

1 **Original Manuscript**

2 **Title: A Status-Neutral Approach to HIV – Is Targeted Testing Still Relevant**

3 **South of Sahara?**

4 Hamufare Mugauri<sup>1</sup>, Owen Mugurungi<sup>2</sup>, Joconiah Chirenda<sup>1</sup>, Kudakwashe

5 Takarinda<sup>3</sup>, Prosper Mangwiro<sup>4</sup>, Mufuta Tshimanga<sup>1</sup>

6

7

8 1. The University of Zimbabwe, Global, Public Health and Family Medicine

9 Department, Harare, Zimbabwe

10 2. Ministry of Health and Childcare, AIDS and TB Unit, Harare, Zimbabwe

11 3. Organisation for Public Health Interventions and Development (OPHID),

12 Harare, Zimbabwe

13 4. Independent Consultant, Zimbabwe

14

15 **\*Corresponding Author**

16 Hamufare Dumisani Mugauri [dumiwaboka@gmail.com](mailto:dumiwaboka@gmail.com)

17 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Global, Public Health and Family Medicine

18 Department, New Health Sciences Building, Parirenyatwa Complex, Mazowe Road,

19 Harare, Zimbabwe

20 Phone: Mobile: +263 772 314 894

21

22 **Author Contribution**

23 Conception and design: all authors; development of data capture tools: HDM, KT,

24 OM; data collection: HDM, KT, OM; data entry: HDM, OM; data analysis and

25 interpretation: all authors; preparing the first draft of the manuscript: all authors;

26 critical review and approval of final draft: all authors.

27

28 **Word count: Abstract 289, Main Document: 2 540**

29

30 **Abstract**

31 **Introduction:** In 2022, UNAIDS replaced the 90% Global HIV targets with six  
32 Comprehensive 95% targets that include linkage to comprehensive HIV prevention  
33 services, the thrust of the status-neutral approach to HIV testing. Zimbabwe has been  
34 implementing both targeted testing and the status-neutral concept. In this paper, we  
35 analyse the role of status-neutral concepts in targeted testing, for effective case  
36 identification and linkage to prevention and treatment services.

37  
38 **Methods:** We conducted a cross-sectional study on 36 multi-stage sampled sites  
39 across 4/10 provinces of Zimbabwe. Screened and non-screened patients were tested  
40 and analysed for positivity ratios and linkage to post-test services. Data were  
41 extracted using Epicollect5 and imported into EpiData software and Stata for cleaning  
42 and analysis. Data were summarized as proportions, odds ratios and adjusted odds  
43 ratios at 5% significance level.

44  
45 **Results:** Of 23,058 HIV tests done, females constituted 55% (n=12,698), whilst  
46 63.5% (n=14,650) were retests and positivity of 7.5% obtained. Screened patients  
47 contributed 75.1% to the overall positivity (1,296/1,727), from 66% (n=15,289) of the  
48 total tests conducted. The 45–49-year category was 3.6 times more likely to test  
49 positive (a95%CI:2.67,4.90). Males were 3.09 times more likely to test positive in  
50 adjusted analysis (a95%CI: 2.74, 3.49), from an 8% (n=912) positivity ratio. First  
51 tests were 65% more likely to test HIV positive (a95%CI: 1.43, 1.91) whilst screened  
52 patients were 3.89 times more likely to link to HIV prevention services (a95%CI:  
53 3.05, 4.97), against 25.5% (n=1,871) linkage among patients not screened

54  
55 **Conclusion:** Targeted and status-neutral testing are related and complimentary  
56 concepts which, when simultaneously applied, potentiates case identification through  
57 prioritizing high-risk individuals for testing, as well as arresting ongoing transmission  
58 of HIV through effective linkage to HIV prevention and treatment. This approach  
59 facilitates economic usage of limited resources, in generalized epidemics.

60  
61 **Keywords:** Targeted testing, Status neutral testing, HIV testing services, HIV Risk  
62 assessment, HIV Screening algorithms

63  
64  
65

66

## 67 **Introduction**

68 Status-neutral HIV testing is a novel approach to HIV education, testing and  
69 treatment that accentuates a continuum of care regardless of the individual's HIV  
70 diagnosis [1]. The concept infers that all people, regardless of their HIV status, are  
71 treated in the same way from the start of the HIV testing process and linked to  
72 appropriate services based on their test results. Further, it envisages improved health  
73 outcomes, the prevention of new infections and the establishment of a world where  
74 HIV is untransmissible through prevention and treatment options availed to everyone  
75 [2].

76 The concept also focuses on activities that meet the needs of populations at  
77 risk or living with HIV, rather than dividing services into prevention or care. Status-  
78 neutral approach to HIV prevention and care defines the entry point to care as the  
79 time of an HIV test [3]. At this point, clients' needs are assessed, and they are  
80 engaged and linked to appropriate services based on these needs, regardless of  
81 whether their HIV test is positive or negative [4].

82 First introduced by the New York City Department of Health and Mental  
83 Hygiene in 2016, this new paradigm is a comprehensive system of prevention that  
84 includes all people affected by HIV, regardless of their HIV status [5–7]. It further  
85 highlights elaborate steps that can lead to an undetectable viral load and steps for  
86 effective combination HIV prevention. The concept is also premised on the assertion  
87 that most countries have achieved the 95% targets and therefore should be focused on  
88 consolidating these achievements by giving equal attention to negative testers, who  
89 were largely neglected in the quest of chasing positivity ratio targets [8].

90 The concept is rapidly being embraced globally with the World Health  
91 Organization (WHO) and Centers for Disease Control promoting it through various

92 for [9]. Many countries have since adopted the concept of variability influenced by  
93 context and needs.

94 Zimbabwe, located in sub-Saharan Africa, is one of the countries severely  
95 affected by the HIV pandemic, where HIV remains firmly established as a generalized  
96 epidemic with a prevalence of 11,01% and incidence of 17% translating to  
97 approximately 23,000 new infections every year [10, 11]. **(Figure 1)**

98 To address her predicament, Zimbabwe has been implementing a Targeted  
99 testing model that prioritizes high-risk individuals through a screening algorithm,  
100 adopting differentiated testing models that include strengthening Index testing- a  
101 proven high-yield HIV testing model [12].

102 Whilst, remarkably, the country has achieved the 95% targets, according to  
103 UNAIDS HIV estimates, the country still bears a generalized epidemic contributed by  
104 population and geographically varied sub-epidemics requiring innovations for case  
105 finding and effective HIV prevention packages [13].

106 This context demands that Zimbabwe, like her Southern African counterparts,  
107 needs interventions designed to arrest ongoing transmission of HIV, identify the  
108 remaining cases, and put them on effective life-long treatment to bring the pandemic  
109 to an end. This paper therefore interrogates the relevance of Status neutrality in the  
110 context of a generalized epidemic, high new infections and established ongoing  
111 transmission of HIV to recommend the context-specific application of the novel  
112 status-neutral concept.

113

## 114 **Materials and Methods**

### 115 *Study Design:*

116 We conducted a cross-sectional study, with an analytical component.

117 *Setting:*

118 General setting: Zimbabwe is a landlocked, low-income country in Southern  
119 Africa located between Botswana, South Africa, Mozambique, and Zambia with an  
120 estimated population of 16,3 million and a human development index of 0.593,  
121 ranked number 174 globally out of 189 countries in 2022[14, 15]. The country is  
122 divided into two urban provinces, eight rural provinces and 62 districts.

123 Zimbabwe National HIV Programme: The AIDS and TB Programme (ATP)  
124 is mandated to coordinate the development of HIV/AIDS health policies and set up  
125 national standards and guidelines as part of the national response to HIV in  
126 Zimbabwe. Four sub-units under ATP, namely, HIV Prevention, Care and Treatment,  
127 Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT) and Monitoring and  
128 Evaluation (M & E). These sub-units are delegated to ensure seamless yet specialised  
129 programming to ensure adequate response to the pandemic [16].

130 The HIV Prevention program oversees the activities of HIV Testing Services  
131 (HTS) activities with the ATP. Since 2016, the HTS programme has been pursuing  
132 targeted testing as an approach to reduce testing volumes, increase efficiency in HIV  
133 testing and enhance the identification of people living with HIV, to enrol them on life-  
134 long Antiretroviral Therapy (ART). Eligibility for HIV testing is done using a  
135 validated Screening algorithm [17]. In this algorithm, high-risk individuals are offered  
136 provider-delivered testing whilst those screened out are offered HIVST kits for self-  
137 screen. Following a negative test result, the patient is further screened for eligibility  
138 for combination prevention which includes PrEP.

139 Specific Study Site: The study sites were four provinces, selected out of 10  
140 provinces in Zimbabwe. Manicaland is a province in eastern Zimbabwe. After Harare  
141 Province, it is the country's second-most populous province, with a population of 1.75

142 million, as of the 2012 census [18]. Mashonaland West Province Mashonaland West  
143 is located to the North of Zimbabwe and shares the international border with Zambia  
144 in the North. Internally, the borders of the province are with Midlands Province in the  
145 West, Matabeleland North in the West, Mashonaland Central in the East, Harare, and  
146 Mashonaland East in the Southeast [19].

147 Matabeleland South Province covers the south-eastern plateau of Zimbabwe,  
148 and it stretches to the Botswana border on the east and borders South Africa on the  
149 South [20]. Midlands province has an area of 49,166 square kilometres and a  
150 population of 1,614,94 [21].

151 *Client population:*

152 All clients who were tested for HIV and documented in HIV Testing registers,  
153 at the 36 sampled facilities between 1 October 2023 to 31 December 2023 were  
154 included in the study.

155 *Sampling:*

156 Multi-stage sampling was done to randomly select 4 out of 10 Zimbabwe  
157 provinces using the lottery method. Further, 3 districts per province were randomly  
158 selected resulting in 12 districts. All health facilities of the 12 districts were included  
159 in the study resulting in a total of 36 health facilities being included. The sampling  
160 criteria aimed to achieve a balanced representation of health facilities, resulting in a  
161 mix of high and low volume, as well as urban and rural sites. **(Table 1)**

162 *Data variables, sources of data and data collection:*

163 Data were extracted from District Health Information System version 2  
164 (DHIS2) as an excel report. The data was accessed on the 26<sup>th</sup> of February 2024 for  
165 research purposes. The data was exported to EpiData Analysis version 2.2.2.186  
166 (EpiData Association, Odense, Denmark) and Stata v14 (Stata Corporation College

167 Station, Texas, USA) for further cleaning and analysis. The following variables were  
168 collected: HTS number, name of the facility, name of the patient, age, sex, screening  
169 for an HIV test, reason for an HIV test, HIV test result, linkage to post-test services  
170 (yes/no), and specific services linked to. No patient level data was collected.

171 *Analysis and statistics:*

172       Socio-demographic characteristics of participants were summarized using  
173 percentage for categorical data and mean (standard deviation) or median (interquartile  
174 range) for continuous data depending on whether they are normally distributed or not.  
175 The number and proportion with a 95% confidence interval were used to summarize  
176 all clients tested for HIV during the study period, the outcomes of the test and linkage  
177 to post-test services as documented in the respective registers.

178       To assess the association between risk profile, the reason for an HIV test, the  
179 result and linkage to post-test services for both negative and positive testers, an  
180 unadjusted and adjusted generalized linear model (log-binomial regression) was used.  
181 Those variables with a p-value <0.25 in the unadjusted analysis were included in  
182 adjusted models. The unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios at 5% significance levels  
183 (95%CI) were expressed as a measure of association.

184 *Ethics approval:*

185       Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Ministry of Health and  
186 Childcare head office. The study was based on data collected into the DHIS2  
187 electronic database which does not include patient identifying data. The study was  
188 therefore exempted from ethical clearances. No primary data was collected.

189

190 **Results**

191 **Demographic characteristics**

192 Of 23,058 patients tested for HIV, females constituted 55% (n=12,698) and  
193 54.7% (n=12,615) patients belonged to the age group 25-49 years. In most patients,  
194 66.3% (n=15,289) were documented to have been screened for eligibility before  
195 testing, while 33.7% were not. Among the patients tested for HIV, 63.5% (n=14,650)  
196 were retested while 1,727 tested positive, translating to a positivity ratio of 7.5%.  
197 Across the districts, Gweru recorded the highest, 15.5% (n=3,575) number of tests  
198 done whilst Mangwe recorded the least, 4.5% (n=1040) number of tests done (**Table**  
199 **2**).

## 200 **Screening, Testing Outcomes and Post-test Linkages**

201 From a total of 23,058 patients who attended the sampled healthcare facilities,  
202 66.3% (N=15,289) were screened for eligibility for testing. The positivity ratio among  
203 these was 8.5% (N=1,296) and almost all of them were enrolled into care (N=1,294,  
204 99.8%). The positivity obtained among the screened patients was 75.1% of the overall  
205 positivity obtained in this study (1,296/1,727). Among the 7,769 (33.7%) clients who  
206 were not screened before testing, 431 (5.5%) tested positive and this was 24.9% of the  
207 overall positivity obtained in this study (431/1,727). Of the 7,338 (94.5%) patients  
208 who tested negative, 1,871 (25.5%) were linked to HIV prevention services (**Figure**  
209 **2**).

## 210 **HIV Positivity and Linkage**

211 The overall positivity ratio obtained in this study was 7.5% (1,727/23,058).  
212 The 45–49-year category was 3.6 times more likely to test positive  
213 (a95%CI:2.67,4.90). Males were 3.09 times more likely to test HIV positive in  
214 adjusted analysis (a95%CI: 2.74, 3.49), from an 8% (n=912) positivity ratio. The first  
215 tests were 65% more likely to test HIV positive (a95%CI: 1.43, 1.91) whilst patients



216 who were screened before testing were 3.89 times more likely to link to at least 1 HIV  
217 prevention service (a95%CI: 3.05, 4.97). **(Table 3.)**

218

## 219 **Discussion**

220 A key finding in this study is that the status-neutral approach to HIV testing  
221 complements targeted HIV testing, enabling prioritized testing and linkage to HIV  
222 prevention and treatment services.

### 223 *Strengths:*

224 The availability of primary source documents, such as HTS registers at all  
225 visited facilities facilitated the data abstraction process. In addition, the sampled 36  
226 health facilities provided a large sample size that enabled us to draw inferences on the  
227 population of the country.

### 228 *Limitations:*

229 Discrepancies between data abstracted from HTS registers, monthly  
230 summaries and DHIS2 during data triangulation exposed data entry or computation  
231 errors that could be rectified by onsite data analysis, and cascade generation.

### 232 *Interpretation of key findings:*

233 This study provided important insights into the role of status-neutral testing in  
234 targeted testing in Zimbabwe.

235 First, patients who were screened for their risk for HIV infection before testing  
236 scored a high positivity ratio of 8.5% compared with those who were not screened  
237 (5.5%). The risk screening was done using a standardized screening algorithm which  
238 is part of standard service delivery by the country, in determining eligibility for an  
239 HIV test [17].

240 Further, the screened patients contributed as high as 75% of the overall  
241 positivity obtained, when the calculation combined with those not screened. This  
242 indicates the relevance of targeted testing in Zimbabwe, in the context of a  
243 generalized epidemic being managed against a backdrop of declining funding for  
244 HIV, characterized by sporadic stockouts of testing commodities for HIV testing. This  
245 finding is consistent with previous studies that underscore the importance of an  
246 algorithm to determine risk and prioritize clients for HIV testing, whilst offering self-  
247 screen to those at low risk [17, 22–24] To remain on course of achieving and  
248 sustaining the targets for case identification, it is therefore imperative to effectively  
249 implement an algorithm that aids health workers in prioritizing patients who are most  
250 likely to test HIV positive

251 Secondly, 98.7% (n=13,811) of the clients who tested HIV negative following  
252 risk screening were linked to HIV prevention services. In multivariate analysis, the  
253 probability of linkage among HIV-negative screened clients was 3.89 (a95%CI:3.05,  
254 4.97). This finding indicates that screening clients for testing assists in focussed HIV  
255 prevention linkage among the clients who test negative. Our findings are consistent  
256 with the tenets of the status-neutral concept of equal emphasis on linkage to  
257 prevention and treatment [6, 7, 25, 26] but vary with the placing of risk assessment  
258 where other studies place it after the test, rather than before the test. Placing the risk  
259 screening stage after the test results in an increased number of clients in the post-test  
260 stage with an unknown risk profile requiring risk screening. The increased numbers,  
261 particularly in our context of high numbers and high-frequency testing may affect the  
262 vigilance with which the screening process is done [27, 28].

263 In this study, we found the utility of risk screening being done before  
264 conducting the test for the status-neutral concept to effectively complement the

265 targeted testing framework which reduces the high frequency of testing which does  
266 not correspond with the risk profile. Implementing the status-neutral concept without  
267 embedding it into targeted testing departs from the standardized retesting algorithm  
268 which restricts the highest frequency of HIV testing to once every three months, for  
269 people at ongoing risk for HIV infection [7, 29].

270 Third, 63.5% of the clients who tested for HIV were retests (n=14,650), and  
271 yet first tests were 65% more likely to test HIV positive (a95%CI: 1.43, 1.91),  
272 adjusted for age and sex. Most tests being retested may be suggestive of “over-  
273 testing” or high-risk perception, particularly given the low positivity ratios obtained  
274 [4]. Clients who test HIV negative at contact are retested annually if they fall into the  
275 general population category and retested 3 monthly if they are at ongoing risk for HIV  
276 transmissions, such as sero-different couples and those on PrEP, according to the  
277 national retesting algorithm [30].

278 Finally, men were 3.09 times more likely to test HIV positive (a95%CI:2.74,  
279 3.49) in adjusted analysis despite contributing 44.9% (10,360/23,058) of the tested  
280 population. This finding implies that fewer men test, from which most test positive.  
281 This finding corroborates previous studies and information in the public domain [31,  
282 32]. Further, men are also less likely to adhere to treatment and more likely to have  
283 unfavourable treatment outcomes, with attributable factors that include gender norms  
284 [30, 33].

285 *Implications for policy and practice:*

286 Targeted testing is the mainstay of HTS programming to achieve epidemic  
287 control. Complemented with status neutral approach to HIV testing will bring out a  
288 double-edged sword, one that prioritizes testing and linkage to both prevention and

289 treatment. The concept needs to be vigilantly implemented to expedite epidemic  
290 control, whilst preventing new infections through linkage to prevention as well.

## 291 **Conclusions**

292 Targeted testing and status-neutral testing are related concepts which are  
293 complimentary. Simultaneously applied, the concepts facilitate active identification of  
294 people living with HIV to meet case identification targets, through prioritizing high-  
295 risk individuals for testing, followed by arresting ongoing transmission of HIV  
296 through effective linkage to HIV prevention and treatment. This approach will  
297 facilitate the best usage of limited resources, particularly in low to medium countries.

298

## 299 **Acknowledgements**

300 I acknowledge several individuals and institutions that made this study a success.  
301 Special gratitude goes to my academic supervisors, Professor M. Tshimanga, Dr J.  
302 Chirenda and Dr K. Takarinda, The Director of AIDS & TB Unit, Dr O. Mugurungi  
303 and the entire HTS team for their support and prodding during this study.

304

305

306

307

308

309

## 310 **References**

- 311 [1] Issue Brief: Status Neutral HIV Care and Service Delivery | Policy and Law |  
312 HIV/AIDS | CDC, [https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/policies/data/status-neutral-issue-](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/policies/data/status-neutral-issue-brief.html)  
313 [brief.html](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/policies/data/status-neutral-issue-brief.html) (accessed 21 August 2023).  
314 [2] Demetre Daskalaki. A Status Neutral Approach: Achieving Together to end  
315 HIV Epidemic. *New York City Department of Health*.

- 316 [3] New York City Health. *The New York City HIV Status Neutral Prevention and*  
317 *Treatment Cycle*. New York City, [https://www.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-](https://www.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/hiv-status-neutral-prevention-and-treatment-cycle.page)  
318 [topics/hiv-status-neutral-prevention-and-treatment-cycle.page](https://www.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/hiv-status-neutral-prevention-and-treatment-cycle.page) (2022, accessed  
319 4 October 2023).
- 320 [4] Phiri DL, Rees K, Davies N. Outcomes of a model for re-testing HIV-negative  
321 index contacts in Sedibeng, South Africa. *South Afr J HIV Med* 2023; 24: 1482.
- 322 [5] Mancuso N, Mansergh G, Stephenson R, et al. Factors associated with mobile  
323 app-based ordering of HIV self-test kits among men who have sex with men in  
324 Atlanta, Detroit and New York City: an exploratory secondary analysis of a  
325 randomized control trial. *J Int AIDS Soc*; 26. Epub ahead of print 1 May 2023.  
326 DOI: 10.1002/jia2.26100.
- 327 [6] Redefining Prevention and Care: A Status-Neutral Approach to HIV - PubMed,  
328 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29977957/> (accessed 22 August 2023).
- 329 [7] Michael Canty, Dorian Freeman, Yazmin Silvia, et al. *Employing Status-*  
330 *Neutral Approaches to End the HIV Epidemic*. 2022.
- 331 [8] CDC. Status Neutral HIV Prevention and Care | Prevent | Effective  
332 Interventions | HIV/AIDS | CDC, [https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/effective-](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/effective-interventions/prevent/status-neutral-hiv-prevention-and-care/index.html)  
333 [interventions/prevent/status-neutral-hiv-prevention-and-care/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/effective-interventions/prevent/status-neutral-hiv-prevention-and-care/index.html)  
334 (accessed 21 August 2023).
- 335 [9] HIV/AIDS | WHO | Regional Office for Africa,  
336 <https://www.afro.who.int/health-topics/hivaids> (accessed 4 October 2023).
- 337 [10] Zimbabwe | UNAIDS,  
338 <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/zimbabwe> (accessed 4  
339 October 2023).
- 340 [11] UNAIDS 2022. Global HIV Statistics,  
341 <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet> (2022, accessed 14 July 2023).
- 342 [12] Ministry of Health and Child care. *Zimbabwe Operational and Service*  
343 *Delivery Manual (OSDM), 2022*. Harare, 2022.
- 344 [13] Mendoza C. UNAIDS Update Global HIV Numbers. *AIDS Rev* 2019; 21: 170–  
345 171.
- 346 [14] Zimbabwe - Human Development Index - HDI 2021 | countryeconomy.com,  
347 <https://countryeconomy.com/hdi/zimbabwe> (accessed 12 February 2024).
- 348 [15] Population, total - Zimbabwe | Data,  
349 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=ZW> (accessed  
350 12 February 2024).
- 351 [16] Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care. *Ministry of Health and Child*  
352 *Welfare, National Tuberculosis Program –Strategic Plan (2017-2020)*. Harare,  
353 Zimbabwe, 2018.
- 354 [17] Mugauri HD, Chirenda J, Takarinda K, et al. Optimising the adult HIV testing  
355 services screening tool to predict positivity yield in Zimbabwe, *PLOS Global*  
356 *Public Health*. 2022; 1–17.
- 357 [18] UNDP and Government of Zimbabwe. *Zimbabwe Human Development Report*  
358 *2017. Climate Change and Human Development: Towards Building a Climate*  
359 *Resilient Nation*. Harare, Zimbabwe, 2017.
- 360 [19] World Population Review. Zimbabwe Population 2018,  
361 <http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/zimbabwe-population/> (2018,  
362 accessed 17 April 2018).
- 363 [20] Zimstat. Zimbabwe Population Census 2012. *Population Census Office* 2012;  
364 1–151.

- 365 [21] Zimbabwe Country Profile | UN in Zimbabwe,  
366 <http://www.zw.one.un.org/uninzimbabwe/zimbabwe-country-profile> (accessed  
367 21 May 2019).
- 368 [22] Mugauri HD, Karakadzai M, Mugurungi O, et al. Exploring HIV Testing  
369 Models for Differentiated Service Delivery in Southern Africa: A Systematic  
370 Review. *Evidence Based Health Policy, Management and Economics*. Epub  
371 ahead of print 5 December 2023. DOI: 10.18502/JEBHPME.V7I3.14287.
- 372 [23] Howard J. HIV Screening Scientific, Ethical, and Legal Issues. *Journal of*  
373 *Legal Medicine* 1988; 9: 601–610.
- 374 [24] Moyer VA. Screening for HIV: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force  
375 recommendation statement. *Ann Intern Med* 2013; 159: 51–60.
- 376 [25] Know Your HIV Status: What it Means to be Status Neutral - PrEP Daily,  
377 [https://prepdaily.org/know-your-hiv-status-what-does-it-mean-to-be-status-](https://prepdaily.org/know-your-hiv-status-what-does-it-mean-to-be-status-neutral/)  
378 [neutral/](https://prepdaily.org/know-your-hiv-status-what-does-it-mean-to-be-status-neutral/) (accessed 21 August 2023).
- 379 [26] Myers JE, Braunstein SL, Xia Q, et al. Redefining Prevention and Care: A  
380 Status-Neutral Approach to HIV. *Open Forum Infect Dis*; 5. Epub ahead of  
381 print 1 June 2018. DOI: 10.1093/OFID/OFY097.
- 382 [27] Moucheraud C, Chasweka D, Nyirenda M, et al. Simple Screening Tool to  
383 Help Identify High-Risk Children for Targeted HIV Testing in Malawian  
384 Inpatient Wards. *JAIDS-JOURNAL OF ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY*  
385 *SYNDROMES* 2018; 79: 352–357.
- 386 [28] Farnham PG, Gorsky RD, Holtgrave DR, et al. Counseling and testing for HIV  
387 prevention: Costs, effects, and cost-effectiveness of more rapid screening tests.  
388 *Public Health Reports* 1996; 111: 44–53.
- 389 [29] ACHA Education Center: The Status-Neutral HIV Testing Continuum,  
390 <https://education.acha.org/products/the-status-neutral-hiv-testing-continuum-2>  
391 (accessed 21 August 2023).
- 392 [30] Why does HIV kill more men than women? - Bhekisisa,  
393 [https://bhekisisa.org/article/2017-08-08-why-does-hiv-kill-more-men-than-](https://bhekisisa.org/article/2017-08-08-why-does-hiv-kill-more-men-than-women/)  
394 [women/](https://bhekisisa.org/article/2017-08-08-why-does-hiv-kill-more-men-than-women/) (accessed 9 April 2024).
- 395 [31] Lopez-Varela E, Augusto O, Fuente-Soro L, et al. Quantifying the gender gap  
396 in the HIV care cascade in southern Mozambique: We are missing the men.  
397 *PLoS One* 2021; 16: e0245461.
- 398 [32] Hensen B, Taoka S, Lewis JJ, et al. Systematic review of strategies to increase  
399 men’s HIV-testing in sub-Saharan Africa. *AIDS* 2014; 28: 2133–2145.
- 400 [33] Gus Cairns. South Africa: women may have higher rates of HIV than men  
401 because fewer men are on treatment. *AIDSMap*,  
402 [https://www.aidsmap.com/news/mar-2018/south-africa-women-may-have-](https://www.aidsmap.com/news/mar-2018/south-africa-women-may-have-higher-rates-hiv-men-because-fewer-men-are-treatment)  
403 [higher-rates-hiv-men-because-fewer-men-are-treatment](https://www.aidsmap.com/news/mar-2018/south-africa-women-may-have-higher-rates-hiv-men-because-fewer-men-are-treatment) (2020, accessed 9  
404 April 2024).  
405

## 406 **Figure legends**

407 **Figure 1: HIV Prevalence and Incidence Rates in Zimbabwe, 2018-2022 (Source:**  
408 **UNAIDS HIV Estimates)**

409 **Figure 2. HIV Testing and Post-test Linkages, Zimbabwe, 2024**

410

411 **Tables**

412 **Table 1. Study sites, Zimbabwe, 2024**

<b>Manicaland Province</b>	<b>Mash West Province</b>	<b>Matabeleland South Province</b>	<b>Midlands Province</b>
<b>Mutare District</b>	<b>Chegutu District</b>	<b>Gwanda District</b>	<b>Gweru District</b> Gweru
Mutare Provincial Hospital	Katanga Utano Clinic	Gwanda Provincial Hospital	Provincial Hospital
Zimunya Clinic	Pfupajena Municipal Clinic	Phakama Clinic	Chikwingwizha Mission Hospital
Mt Zuma Clinic	Clinic Selous Clinic	Manama Mission Hospital	Lower Gweru Clinic
<b>Chipinge District</b>	<b>Makonde District</b>	<b>Mangwe District</b>	<b>Kwekwe District</b>
Chikore Mission Hospital	Chinhoyi Provincial Hospital	Plumtree District Hospital	Kwekwe General Hospital
Chipinge Town Clinic	Chikonohono Municipal Clinic	Tshitshi Clinic	Amaveni Clinic
Tanganda Rural Health Centre	Alaska Municipal Clinic	Dingumuzi Clinic	Nyoni Rural Health Centre
<b>Makoni District</b>	<b>Sanyati District</b>	<b>Umzingwane District</b>	<b>Zvishavane District</b>
Rusape District Hospital	Kadoma General Hospital	Nhlangano Clinic	Mandava Health Centre
Katsenga Rural Health Centre	Ordoff Clinic	Nswazi Clinic	Mabasa Clinic
	Waverly Municipal Clinic	How Mine Clinic	Mtambi Clinic
		Kumbudzi RHC	

413

414

415

416

417

418



419 **Table 2. Clinical and demographic profile of patients, Zimbabwe, 2024.**

420 **(N=23,058)**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>(%)*</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>23,058</b>	<b>(100)</b>
Age in years		
○ 15-24	3,524	(15.3)
○ 22-29	3,588	(15.6)
○ 30-34	5,223	(22.7)
○ 35-39	3,679	(16.0)
○ 40-44	4,315	(18.7)
○ 45-49	2,398	(10.4)
○ >= 50	331	(1.4)
Gender		
○ Male	10,360	(44.9)
○ Female	12,698	(55.1)
Risk Screened before testing		
○ Yes	15,289	(66.3)
○ No	7,769	(33.7)
Type of HIV Test		
○ First Test	7,906	(34.3)
○ Retest	14,650	(63.5)
○ Not Documented	502	(2.2)
HIV Test Result		
○ Negative	21,331	(92.5)
○ Positive	1,727	(7.5)
Testing District		
○ Mangwe	1040	(4.5)
○ Sanyati	1232	(5.3)
○ Gwanda	1239	(5.4)
○ Chipinge	1350	(5.9)
○ Mutare	1254	(5.4)
○ Gweru	3575	(15.5)
○ Kwekwe	2443	(10.6)
○ Chegutu	3279	(14.2)
○ Makonde	2997	(13.0)
○ Umzingwane	1144	(5.0)
○ Makoni	2424	(10.5)
○ Zvishavane	1081	(4.7)

421 \*Column percentage

422

423

424

425

426

427 **Table 3. Factors associated with HIV Positivity among patients who tested for**  
 428 **HIV, Zimbabwe, 2024. (N=23,058)**

Variable	Total	HIV Positive <sup>#</sup>		OR (95 CI)	aOR (95 CI) <sup>#</sup>
	N	N	(%)**		
<b>Total</b>	23,058	1,727	(7.5)	-	-
Age in years					
○ 15-24	3,524	440	(12.5)	7.43 (5.68, 9.73)	7.42 (5.65, 9.86) <sup>^</sup>
○ 25-29	3,588	72	(2.0)	Ref	Ref
○ 30-34	5,223	92	(1.8)	1.69 (1.22, 2.33)	1.68 (1.22, 2.34) <sup>^</sup>
○ 35-39	3,679	334	(9.1)	10.32 (7.90, 13.49)	10.31 (7.92, 13.54) <sup>^</sup>
○ 40-44	4,315	342	(7.9)	12.26 (9.21, 16.31)	12.23 (9.22, 16.36) <sup>^</sup>
○ 45-49	2,398	410	(17.1)	23.61 (2.67, 4.89)	3.61 (2.67, 4.90) <sup>^</sup>
○ ≥/ 50	331	29	(8.8)	5.07 (3.62, 7.11)	5.06 (3.62, 7.12) <sup>^</sup>
Gender					
○ Male	10,360	912	(8.8)	3.10 (2.74, 3.49)	3.09 (2.74, 3.49) <sup>^</sup>
○ Female	12,698	815	(6.4)	Ref	Ref
Type of HIV Test					
○ Retest	7,906	404	(5.1)	Ref	Ref
○ First Test	14,650	1,301	(8.9)	1.66 (1.44, 1.91)	1.65 (1.43, 1.91) <sup>^</sup>
○ Unspecified	502	22	(4.4)	1.38 (0.91, 2.09)	
Linkage to Prevention*					
○ Screened	15,289	-	(66.3) *	3.90 (3.05, 4.97)	3.89 (3.05, 4.97) <sup>^</sup>
○ Not Screened	7,769	-	(33.7)	Ref	Ref

429 OR – Odds Ratio; aOR – adjusted Odds Ratio; CI – confidence interval

430 <sup>#</sup> Positivity excludes missing variables

431 \*\*Row percentages; <sup>#</sup>Modified Poisson regression for aOR; <sup>^</sup>p<0.05, \*\*\* Fisher’s

432 Exact

433 \*Denominator is all tests done (N=23,058), <sup>##</sup> Denominator is all Negative tests

434 (N=21,331)

435

436

437

438




Fig 1. HIV Prevalence and Incidence Rates in Zimbabwe




Fig 1. HIV Prevalence and Incidence Rates in Zimbabwe