

Sexually Transmitted Infections

Scoping review of online postal sexually transmitted infection services: access, usage and clinical outcomes

Authors and affiliations

Kirsi Sumray¹

Karen C. Lloyd²

Claudia Estcourt³

Fiona Burns²

Jo Gibbs²

1 Institute of Epidemiology and Health Care, University College London, UK

2 Institute for Global Health, University College London, UK

3 School of Health and Life Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK

Correspondence to:

Dr. Karen C. Lloyd, Mortimer Market Centre, Off Capper St, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 6JB; K.lloyd@ucl.ac.uk

Word count (excluding title page, abstract, tables, contributions and references): 3417/3500

ABSTRACT

Background: There has been considerable expansion in online postal self-sampling STI services in many parts of the UK, driven by increasing demand on sexual health services and developments in diagnostics and digital health provision. This shift in service delivery has occurred against a backdrop of reduced funding and service fragmentation and the impact is unknown. We explored characteristics of people accessing and using online postal self-sampling (OPSS) services for STIs in the UK, the acceptability of these services, and their impact on sexual health inequalities.

Methods: A scoping review was conducted of studies published in English-language based on pre-agreed inclusion/exclusion criteria, between 01/01/2010 to 07/07/2021. Nine databases were searched, and 23 studies that met the eligibility criteria were included. Studies were appraised using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.

Results: Study designs were heterogenous, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed method analyses. The majority were either evaluating a single site/self-sampling provider, exploratory or observational and of variable quality. Few studies collected comprehensive user demographic data. Individuals accessing OPSS tended to be asymptomatic, of White ethnicity, women, over 20 years, and from less deprived areas. OPSS tended to increase overall STI testing demand and access, although return rates for blood samples was low, as was test positivity. There were varied results on whether services reduced time to treatment. OPSS services were acceptable to the majority of users. Qualitative studies showed the importance of trust, confidentiality, discretion, reliability, convenience and improved patient choice.

Conclusion: OPSS services appear highly acceptable to users. However, uptake appears to be socially patterned and some groups that bear a disproportionate burden of poor sexual health in the UK are under-represented among users. Current provision of online self-sampling could widen health inequalities, particularly where other options for testing are limited. Work is needed to fully evaluate the impact and cost-effectiveness of OPSS services.

Keywords: Sexual health; digital health; service delivery; STI testing

Key messages:

1. An increasing proportion of STI testing in the UK is occurring via online postal self-sampling services
2. Service users tend to be asymptomatic, white, women, over 20s, and from less deprived areas
3. OPSS services are acceptable to users and can improve choice
4. There is a need for a wide-ranging evaluation of OPSS services to determine their impact on sexual health inequalities, access, clinical outcomes and service delivery

INTRODUCTION

“Home testing” whereby an individual tests for sexually transmitted infections (STIs) and/or blood borne viruses (BBV) remote from traditional healthcare settings, encompasses user self-sampling (the laboratory processes and tests the samples) or self-testing (the user tests their own samples) (1). The most widely used option in the UK is online postal self-sampling (OPSS) in which users order specimen collection kits via the internet. Kits are delivered by post or may be collected from a sexual health clinic. Users obtain their own samples (typically urine, vulvo-vaginal, ano-rectal and pharyngeal swabs), and repackage before posting back to a laboratory for testing. Test results are made available by text message or online. OPSS is increasingly provided in high income countries (2–4). England’s earliest online chlamydia testing services began in 2006 (5), but the other devolved nations of the United Kingdom (UK) introduced OPSS rather later (6–8). The British Association for Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH) recommends online testing and care provision as an adjunct to in-person services to increase choice for service users (9).

The UK had seen a sustained rise in several STIs until the start of the COVID-19 pandemic (10), and demand for sexual health service (SHS) consultations has increased. Between 2015 and 2019 in England there was a 23% increase (3,143,144-3,852,121). Total sexual health screens for chlamydia, gonorrhoea, syphilis and HIV increased by 31% (1,657,425 to 2,175,525) in this period. Internet based services have assumed an increasing proportion of consultations and screening activity. In 2018-19, while overall consultations and tests in England rose by 7% and 10% respectively, consultations and STI screens provided by internet-based services surged by 94% and 69% (11). This trend of an increasing proportion of testing and consultations being accessed and provided online has accelerated as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic (10). Young people, people from ethnic minority groups, men who have sex with men (MSM), people who are gender diverse, and those living in more deprived areas have borne a disproportionate burden of STIs and poorer sexual health for many years (12–17). The reasons for this disparity are not sufficiently understood (18).

Some evidence suggests that OPSS might improve access to STI services for those who feel uncomfortable or struggle to attend face-to-face services (19), and might cost less than in-person care (20,21). However, relatively little is known about the characteristics of people who use OPSS and the existing literature is heterogeneous and has not previously been comprehensively reviewed. With a drive towards further online sexual health provision in the UK (22), the pre-existing unequal burden of sexual ill health in the population, and well described inequalities in access to sexual health care, it is important to understand the impact of this shift in service delivery. We aimed to evaluate the current evidence on access to and usage of OPSS services. We have restricted our scope to the UK because online care has been relatively mainstreamed in at least one country (England) for many years and sexual health care is provided free at the point of access without the need for specialist referral. Our specific objectives were to: 1. describe characteristics of people accessing and using STI self-sampling services in the UK; 2. assess whether OPSS increases demand for testing; 3. assess the impact of OPSS on clinical outcomes; 4. assess levels of acceptability of OPSS services in the UK.

METHODS

We conducted a systematic scoping review in order to map and synthesise the current research evidence, in an area where the existing literature is heterogeneous and has not previously been comprehensively reviewed (23). We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-SCR) guidelines (24). A review protocol

has not been registered. The PICO framework was used to identify the research question and objectives:

Population: People residing in the UK who are engaging in sexual activity and accessing online sexual health services.

Intervention: Self-sampling STI testing kits which are posted to individuals' homes by online sexual health services.

Comparators: The alternatives to this intervention are for individuals to visit sexual health clinics, General Practice, or community outreach services to be tested by healthcare professionals, self-sample in a clinical setting, or collect kits to bring home. This review will compare OPSS with these comparators where included studies have done so.

Outcome: Accessibility and usage of OPSS services with a focus on inequalities in access and acceptability of services.

Study selection criteria

Studies were included if they described the use of home self-sampling kits provided by online sexual health services in the United Kingdom, published between 1.1.2010-30.06.2021 in the English language. All non-theoretical study types with full-text online access were included. Studies were excluded if they described services outside of the UK, published prior to 2006 or not in English, and not focusing on home self-sampling kits provided by online sexual health services (for example, STI education, contraception or self-testing kits). We also excluded "siloes" (HIV only) HIV self-sampling services because the national HIV self-sampling service targets specific key populations such as MSM and black African groups (22) rather than the general population, and one of our key objectives was to evaluate access to, including potential inequalities with, the use of OPSS services. Protocols of studies and research displayed via conference or other forms of presentation were excluded if there was no full-text access.

Study selection

De-duplication and title screening was conducted by the first author; 20% of the abstract screening and 100% of the full-text screening were verified by a second reviewer (KCL and JG, respectively) independently to reduce selection bias (25). The inter-reliability rate of the two reviewers was over 90% at the abstract-screening stage and was 100% for full-text screening.

Search method

A systematic search and data extraction was conducted on 22nd June 2020 to fulfil requirements of KS' Masters dissertation and was rerun on 7th July 2021 by JG in nine databases: Medline, EMBASE, PsycInfo, The Health Management Information Consortium (HMIC), Web of Science, CINHAL Plus, Scopus, Open Grey and Ethos. The use of two grey literature databases (Open Grey and Ethos) aimed to reduce potential publication bias and provide a more comprehensive view of the evidence (26). The search consisted of a selection of medical subject headings (MeSH terms), where appropriate, and free-text. Limits were used in applicable databases which limited by date and language. The search comprised of four concepts: types of STI, type of online or self-sampling service, accessibility or inequalities, and UK filters. For example, terms such as 'STI', 'Chlamydia', 'Self-Sampl*', 'eHealth', 'Access*', 'Inequalit*', 'United Kingdom', and 'England' were used. To ensure the search strategy was fully comprehensive, additional terms for 'eHealth' were included (27) and adapted and simplified versions of two verified filters for the UK were used in database searches, where appropriate (28,29).

The search only included studies published between 2010-2021; this was due to the very low numbers of users of OPSS services prior to 2010 (5). See online supplemental file 1 for details of the full search strategy.

Data extraction

The phases of data identification, de-duplication, screening and eligibility checks shown in Figure 1. For included studies, a data extraction form (online supplemental file 2) was used to extract the demographics of the study participants (online supplemental file 3), the study design and key findings from each study (online supplemental file 4).

Empirical appraisal and analysis of included articles

Study designs were heterogeneous, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed method analysis, and were therefore appraised using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (30). Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, and qualitative data were analysed using inductive thematic analysis (31) .

RESULTS

Overview of included studies

This search strategy identified 23 relevant articles that described ten different OPSS services, all located in England (see Table 1 and online supplemental file 3 and 4). The overall quality was variable, with the majority either evaluating a single site/testing provider, and exploratory or observational. See online supplemental file 5 for the full MMAT results. For a summary of each individual service or intervention, see online supplemental file 6. Six studies explored solely chlamydia testing, one assessed a chlamydia and gonorrhoea testing service and seventeen assessed services which tested for chlamydia, gonorrhoea, HIV and syphilis. Five articles compared demographic characteristics and outcomes of users of OPSS with clinic-based services (20,32–36).

Table 1: Overview of Included Studies

Service	Author (Year)	Study Type	Study Aims	Demographic characteristics captured				
				Gender	Age	Ethnicity	Sexual orientation	IMD
eSexual Health Clinic (eSHC)	Aicken et al. 2018 (37)	Qualitative interviews	To understand use and experience of the eSHC to inform future evaluation and refinement	Binary	18-35	✓	✓	-
	Estcourt et al. 2017 (38)	Non-randomised, exploratory proof of concept study	To assess the safety and feasibility of eSHC	Binary	18+	✓	✓	-
	Gibbs et al. 2018 (39)	Mixed methods evaluation	To evaluate the eSHC results service	-	-	-	-	-
Freetest.me	Dolan et al. 2014 (40)	Randomised experiment	To explore the effect on chlamydia test return rates of non-cash financial incentives, and the influence of socioeconomic status	Binary	16-24	✓	-	Mean score
Letstalkaboutit	Gasmelsid et al. 2021 (34)	Retrospective service evaluation	To determine whether online screening is accessible by those patients most at need by comparing the demographics and number of asymptomatic chlamydial infections detected online and in clinic.	Binary	<25, 25+	✓	✓	**
NCSP	Woodhall et al. 2012 (5)	Quantitative retrospective data analysis; website evaluation	To describe and evaluate access to the NCSP's online chlamydia testing service	Binary	15-24	✓	-	✓
North East Essex PCT	Bracebridge et al. 2012 (41)	Cross-sectional study	To quantify uptake and test-positivity rates, identify factors associated with screening and compare costs of the intervention with the NCSP	Binary	17-25	✓	-	✓ [#]
Saving Lives	Page et al. 2019 (42)	Observational study	To ascertain how DBS HIV kits compared with MT kits in this postal testing service.	Female, male, trans	Median 26	✓	✓	-
Sexual Health London	Day et al. 2020 (43)	Retrospective service evaluation	To report the rate of recent sexual assault (SA) disclosure amongst users of SHL, and identify the outcomes of their call back discussions.	Female, male, trans or non-binary	18-55	✓	✓	-
	Day et al. 2021 (44)	Retrospective service evaluation	To assess the sexual health needs, sexual practices, STI/HIV positivity and satisfaction rates of trans and non-binary users of Sexual Health London	Female, male, trans, non-binary/gender fluid	15-82	✓	-	-
	Day et al. 2020 (45)	Retrospective service evaluation	To report the safeguarding concerns and outcomes of 16-17year olds accessing SHL	Female, male, trans or non-binary	16-17	✓	✓	-
	Day et al. 2021	Retrospective service	To identify the characteristics and transfer to care	Binary	21-50	✓	✓	-

	(46)	evaluation	rates of those who have a reactive HIV test result via SHL					
SH:24	Barnard et al. 2018 (32)	Cross-sectional study	To compare the characteristics of e-STI service users with clinic users, and OPSS kit returners with non-returners	Binary	16+	✓	✓	✓
	Barnard 2020 (Chapter 6) (47)	Qualitative interviews	To describe the experiences, barriers and facilitators of SH:24 in Lambeth and Southwark	Female, male, trans	16-30	✓	✓	-
	Syred et al. 2019 (48)	Observational study	To describe user choice of OPSS orders and diagnoses in a 'choose to test' intervention	Binary	16-24	✓	✓	✓
	Turner et al. 2018 (20)	Observational study	To investigate the effect of decision-making on resource allocation in a clinic after the introduction of an e-STI service in Lambeth and Southwark	Binary	16+	✓	✓	-
	Turner et al. 2019 (33)	Case study analysis and model generation	To establish cost-effectiveness of an OPSS service, and explore cost per diagnosis in different scenarios	-	-	-	-	-
	Wilson et al. 2017 (49)	Single-blind randomised control trial (RCT)	To assess the effectiveness of an OPSS service compared with face-to-face services	Female, male, trans	16-30	✓	✓	-
	Wilson et al. 2019 (50)	Secondary data analysis of an e-STI RCT in Lambeth and Southwark	To examine the effect of an e-STI service on testing uptake on people who had never previously tested (never-testers)	Female, male, trans	16-30	✓	✓	-
TakeATestUK.com	Page et al. 2021 (51)	Observational study	To ascertain how DBS HIV and syphilis kits compared with MT kits in this postal testing service	Female, male, trans	Mean 27	✓	✓	-
Umbrella	Banerjee et al. 2018 (35)	Retrospective service evaluation	To evaluate the rates of uptake and return of OPSS kits and compare patient demographics and clinical outcomes in home and clinic testers	Female, male, transgender	16+	✓	✓	-
	Banerjee et al. 2020 (36)	Retrospective service evaluation	To evaluate the uptake, return rate and new diagnosis rates of home-based testing in comparison with clinic-based testing for HIV, syphilis and hepatitis B	Female, male, transgender	16+	✓	✓*	-
	Manavi et al. 2017 (52)	Observational study	To establish which factors influence return of OPSS kits	Female, male, transgender	-	-	-	IMD rank

Characteristics of those accessing OPSS services

Comprehensive demographic data was not consistently collected across studies, in terms of both type of data collected and what was collected (see Table 1). Only two studies collected demographic data on all of gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation and the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) (32,48); two collected none of these items (20,39). In addition to age and gender, six studies collected IMD data, 17 collected sexual orientation and 21 collected ethnicity, the majority of which were described in different ways using a variety of groupings. Gender types captured also varied between studies, with two that did not collect this data, and ten only reporting binary types.

Those who accessed services tended to be majority women (56.7-69.4% women, five studies reported statistical significance) (5,20,32,34–36,40,41,51), were resident in less deprived areas compared to accessing testing in other settings ($p < 0.001$) (5,32,40,41), white or white British (53.3-92% users, four studies reported statistical significance) (5,32,34–36,40,51), and 20 years old or over (95.4% when compared to any age group (20,32), 32-42.9% when c.f. people aged 20-25 (41,53)), with two studies reporting statistical significance (20,32).

In those studies that collected more comprehensive gender data, people who identified as gender diverse made up a small proportion of the overall population accessing the service (0.0-0.42%) (35,36,44,49–52).

There were limited and conflicting data on access according to sexual orientation; one study reported more MSM requesting access than heterosexual men (32), and one study found that a higher proportion of people identifying as non-heterosexual accessed online self-sampling compared to clinic based testing (OR 0.44, (95% CI 0.27-0.72) (34). This is in contrast to findings from the Umbrella service, Birmingham (36).

Those accessing online services sometimes displayed higher risk behaviours (5,40) but often had a greater proportion of negative test results (32,33,35,36). Individuals were more likely to order OPSS kits if they had used STI testing services before (40). Of those who were never-testers, a significant proportion were recruited face-to-face in communities (50).

Usage of OPSS services

The proportion of users returning self-sampling test kits varied by study (range 48%-78.4%) (32,35,36,44). Women were more likely than men to access and return STI self-sampling kits in the majority of studies (20,32,35,36,40,41,52). One service evaluation found no difference between kit return rates between those identifying as gender diverse and those identifying as cisgender (OR 1.00, 95%CI 0.81-1.24), although successful return (OR 1.6, 95% CI 1.06-2.36) and successful testing (OR 1.2, 95% CI 0.87-1.66) of blood samples were higher in those identifying as trans or non-binary/gender fluid (44). Characteristics of those who returned test kits varied between studies for age (32,36,40), and by level of deprivation (40,52). However, across several studies, people of white ethnicity were more likely to return the kit compared to other ethnicities (32,35,36).

A study that evaluated those accessing an OPSS spontaneously, compared to those that attended clinic and were triaged to testing online, found that the return rate was slightly lower in the triage and signpost group compared to the spontaneous online group (67.0% vs 70.5% by 6 weeks respectively) (20).

There is limited data on return rate of blood sampling kits, with one study finding only 54% (9033/16,611) of people returned a blood sample with a sufficient quantity of blood for testing (36). Studies that examined different types of blood sampling kits found no difference between return rates for dried blood samples (DBS) versus mini tests (MT) (66.5% vs 68.7%) (42), but did find that the samples were significantly more likely to be successfully processed with DBS (94.6%-98.8%) compared with MT (55.7%-54.5%, $p < 0.001$) (42,51).

Impact of OPSS services on demand

In many areas, the introduction of OPSS services was not associated with a change in numbers of people attending clinics, but increased the overall demand for STI testing services (20,33,49).

Impact on clinical outcomes

Test positivity

Overall test positivity for chlamydia and gonorrhoea was lower in OPSS services (4.4-8%) than clinic-based services (10-14.4%) (32,35). Two studies found a low HIV prevalence in their OPSS testing population; 0.097% (144/148,257) (45) and 0.83% (75/16,611) (36) of users in the evaluation period had a reactive HIV result. Of these, 65% (36) and 92% (45) had confirmatory testing, and 1% (1/75) (36) and 23.6% (34/144) had a new diagnosis of HIV confirmed. When comparing DBS and MT for HIV self-sampling, MT was found to have a higher proportion of reactive tests (6.2% vs 0.5%) (51), lower proportion of confirmed reactive tests ($n=1/30$ (3.3%) vs $(1/11)$ 9.1%) (51) and higher false positive tests (5.2-5.4% vs 0.0-0.4%) (42,51). However, these were service evaluations and the blood sampling kit options were offered sequentially rather than in parallel.

Time to treatment

There were varied results regarding time-to-treatment; one paper reported that online patients took longer to receive treatment than clinic users (35), and one study found that there was no statistically significant difference (49). When an entire care pathway was trialled online and asymptomatic chlamydia-positive individuals could access an automated online clinical consultation which allowed people to collect their treatment at a community pharmacy, median time to treatment was one day (IQR 0-1) (38). A study comparing outcomes of asymptomatic service users testing positive for chlamydia via clinic-based services and online found that those diagnosed online were less likely to wait more than a week for treatment compared to those diagnosed in clinic (OR 9.94, 95% CI 2.87-34.42) (34).

Reporting sexual assault and safeguarding outcomes

When evaluating outcomes of those people who reported online a recent sexual assault over a 6-month period in 2020, one service found that 0.5% ($n=242/45841$) of users indicated they had been a victim of a recent sexual assault, which led to telephone intervention by a clinical healthcare professional. Of these, nearly 80% of people were contacted. However, 41.7%, ($n=101/242$) of users stated that they had not intended to report recent sexual assault. Fifteen people had already reported the sexual assault and had been seen by the police or by a Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC). One person required a SARC referral, and 8 people were referred to a clinic-based service (43). The same service also evaluated their safeguarding outcomes in 16-17 year olds, finding that a high proportion of this population (42.5%) met the service criteria for a follow-up telephone call from a health advisor. The most frequent reason that a call was triggered was related to drug and

alcohol use (27%). The outcome of 8.5% of calls was a discussion with the child protection team, with 7% requiring a referral or discussion with social services (45).

Acceptability of OPSS services

Qualitative research showed the importance of trust, confidentiality, discretion, reliability, convenience and improved patient choice in ensuring the successful use of OPSS (37,47), and between 74-98% of individuals surveyed expressed that they were pleased with and found these services acceptable (39,49,50).

Economics

Although this review did not specifically set out to evaluate the economic outcomes of OPSS services, only one study included any costings data (33). This study, evaluating the impact of online testing across specialist sexual health services in two London boroughs found that, although there was an increase in the total annual cost of STI testing following the introduction of online testing, the average cost per test and diagnosis decreased (33)

DISCUSSION

Although evaluations of OPSS of variable quality were found, we did not identify any large scale, multicentre robust studies. Available evidence suggests that OPSS services appear to be most used by and acceptable to asymptomatic individuals who are predominately women, over 20 years of age, resident in less deprived areas, and of white ethnicities. There is preliminary evidence that people from groups experiencing a disproportionate burden of STIs use OPSS less than other groups. The heterogeneity of the included studies prevented full evaluation of clinical outcomes.

Online services tend to be targeted at asymptomatic individuals who do not have other sexual health needs. The ability for asymptomatic people to manage their care needs remotely is an important and useful contribution to detect symptomless STIs, in order to enable treatment of the index patient and partner notification, and reduce morbidity and onward transmission. However, asymptomatic users reported higher risk behaviours in some studies (5,40), and there was no data on the impact of using OPSS on future sexual behaviour. In addition, there was insufficient evidence to be able to establish the impact of OPSS on treatment and partner notification outcomes.

Women were more likely than men to access and return STI self-sampling kits in the majority of studies (20,32,35,40,41,52). For services that provided accessibility information by sexual orientation, MSM seemed to be successfully using OPSS services (32,52). This finding is consistent with those from an OPSS in Canada (54). Certain minority ethnic groups such as black Caribbean, black African and mixed ethnicities, who are also key populations that are at higher risk of poor sexual health were underrepresented in OPSS users (11), perhaps due to a preference for face-to-face care (47).

Some services appear to appropriately reach younger people, but other services were more popular with those aged over 20 (35). This could be because younger people are more likely to live at home and have concerns about parents finding a test kit delivered through the post (55). Using chlamydia as an exemplar, chlamydia has formed 49% of new STI diagnoses in 2019, yet there has been a 13% reduction in tests completed by young people since 2015 (11). Chlamydia is the most commonly reported STI in the UK, and disproportionately affects

young people from deprived areas (53), so it is crucial to ensure services are targeting these groups within their region. Despite this, recent research shows that both men (adjusted odds ratio (aOR): 1.36 [95%CI: 1.35-1.39], $p < 0.001$) and women (aOR: 1.32 [95%CI: 1.31-1.33], $p < 0.001$) living in the least deprived quintile were more likely to use OPSS services for chlamydia screening than those from the most deprived quintile (56).

Understanding inequalities in access and usage of OPSS services requires services to collect comprehensive socio-demographic data. Of the fifteen included studies, only two collected gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation and IMD data (32,48). Most studies included categories such as 'other' ethnicity or sexual orientation and though a few included trans participants, only one described people of non-binary, gender fluid or other genders (44). This data gap results in not only a skewed understanding of the impact of STIs on minorities, but also "facilitates the erasure of communities" (18). Further, the interrelations between demographic groups have not been sufficiently examined in these studies despite reference in the literature (e.g. 4,11,65).

Return rates of blood samples that were sufficient for testing were relatively low, and in keeping with findings from the National HIV self-sampling service (58). Overall test positivity was lower in OPSS services compared to clinic-based services (32,36). This is in keeping with, but more marked than, findings from both selective and unselective national datasets (10,58). As highlighted within one study, the low PPV for home-based BBV testing is concerning (36) and requires further evaluation from both a cost-effectiveness and well-being perspective.

To our knowledge, this is the first review to explore the accessibility of OPSS services in the UK. The inclusion of qualitative as well as quantitative studies ensured that both acceptability and core themes regarding people's access to and use of services could be explored. The included studies were heterogenous in design using a variety of methodologies which added value to the review. By excluding hypothetical studies, acceptability and barriers to service use are indicative of the real-life experience of online service users.

Fourteen of 23 studies took place in London and no studies were conducted in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland so findings may not be generalisable to all of the UK. This review did not set out to evaluate partner notification or economic outcomes of OPSS services, but the authors observed that there was a dearth of information on these within the studies that were included in this review. This study only focussed on the UK setting as it was focussing on access, and the infrastructure of sexual health service provision in the UK is different to other settings. However, the findings relating to acceptability and convenience are similar to those reported in systematic review and synthesis of qualitative research on OPSS services (55).

OPSS services appear acceptable to current users and improve choice but evaluation is limited. The existing evidence suggests that successful services achieve reliability, privacy, convenience, trust, and are integrated with clinic-based services to provide ease of transition between modalities of care. Online services are successful in relieving pressure from clinics (59), but clinic-based services remain essential for symptomatic individuals, people who have digital constraints, and those who prefer face-to-face care and or require additional safeguarding, amongst others (18).

With the extensive expansion in provision of OPSS services in recent years, a large-scale, multi-centre evaluation is needed to determine their cost-effectiveness and impact on access, clinical outcomes and service delivery. Clinical outcomes are key to understanding the cost-effectiveness of these services and there is limited research into this important factor. Further research is required to understand why people aged under 20 have lower uptake, and whether this is related to, for example, an individual's experience of autonomy, competence and relatedness (60) and how awareness and access can be improved for these individuals (61).

The author declares no competing interests.

FB, CSE and JG report receiving NIHR funding to research digital sexual health (NIHR129157 (FB, JG) and NIHR200856 (CSE, JG)). CSE and JG are associate editors for STI journal.

Contributions statement:

KS conducted the original scoping review to fulfil requirements of KS' Masters dissertation, supervised by JG and KCL. JG, KL, KS, CSE and FB conceived of the original idea. KS, JG and KL contributed to the design of the study. KS led, and KCL and JG contributed to the establishment of the search strategy and method of analysis. The original article reviewing and data analysis were led by KS, with contribution from KCL and JG. The updated article review and data analysis were led by JG, with contribution from KCL and KS. All authors (KS, KCL, CSE, FB and JG) have made contributions to the drafting and revising of the article, and have approved the final version.

1. Harding-Esch EM, Hollis E, Mohammed H, Saunders JM. Self-sampling and self-testing for STIs and HIV: The case for consistent nomenclature. Vol. 93, Sexually Transmitted Infections. BMJ Publishing Group; 2017. p. 80.
2. Gilbert M, Thomson K, Salway T, Haag D, Grennan T, Fairley CK, et al. Differences in experiences of barriers to STI testing between clients of the internet-based diagnostic testing service GetCheckedOnline.com and an STI clinic in Vancouver, Canada. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet]. 2019 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Oct 26];95(2):151–6. Available from: <https://sti.bmj.com/content/95/2/151>
3. Greenland KE, Op De Coul ELM, Van Bergen JEAM, Brouwers EEHG, Fennema HJSA, Götz HM, et al. Acceptability of the internet-based chlamydia screening implementation in the netherlands and insights into nonresponse. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2011 Jun;38(6):467–74.
4. Chai S, Aumakhan B, Barnes M, Jett-Goheen M, Quinn N, Agreda P, et al. Internet-based screening for sexually transmitted infections to reach nonclinic populations in the community: risk factors for infection in men. *Sex Transm Dis* [Internet]. 2010 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Oct 26];37(12):756–63. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC20644498/?tool=EBI>
5. Woodhall SC, Sile B, Talebi A, Nardone A, Baraitser P. Internet testing for Chlamydia trachomatis in England, 2006 to 2010. Vol. 12, BMC Public Health. BioMed Central; 2012. p. 1–8.
6. FriskyWales. FriskyWales webpage [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 29]. Available from: <https://www.friskywales.org/chlamydia-and-gonorrhoea-home-testing-pilot.html>
7. Estcourt CS. Reference Type: Personal Communication. 2020.
8. SH:24. About SH:24 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 30]. Available from: <https://sh24.org.uk/about-sh24>

9. British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. Standards for the Management of STIs [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2020 Sep 30]. Available from: <https://www.bashh.org/about-bashh/publications/standards-for-the-management-of-stis/>
10. Public Health England. Sexually transmitted infections and screening for chlamydia in England, 2020 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 10]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1015176/STI_NCSP_report_2020.pdf
11. Public Health England. Sexually transmitted infections and screening for chlamydia in England, 2019 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 29]. Available from: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/914184/STI_NCSP_report_2019.pdf
12. Mercer CH, Tanton C, Prah P, Erens B, Sonnenberg P, Clifton S, et al. Changes in sexual attitudes and lifestyles in Britain through the life course and over time: Findings from the National Surveys of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal). *Lancet*. 2013 Nov 30;382(9907):1781–94.
13. Ford K, Sohn W, Lepkowski J. Characteristics of Adolescents' Sexual Partners and Their Association with Use Of Condoms and Other Contraceptive Methods. Vol. 33, *Family Planning Perspectives*. 2001.
14. Wayal S, Hughes G, Sonnenberg P, Mohammed H, Copas AJ, Gerressu M, et al. Ethnic variations in sexual behaviours and sexual health markers: findings from the third British National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal-3). *Lancet Public Heal*. 2017 Oct 1;2(10):e458–72.
15. Daskalopoulou M, Rodger AJ, Phillips AN, Sherr L, Elford J, McDonnell J, et al. Condomless sex in HIV-diagnosed men who have sex with men in the UK: Prevalence, correlates, and implications for HIV transmission. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2017 Dec 1;93(8):590–8.
16. Curtis TJ, Rodger AJ, Burns F, Nardone A, Copas A, Wayal S. Patterns of sexualised recreational drug use and its association with risk behaviours and sexual health outcomes in men who have sex with men in London, UK: A comparison of cross-sectional studies conducted in 2013 and 2016. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2020 May 1;96(3):197–203.
17. Sewell J, Cambiano V, Miltz A, Speakman A, Lampe FC, Phillips A, et al. Changes in recreational drug use, drug use associated with chemsex, and HIV-related behaviours, among HIV-negative men who have sex with men in London and Brighton, 2013-2016. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2018 Nov 1;94(7):494–501.
18. Terrence Higgins Trust, British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. The State of the Nation Sexually Transmitted Infections in England [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 30]. Available from: https://www.tht.org.uk/sites/default/files/2020-02/State_of_The_nation_Report.pdf
19. Robertson R, Wenzel L, Thompson J, Charles A. Understanding NHS financial pressures - How are they affecting patient care? [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Jul 28]. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/field/field_publication_file/Understanding_NHS_financial_pressures_-_full_report.pdf
20. Turner KM, Zienkiewicz AK, Syred J, Looker KJ, Joia De Sa J, Brady M, et al. Web-Based Activity Within a Sexual Health Economy: Observational Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2018;20(3).
21. Kersaudy-Rahib D, Lydié N, Leroy C, March L, Bébeár C, Arwidson P, et al. Chlamyweb Study II: A randomised controlled trial (RCT) of an online offer of home-based Chlamydia trachomatis sampling in France. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet].

- 2017 May 1 [cited 2021 Jun 25];93(3):188–95. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28377422/>
22. British Association for Sexual Health and HIV. Principles for Recovery for out-patient Genitourinary Medicine, Contraception and Sexual Health Services and outpatient HIV Services Summary of Document & Purpose [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 30]. Available from: <https://members.bashh.org/Documents/COVID-19/Principles for Recovery of Sexual Health Draft 08.06.2020 - for website upload.pdf>
 23. Khalil H, Peters M, Godfrey CM, Mcinerney P, Soares CB, Parker D. An Evidence-Based Approach to Scoping Reviews. *Worldviews Evidence-Based Nurs* [Internet]. 2016 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Jun 25];13(2):118–23. Available from: <https://sigmapubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/wvn.12144>
 24. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850> [Internet]. 2018 Sep 4 [cited 2021 Oct 26];169(7):467–73. Available from: <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/abs/10.7326/M18-0850>
 25. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, Marshall C, Metzendorf M-I, et al. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (version 6.0). 2019.
 26. Paez A. Gray literature: An important resource in systematic reviews. *J Evid Based Med*. 2017 Aug 1;10(3):233–40.
 27. Pagliari C, Sloan D, Gregor P, Sullivan F, Detmer D, Kahan JP, et al. What is eHealth (4): A scoping exercise to map the field. *J Med Internet Res*. 2005 Jan;7(1).
 28. Ayiku L, Levay P, Hudson T, Craven J, Barrett E, Finnegan A, et al. The Medline UK filter: development and validation of a geographic search filter to retrieve research about the UK from OVID medline. *Health Info Libr J*. 2017 Sep 1;34(3):200–16.
 29. Ayiku L, Levay P, Hudson T, Craven J, Finnegan A, Adams R, et al. The Embase UK filter: validation of a geographic search filter to retrieve research about the UK from OVID Embase. *Health Info Libr J*. 2019 Jun 1;36(2):121–33.
 30. Nha HONG Q, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. MIXED METHODS APPRAISAL TOOL (MMAT) VERSION 2018 User guide [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. Available from: <http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/>
 31. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006;3(2):77–101.
 32. Barnard S, Free C, Bakolis I, Turner KME, Looker KJ, Baraitser P. Comparing the characteristics of users of an online service for STI self-sampling with clinic service users: A cross-sectional analysis. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2018 Aug 1;94(5):377–83.
 33. Turner KME, Looker KJ, Syred J, Zienkiewicz A, Baraitser P. Online testing for sexually transmitted infections: A whole systems approach to predicting value. Santella AJ, editor. *PLoS One*. 2019 Feb;14(2):e0212420.
 34. Gasmelsid N, Moran BC, Nadarzynski T, Patel R, Foley E. Does online sexually transmitted infection screening compromise care? A service evaluation comparing the management of chlamydial infection diagnosed online and in clinic: *Int J STD AIDS* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 3 [cited 2021 Oct 10];32(6):528–32. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0956462420980929>
 35. Banerjee P, Thorley N, Radcliffe K. A service evaluation comparing home-based testing to clinic-based testing for Chlamydia and gonorrhoea in Birmingham and Solihull. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2018 Sep 1;29(10):974–9.
 36. Banerjee P, Madhwapathi V, Thorley N, Radcliffe K. A service evaluation comparing

- home-based testing to clinic-based testing for HIV, syphilis and hepatitis B in Birmingham and Solihull. *Int J STD AIDS* [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Dec 5];31(7):613–8. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0956462419900461?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed
37. Aicken CRH, Sutcliffe LJ, Gibbs J, Tickle LJ, Hone K, Harding-Esch EM, et al. Using the eSexual Health Clinic to access chlamydia treatment and care via the internet: a qualitative interview study. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2018 Jun 1;94(4):241–7.
 38. Estcourt CS, Gibbs J, Sutcliffe LJ, Gkatzidou V, Tickle L, Hone K, et al. The eSexual Health Clinic system for management, prevention, and control of sexually transmitted infections: exploratory studies in people testing for Chlamydia trachomatis. *Lancet Public Heal.* 2017 Apr 1;2(4):e182–90.
 39. Gibbs J, Aicken CRH, Sutcliffe LJ, Gkatzidou V, Tickle LJ, Hone K, et al. Mixed-methods evaluation of a novel online STI results service. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2018 Dec 1;94(8):622–4.
 40. Dolan P, Rudisill C. The effect of financial incentives on chlamydia testing rates: Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Soc Sci Med.* 2014 Mar 1;105:140–8.
 41. Bracebridge S, Bachmann MO, Ramkhalawon K, Woolnough A. Evaluation of a systematic postal screening and treatment service for genital Chlamydia trachomatis, with remote clinic access via the internet: A cross-sectional study, East of England. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2012 Aug;88(5):375–81.
 42. Page M, Atabani SF, Wood M, Smit E, Wilson S, Atherton C, et al. Dried blood spot and mini-tube blood sample collection kits for postal HIV testing services: a comparative review of successes in a real-world setting. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet]. 2019 Feb 1 [cited 2021 Nov 21];95(1):43–5. Available from: <https://sti.bmj.com/content/95/1/43>
 43. Day S, Singh GJ, Jones S, Kinsella R. Sexual assault reporting amongst users of online sexual health services: *Int J Prev Med* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 16 [cited 2021 Oct 10];32(3):280–5. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0956462420963940>
 44. Day S, Smith J, Perera S, Jones S, Kinsella R. Beyond the binary: sexual health outcomes of transgender and non-binary service users of an online sexual health service. *Int J STD AIDS* [Internet]. 2021 Jun 9 [cited 2021 Oct 10];32(10):896–902. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0956462420982830>
 45. Day S, Kinsella R, Jones S, Tittle V, Suchak T, Forbes K. Safeguarding outcomes of 16 and 17-year-old service users of Sexual Health London (SHL.uk), a pan-London online sexual health service: *Int J STD AIDS* [Internet]. 2020 Oct 25 [cited 2021 Oct 10];31(14):1373–9. Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0956462420933462>
 46. Day S, Khan K, Kelly AM, Jones S, Kinsella R. Characteristics of newly diagnosed HIV-positive service users using a pan-London e-sexually transmitted infection screening service. *Int J STD AIDS* [Internet]. 2021 May 12 [cited 2021 Oct 10]; Available from: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/09564624211014729>
 47. Barnard SL. Access to online services for sexually transmitted infection self-sampling at home [Internet]. [London]: King’s College London; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 20]. Available from: [https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/access-to-online-services-for-sexually-transmitted-infection-selfsampling-at-home\(7e625417-c622-4cdf-a8f6-e82e44e5bcb0\).html](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/access-to-online-services-for-sexually-transmitted-infection-selfsampling-at-home(7e625417-c622-4cdf-a8f6-e82e44e5bcb0).html)
 48. Syred J, Holdsworth G, Howroyd C, Spelman K, Baraitser P. Choose to test: Self-selected testing for sexually transmitted infections within an online service. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2019 May 1;95(3):171–4.

49. Wilson E, Free C, Morris TP, Syred J, Ahamed I, Menon-Johansson AS, et al. Internet-accessed sexually transmitted infection (e-STI) testing and results service: A randomised, single-blind, controlled trial. *PLoS Med*. 2017 Dec 1;14(12).
50. Wilson E, Leyrat C, Baraitser P, Free C. Does internet-Accessed STI (e-STI) testing increase testing uptake for chlamydia and other STIs among a young population who have never tested? Secondary analyses of data from a randomised controlled trial. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2019 Dec 1;95(8):569–74.
51. Page M, Atabani S, Arumainayagam J, Wilson S, Hartland D, Taylor S. Are all blood-based postal sampling kits the same? A comparative service evaluation of the performance of dried blood spot and mini tube sample collection systems for postal HIV and syphilis testing. *Sex Transm Infect* [Internet]. 2021 May 1 [cited 2021 Nov 21];97(3):209–14. Available from: <https://sti.bmj.com/content/97/3/209>
52. Manavi K, Hodson J. Observational study of factors associated with return of home sampling kits for sexually transmitted infections requested online in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2017 Oct 1;7(10):e017978.
53. Woodhall SC, Soldan K, Sonnenberg P, Mercer CH, Clifton S, Saunders P, et al. Is chlamydia screening and testing in Britain reaching young adults at risk of infection? Findings from the third National Survey of Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles (Natsal-3). *Sex Transm Infect*. 2016 May 1;92(3):218–27.
54. Gilbert M, Salway T, Haag D, Fairley CK, Wong J, Grennan T, et al. Use of GetCheckedOnline, a Comprehensive Web-based Testing Service for Sexually Transmitted and Blood-Borne Infections. *J Med Internet Res* [Internet]. 2017 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Nov 21];19(3). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28320690/>
55. Spence T, Kander I, Walsh J, Griffiths F, Ross J. Perceptions and Experiences of Internet-Based Testing for Sexually Transmitted Infections: Systematic Review and Synthesis of Qualitative Research. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(8).
56. Sonubi T, Allen H, Kuyumdzhieva G, Connor N, Sinka K, Folkard K, et al. The relationship between socioeconomic deprivation and chlamydia screening in England - an analysis of national surveillance data, 2015-2019. In: Poster presented at: BASHH Annual Conference 2020, Virtual. 2020.
57. Furegato M, Chen Y, Mohammed H, Mercer CH, Savage EJ, Hughes G. Examining the role of socioeconomic deprivation in ethnic differences in sexually transmitted infection diagnosis rates in England: Evidence from surveillance data. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2016 Nov 1;144(15):3253–62.
58. Public Health England. National HIV self-sampling service: November 2018 to October 2019 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Dec 5]. Available from: www.test.hiv
59. Department of Health and Social Care. Government Response to the Health and Social Care Committee report on Sexual Health - CP186 [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2020 Sep 29]. Available from: www.gov.uk/official-documents.
60. Morrison LG. Theory-based strategies for enhancing the impact and usage of digital health behaviour change interventions: A review. *Digit Heal* [Internet]. 2015 Jan 17 [cited 2021 Jan 17];1:205520761559533. Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2055207615595335>
61. Munro CH, Patel R, Brito-Mutunayagam S, Carlin E, Kasliwal A, Manavi K, Phillips, D, Reed D. FSRH/BASHH Standards for Online and Remote Providers of Sexual and Reproductive Health Services - January 2019 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://www.fsrh.org/standards-and-guidance/documents/fsrhhbashh-standards-for-online-and-remote-providers-of-sexual/>

Figure 1: Flow of Information, based on the PRISMA Flow Diagram (32)

