**Supplement**

**1. Calculation of costs**

The cost of diagnosis and treatment of a symptomatic susceptible case ($Cost\_{sg}$) included cost of gonorrhea test ($c\_{gt}$), cost of the current first-line antibiotic medications for gonorrhea ($c\_{at}$), cost of treatment for urethritis ($c\_{U}$) which includes the cost of a short clinic visit consistent with the previous studies [1] [2], and cost of treatment of adverse reaction to gonorrhea antibiotic medications ($c\_{ar}$). In 2017-2020, a combination of ceftriaxone 250g and azithromycin 1g was the first-line therapy [3]. In 2020, it was replaced by ceftriaxone 500g [3]. We assumed that its cost equals to the double cost of ceftriaxone 250g. Mild to moderate (abdominal pain, vomiting, skin rash, dizziness etc.) and severe (cholestatic jaundice, anaphylaxis etc.) reactions can take place as adverse reactions to gonorrhea antibiotic treatment with ceftriaxone and azithromycin [2].

$Cost\_{sg}$=$c\_{sg}+c\_{at}+c\_{U}+p\_{ar}c\_{ar}$,

where $p\_{ar}$ is the probability of adverse reaction to gonorrhea antibiotic medications.

The cost of diagnosis and treatment of a detected asymptomatic case ($Cost\_{ag}$) consisted of almost the same components as the cost of diagnosis and treatment of a symptomatic susceptible case, expect for the cost of a short clinic visit ($c\_{sv}$) used instead of the cost of treatment for urethritis. For the US men who have sex with men (MSM), the routine screening is recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines [4] at the sites for which they reported the exposure. We assumed that the majority of the MSM were exposed at all three anatomical sites since their last screening and used the triple cost of testing for gonorrhea for calculating these costs. The cost of screening in case no infection was found was not included.

$Cost\_{ag}$=$3c\_{sg}+c\_{at}+c\_{sv}+p\_{ar}c\_{ar}$.

The cost of diagnosis and treatment of antimicrobial-resistant (AMR) case ($Cost\_{AMRg}$) included the cost of diagnosis and treatment of a symptomatic susceptible case ($Cost\_{sg}$) and the cost of being re-treated with the second-line drug ($c\_{at2}$).

$Cost\_{AMRg}$=$Cost\_{sg}+c\_{at2}+c\_{U}+p\_{ar}c\_{ar}$,

The second-line antibiotic for gonorrhea is ertapenem 1g. We assumed that the probability of adverse reaction to ertapenem and the cost of treatment of that reaction is the same as for the first-line antibiotics as it has a safety profile comparable to that of ceftriaxone [5]. The cost of antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST) upon patient return to a healthcare provider with suspected treatment failure was not included as currently the Maryland and Washington State Public Health Labs offer nationwide AST at no cost through the CDC's AR Lab Network [6].

The cost of treatment of a sequala (epididymitis or disseminated gonococcal infection) per case of untreated gonococcal infections was calculated as:

$$Cost\_{seq\_{i}}=p\_{i}(c\_{ni}p\_{ni}+c\_{oi}(1-p\_{ni})), $$

$i=1,2,$

where $p\_{i}$ is the probability of the sequala $i$ given untreated gonococcal infection; $p\_{ni}$ is the probability of inpatient treatment given sequala $i$; $c\_{ni}$ and $c\_{oi}$ is the cost of inpatient and outpatient treatment of sequala $i$, respectively.

**2.** **Results of sensitivity analysis**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Utilities | Incremental QALYs gained |
| Low value | High value |
| Urethritis  | 0.3 (-8.6, 11.9) | 0.35 (-7.4, 9.5) |
| Epididymitis (inpatient treatment)  | 0.2 (-5.6, 7.6) | 0.2 (-5.6, 7.6) |
| Epididymitis (outpatient treatment)  | 0.4 (-9.2, 9.1) | 0.11 (-5.4, 4.8) |
| DGI (inpatient treatment)  | 0.2 (-8.2, 7.6) | 0.19 (-8, 7.6) |
| DGI (outpatient treatment)  | 0.24 (-8.3, 7.9) | 0.18 (-7.8, 7.5) |

**Table A. Impact of uncertainty in utilities on the results for cost-effectiveness of eGISP surveillance strategy.** The results were obtained using the low and high parameter values from the corresponding uncertainty intervals in Table 1 in the main text. Abbreviation: DGI, disseminated gonococcal infection.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Durations | Incremental QALYs gained |
| Low value | High value |
| Urethritis  | 0.2 (-6.9, 8.6) | 0.2 (-6.9, 8.6) |
| Epididymitis (inpatient treatment)  | 0.17 (-7.7, 8.4) | 0.17 (-7.7, 8.4) |
| Epididymitis (outpatient treatment)  | -0.025 (-4.3, 3.3) | 0.74 (-12.8, 19.2) |
| DGI (inpatient treatment)  | 0.18 (-5.4, 7.5) | 1.4 (-5, 8.8) |
| DGI (outpatient treatment)  | 0.17 (-5.4, 7.5) | 0.22 (-5.5, 7.5) |

**Table B. Impact of uncertainty in durations on the results for cost-effectiveness of eGISP surveillance strategy.** The results were obtained using the low and high parameter values from the corresponding uncertainty intervals in Table 1 in the main text. Abbreviation: DGI, disseminated gonococcal infection.
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