



Fig. S1. Algorithm of partners ($n=2,390$) those eligible; those included ($n=1,693$); those primarily not included due to exclusion criteria ($n=697$); those partners secondarily excluded in the study for various specific reasons ($n=1,033$); and those included ($n=660$). ^aNot included because of exclusion criteria, such as living abroad ($n=86$); living in another county ($n=419$); being a man who has sex with men ($n=13$); randomization not properly performed or documented ($n=126$); index patients attending after inclusion of new sexual networks and not recognized as belonging to a prior network existing within the study, i.e. after primary index patients randomization had terminated ($n=50$); and 1 index patient did not want to participate in the study ($n=3$ partners). ^bPartners could not be identified, and thus could not be traced ($n=142$); although elicited partners were not traced because the counsellor deemed it implausible that the partner could be infected ($n=12$) or because the partner had died ($n=1$); partners not revealed by the index patient, but tested and *Chlamydia trachomatis*-positive and thus new index patients ($n=39$). ^cPartner performed the test, but the date of examination could not be determined ($n=39$). ^dPartners had already been tested at the time the index patient's eliciting of partners to the contact tracer had commenced ($n=711$). ^ePartners, when traced, claimed not to be at any risk of having contracted *C. trachomatis* ($n=4$); or the self-sampling kit was returned to sender or not delivered properly ($n=7$).