – We assessed the consistency for direct treatment comparisons using I^2 estimates and visual inspection of point estimates. An I^2 of 75% or higher indicates considerable heterogeneity. This was conducted along the shortest indirect pathway with the largest number of trials for indirect estimates. ***Risk of Bias*** – For direct estimates we rated down for risk of bias if the majority of studies within a comparison were considered to be at high risk of bias and similarly along the principal indirect pathway for indirect estimates. ***Indirectness*** – We rated down for comparisons solely informed by indirect comparisons and for instances when direct comparisons were comprised of mostly at risk groups.

GRADE confidence in estimates
High confidence - Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect; *Moderate confidence* - Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate; *Low confidence* - Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate; *Very low confidence* - Any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

References

[1] Mills EJ, Nachega JB, Buchan I, Orbinski J, Attaran A, & Singh S. et al. Adherence to antiretroviral therapy in sub-Saharan Africa and North America: a meta-analysis. JAMA 2006. 2006 Aug 9;296(6):679-90.
[1] Kim SH, Gerver SM, Fidler S, Ward H. Adherence to antiretroviral therapy in adolescents and living with HIV: systematic review and meta-analysis. AIDS. 2014 Aug 24;28(13):1945-56. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000316.
[1] Nachega JB, Uthman OA, Anderson J, Peltzer K, Wampold S, Cotton MF, et al. Adherene to antiretroviral therapy during and after pregnancy in low-income, middle-income, and high-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. AIDS. 2012 Oct 23;26(16):2039-52. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0b013e328359590f.
[1] Rodrigues R, Bogg L, Shet A, Kumar DS, De Costa A. Mobile phones to support adherence to antiretroviral therapy: what would it cost the Indian National AIDS Control Programme? J Int AIDS Soc. 2014 Sep 2;17:19036. doi: 10.7448/IAS.17.1.19036. eCollection 2014.
[1] O'Malley G, Marseille E & Weaver MR. Cost-effectiveness analyses of training: a manager's guide. Hum Resour Health. 2013 May 20;11:20. doi: 10.1186/1478-4491-11-20.
[1] Ma Q, Rich Z, Tucker J et al. ARV Adherence intervention qualitative evidence review. 2015 (not published)
[1] Preliminary report of the Community- led consultation for the WHO 2015 consolidated treatment guidelines update. Acceptability of Early initiation of antiretroviral therapy and viral load monitoring: values and preferences of service users and providers. Compiled by Pangaea Global AIDS on behalf of AIDS Healthcare Foundation Ukraine (AHF); Asia Pacific Network of People Living with HIV (APN+); African Community Advisory Board (AFROCAB); European AIDS Treatment Group (EATG); Grupo Portugués de Activistas sobre Tratamentos de VIH/SIDA (GAT); the International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW); and Asociacion Via Libre.
[1] Ngoksin E, Ninahazwe C, Bhila J, Musah L, Beryl CA, Watson K, et al.,'Taking them forever and taking them on time': The treatment and care needs of adolescents living with HIV. Awaiting publication. Conducted Sept 2014.
[1] Mark D, Andrade C, Armstrong A, Runciman T, Penazzato M, Hatane L,et al., Availability of appropriate HIV treatment and care services for adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa: A situational analysis. Awaiting publication. Conducted Sept 2014.
[1] Bernays S, Paparini S, Rhodes T & Seeley J. Summary Report to address PICO questions for young people living with HIV: findings from the ARROW and BREATHER qualitative research projects in Uganda, Zimbabwe, USA, UK and Ireland. On behalf of Breather and ARROW social science teams. May 2015.