

1 **The Acceptability of Self-Collected Samples for STI Testing: A Qualitative Study Among**
2 **Adults in Rakai, Uganda**

3
4 **Authors:**

5 Yasmin P. Ogale, PhD* – Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
6 M. Kathryn Grabowski, PhD – Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
7 Proscovia Nabakka – Rakai Health Sciences Program
8 William Ddaaki – Rakai Health Sciences Program
9 Rosette Nakubulwa – Rakai Health Sciences Program
10 Neema Nakyanjo – Rakai Health Sciences Program
11 Fred Nalugoda, PhD – Rakai Health Sciences Program
12 Joseph Kagaayi, MBChB, MPH – Rakai Health Sciences Program
13 Godfrey Kigozi, MBChB, MPH – Rakai Health Sciences Program
14 Julie A. Denison, PhD – Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
15 Charlotte Gaydos, MS, MPH, DrPH – Johns Hopkins School of Medicine
16 Caitlin E. Kennedy, PhD, MPH – Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

17
18 *Corresponding author: Yasmin.ogale@gmail.com, +1-302-588-0608, 220 Bill Kennedy Way
19 SE Apt. A0-18, Atlanta, GA, USA

20
21 **Abstract word count:** 182

22 **Key questions word count:** 134

23 **Text word count:** 2920

24 **Number of references:** 48

25 **Number of figures:** 0

26 **Number of tables:** 1

27
28
29 **Conflicts of interest and sources of funding:**

30 The authors declare no competing interest. This work was supported by the Fogarty-Fulbright
31 Fellowship in Public Health; the Johns Hopkins Center for Global Health; the Johns Hopkins
32 Center for Qualitative Studies in Health and Medicine; the Hopkins Population Center via the
33 National Institutes of Health/Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and
34 Human Development under Grant R24HD042854; and The Alliance for a Healthier World.
35 STIPS was supported by the Johns Hopkins Center for AIDS Research and the National
36 Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases under Grant
37 1P30AI094189.

38

39 **Acknowledgments**

40 We are grateful to the community members and leaders of Rakai who participated in this
41 research. We also give special appreciation to all the RHSP staff members and in particular the
42 Social and Behavioral Sciences team for supporting this research. Thank you to Herman Mukiibi
43 and Frank Lukabwe for their work with data collection. We would also like to acknowledge the
44 support of Drs. Ronald Gray and Maria Wawer.

45

46 **Abstract**

47 **Introduction:** Self-collected samples (SCS) for sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing have
48 been shown to be feasible and acceptable in high-resource settings. However, few studies have
49 assessed the acceptability of SCS for STI testing in a general population in low-resource settings.
50 This study explored the acceptability of SCS among adults in south-central Uganda.

51 **Methods:** Nested within the Rakai Community Cohort Study, we conducted semi-structured
52 interviews with 36 symptomatic and asymptomatic adults who self-collected samples for STI
53 testing. We analyzed the data using an adapted version of the Framework Method.

54 **Results:** Overall, participants did not find SCS physically uncomfortable. Reported acceptability
55 did not meaningfully differ by gender or symptom status. Perceived advantages to SCS included
56 increased privacy and confidentiality, gentleness, and efficiency. Disadvantages included the
57 lack of provider involvement, fear of self-harm and the perception that SCS was unhygienic.
58 Most participants preferred provider-collected samples to SCS. Nevertheless, almost all said they
59 would recommend SCS and would do it again in the future.

60 **Conclusion:** Despite a preference for provider-collection, SCS are acceptable among adults in
61 this setting and support expanded access to STI diagnostic services.

62

63 **Keywords:** sexually transmitted infection, sexually transmitted disease, self-care, self-sampling,
64 self-collection, low-resource

65

66 **Key Questions**

67 **What is already known on this topic:**

68 Timely diagnosis is critical for STI control, with testing being the gold standard for diagnosis.

69 Self-collected samples (SCS) for STI testing offer an opportunity to expand STI testing services

70 and are well accepted in high-resource settings. However, patient acceptability of self-collected

71 samples in low-resource settings is not well described.

72 **What this study adds:**

73 We found that SCS was acceptable to both male and female participants in our population,

74 regardless of whether they reported STI symptoms. Perceived advantages to SCS included:

75 increased privacy and confidentiality, gentleness, and efficiency; disadvantages included lack of

76 provider involvement, fear of self-harm and the perception that SCS was unhygienic. Overall,

77 most participants preferred provider collection over SCS.

78 **How this study might affect research, practice or policy:**

79 Patient education addressing perceived disadvantages may increase SCS acceptability and

80 support the use of SCS as a means to identify cases and control STIs in low-resource settings.

81

82 **Introduction**

83 Countries in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) generally follow a syndromic approach to manage non-
84 HIV sexually transmitted infections (STIs). While practical and cost-effective, syndromic
85 management is limited as diagnostic tool.¹⁻⁴ Self-collected samples (SCS) may be one way to
86 address these limitations. SCS for STI testing (SCS/STI testing) occurs when individuals obtain a
87 swab or fluid sample themselves, either within or outside the clinic, and send the specimen to a
88 laboratory for testing.⁵ Research in high-resource settings shows that SCS are as accurate as
89 provider-based tests,⁶ and that SCS/STI testing interventions are feasible and acceptable in
90 diverse populations.⁷⁻¹⁶ While not a replacement for clinic-based examination, SCS may be part
91 of innovative efforts to expand STI case management beyond the provider-dependent, syndromic
92 approach.¹⁷⁻²⁰ By allowing the patient to collect a sample themselves, studies suggest that SCS
93 can circumvent some barriers to clinic- and/or provider-based STI case management, like stigma,
94 access and privacy concerns.^{1, 21, 22} For these reasons, the WHO recommended SCS as an
95 additional approach to deliver STI testing services.²³
96
97 Despite their potential, SCS/STI testing interventions are rare in SSA due to a lack of cheap and
98 accurate diagnostic tests²⁴ and laboratory facilities. However, intensive scale-up of HIV care and
99 treatment over the past 15 years has resulted in strengthened infrastructure in the region. As
100 such, the potential for using cheaper technologies to facilitate STI etiologic testing is now
101 becoming a viable reality,¹⁸ especially in countries like Uganda. To develop effective
102 interventions, context-specific data are required, yet few studies have considered the
103 acceptability of SCS in a general population in low-resource settings. This qualitative study
104 aimed to provide data on user acceptability of self-collected genital swabs for STI testing in both
105 women and men in a low-resource setting.

106

107 **Methods**

108 Implemented by the Rakai Health Sciences Program (RHSP), the Rakai Community Cohort
109 Study (RCCS) is an ongoing, open community-based cohort of residents aged 15–49 years in
110 agrarian communities, semi-urban trading centers and Lake Victoria fishing communities in
111 south-central Uganda.²⁵ The RCCS includes the administration of a demographic and health
112 questionnaire, as well as HIV testing for all consenting participants. Nested within the RCCS, the
113 STI Prevalence Study (STIPS) aimed to estimate STI prevalence among 1,825 sexually active
114 HIV+ and HIV- men and women aged 18–49 years in two communities (one inland and one
115 fishing), from May to October 2019.²⁶ STIPS participants were tested for *Trichomonas vaginalis*
116 (TV) (in the field), syphilis (screening in the field; samples tested in the lab), *N. gonorrhoeae*
117 (NG), *C. trachomatis* (CT), and herpes simplex virus type 2 (HSV-2) (samples tested in the lab).
118 To this end, three provider-collected penile-meatal swabs were obtained for all male STIPS
119 participants who consented to STI testing. Because we were interested in men’s experience with
120 SCS, a fourth, self-collected swab was obtained from a sub-sample of men (n=40); it is from this
121 sub-sample that we recruited the male study participants for our qualitative interviews (n=15).
122 Three self-collected vaginal swabs were obtained for all female STIPS participants who
123 consented to STI testing (provider-collected samples were not obtained for females); it is from
124 this sample that we recruited the female study participants for our qualitative interviews (n=21).
125 All participants who self-collected samples received instructions from a same-gender provider
126 before sample collection and were then given privacy to self-collect. Interviews were conducted
127 after participants received their HIV, TV and syphilis screening results but before their NG, CT
128 and HSV-2 results. Individuals who tested positive for STIs were provided treatment by RHSP

129 according to the Ugandan National Clinical Treatment Guidelines for Sexually Transmitted
130 Infections.

131

132 This qualitative study was conducted among 36 adults—15 men and 21 women—from the
133 STIPS rural, inland community who self-collected a sample in STIPS. We selected participants
134 based on gender and self-reported symptom status, with 9/15 (60%) men and 15/21 (71%)
135 women reporting at least one STI-related symptom in the last six months. Symptoms included:
136 genital ulcer, genital discharge, frequent urination, painful urination, pain during intercourse,
137 bleeding during intercourse, lower abdominal pain, genital warts, and for females: thick and/or
138 colored vaginal discharge, vaginal itching and unpleasant vaginal odor. We conducted semi-
139 structured interviews that explored participants' experiences and preferences related to SCS/STI
140 testing. Interviews were conducted in a private location of the participant's choosing. RHSP
141 social and behavioral scientists conducted all interviews in Luganda. The interviewers and study
142 lead debriefed after each interview.

143

144 Interviewers transcribed and translated interviews into English. We then imported the data into
145 MAXQDA 2018²⁷ for review and initial analysis. Our analysis methods were adapted from the
146 Framework Method.²⁸ First, we reviewed the interviews in MAXQDA to familiarize ourselves
147 with the data. Second, we developed an analytic framework comprised of categories that were
148 informed by our interview guide and research questions. We used this framework to index the
149 interviews. Third, after all interviews were indexed, we charted the data into a framework matrix
150 in Excel. Fourth, we conducted open-ended coding, followed by focused coding,²⁹ to identify
151 prominent themes within each category. Prominent themes were defined by the depth of

152 discussion any one participant provided on the topic, prevalence across participants and
153 ‘keyness’ in relation to our research questions.³⁰ Fifth, we compared the themes by gender and
154 symptom status to assess for any meaningful differences. Finally, we discussed our findings
155 among the research team, including interviewers and co-investigators, to ensure clarity and
156 cohesion.

157

158 *Ethical Consideration*

159 We obtained ethical clearance from the Johns Hopkins Medicine Institutional Review Board
160 (IRB00204691; July 9, 2019), the Uganda Virus Research Institute Research and Ethics
161 Committee (GC/127/19/07/709; July 19, 2019) and the Uganda National Council for Science and
162 Technology (HS364ES; June 6, 2019). Interviewers obtained written consent from participants
163 prior to data collection.

164

165 **Results**

166 Below, we present participants’ experiences and preferences related to SCS/STI testing.
167 Participants are described by their gender (M: male; F: female) and symptom status (S+: self-
168 reported symptoms; S-: no self-reported symptoms). Table 1 provides illustrative quotations
169 identified by letters to match the corresponding themes in the text below.

170

171

172 *Overall experience*

173 In terms of their experience self-collecting a sample, almost all participants reported ‘never
174 [feeling] bad’ during the collection process and that they had ‘no problems’ with it [A].

175 Participants said the SCS instructions given by the provider before self-collection were helpful
176 [B]. Overall, participants found the SCS process to be comfortable physically. The majority
177 stated that they ‘never felt any pain’ during sample collection. A few men did indicate a minor
178 discomfort when taking the swab but described it as ‘some little pain’ that was ultimately
179 ‘bearable’ (M, S+). While participant responses were generally positive, two symptomatic
180 women did not appreciate the SCS experience: the first woman did not feel comfortable because
181 it was a new method, while the second simply did not like it [C].

182

183 *SCS advantages*

184 Advantages of SCS included privacy and confidentiality and gentleness. SCS was also more
185 efficient, as it addressed challenges due to transportation, time and money, which make clinic
186 attendance difficult.

187

188 Regarding privacy and confidentiality, some participants felt that SCS removed feelings of
189 shyness and embarrassment associated with undressing in front of a provider. This sentiment was
190 expressed by both men [D] and women [E].

191

192 Some participants also liked SCS because it avoided embarrassment caused by being ‘dirty,’
193 which related to being ungroomed, unkempt or unclean in the genital area [F].

194 A few men wanted to avoid this embarrassment as a professional courtesy to the provider. As
195 one man described, a patient may come when they are ‘*munda oyo tasawayo* <not shaven>,’ this
196 could ‘for sure...scare the health care worker.’ He later stated that self-collecting a sample was
197 best as it would avoid disturbing the provider in such a way (M, S+).

198

199 Confidentiality was another perceived advantage to SCS. Some participants, including both men
200 and women, felt that SCS was more confidential than provider-collection. Participants described
201 a local environment of mistrust and rumor mongering: ‘people in the community are rumor
202 mongers,’ explained one woman, ‘they tell everyone.’ (F, S-) Participants therefore valued
203 confidentiality and the ‘keeping of secrets;’ participants felt that SCS allowed them to maintain
204 the secret that they participated in STI testing [G]. SCS was also advantageous for those who
205 were afraid to discuss their private matters with a provider [H].

206

207 Some participants felt that SCS was gentler than provider-collection. This was especially true
208 among participants who reported symptoms. Both men and women feared that the provider
209 would inflict pain when taking a sample [I]. Some participants felt that SCS would be less
210 painful than provider-collection because the patient ‘knows their own body,’ unlike the provider
211 [J].

212

213 Finally, some participants felt that SCS was more efficient, especially if used at home, and would
214 save time and money [K]. Some participants also perceived SCS to be faster than provider-
215 collection, where clinic waiting times could cause delays.

216

217 *SCS disadvantages*

218 Reported disadvantages of SCS included the lack of provider involvement (and thereby, their
219 training and expertise) in the collection process, fear of self-harm and the perception that SCS
220 was unhygienic.

221

222 Regarding provider involvement, some participants worried that they may collect a sample
223 poorly if they were to collect it in the absence of a provider. Participants felt that the provider
224 was trained and more experienced, and as such, would carry out the process better than they
225 would themselves [L, M].

226

227 A perceived risk of self-harm was another disadvantage of SCS. Some participants were afraid of
228 hurting themselves if they took the sample [N, O].

229

230 Finally, some participants were concerned that SCS was unhygienic: because they do not wear
231 gloves, participants were afraid of spreading germs in their genital area during self-collection;
232 provider-collection was more sanitary because providers wore personal protective equipment [P].

233

234 *Preference and future use*

235 When asked for their ultimate preference, more participants preferred provider-collection over
236 SCS (18/36 [50%] for provider versus 13/36 [36%] for SCS; 5/36 [14%] with no preference).

237 This was true regardless of symptom status or gender. Of those that preferred SCS (n=36),
238 however, women—especially those reporting symptoms—were slightly more likely to prefer
239 SCS than men (9/21 [43%] of women selected SCS versus 4/15 [27%] of men).

240

241 Nevertheless, we found that almost all participants would recommend SCS to others, whether it
242 be their friends, family or peers. We also found that almost all participants, except one woman,
243 were willing to use SCS again in the future. Many recognized the utility of SCS as a means to

244 receive an STI diagnosis and valued the opportunity to ascertain their disease status again in the
245 future [Q].

246

247 While almost all participants were willing to use SCS again, one woman said she would not use
248 SCS again out of fear that community members would spread rumors about her because she
249 tested for STIs.

250

251 **Discussion**

252 In this qualitative study in south-central Uganda, we found that SCS was acceptable to both male
253 and female participants, regardless of whether they reported STI symptoms. Overall, participants
254 reported a positive experience with self-collection. Advantages of SCS included confidentiality,
255 privacy, comfort and efficiency. Disadvantages included a lack of provider involvement, fear of
256 self-harm, and the perception that SCS was unhygienic. Most participants said they preferred
257 provider-collection for STI testing. However, with one exception, all participants stated that they
258 would recommend SCS to others and would use SCS again in the future.

259

260 Data on the acceptability of self-collected genital swabs for STI testing in a general population in
261 low-resource settings, particularly in SSA, are rare. Our findings corroborate previous studies in
262 Rakai, which demonstrated that self-administered vaginal swabs were valid and acceptable
263 methods to screen for STIs among women, and urine samples were acceptable to both women
264 and men.³¹⁻³⁴ Our findings also agree with those of a systematic review by Paudyal et al. on
265 patient experiences obtaining self-samples to diagnose STIs.¹³ While the review covered a
266 variety of self-collection methods (not just genital swabs) and included only two studies from

267 low-resource settings, it evaluated the same STIs as our study, and found that the majority of
268 adults accepted SCS and found it to be an ‘easy’ procedure. The review also found that privacy
269 and safety were the most common concerns adults had about SCS.

270
271 While more specific to women, we can draw comparisons between our data and data on the
272 acceptability of self-collected swabs for HPV testing in SSA. Two studies from Uganda have
273 examined acceptability of self-collection of HPV samples. A quantitative study of women in a
274 low-resource community in Kampala found that more than 80% of participants were willing to
275 collect their own HPV samples.³⁵ However, in that study, SCS was delivered by a provider to
276 the participant’s home (and SCS was conducted there, too); therefore the high observed
277 acceptability could have been due to the location of sample collection (i.e. at home), the mode of
278 delivery (i.e. by a provider), the collection method (i.e. SCS), or some combination of the three.
279 Despite this, the study did identify some barriers to self-collection, including embarrassment due
280 to a lack of privacy (in the home/community), worry of collecting incorrectly and older age.
281 Likewise, a mixed methods study conducted in India, Nicaragua and Uganda found that 75% of
282 all women felt SCS was easy, though initial concerns included hurting themselves (52%) and
283 getting a bad sample (24%).³⁶ Women also reported an unwillingness to touch the genital region;
284 similar to our study, participants also valued sanitation, privacy and cleanliness.³⁶

285
286 To our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the acceptability of self-collected penile-
287 meatal swabs among men in a low-resource setting. We were surprised that SCS acceptance
288 among men in our population was not higher. We expected that most men would rather self-
289 collect to avoid undressing and exposing themselves in front of a provider. We also expected that

290 the majority of men would prefer SCS, citing its flexibility to test during non-clinic hours, as has
291 been observed in studies on the acceptability of HIV self-testing among men.^{37,38} We
292 recommend researchers continue to explore SCS acceptability among men in diverse settings.

293

294 Finally, we were initially surprised by our finding that both men and women preferred a
295 provider-collected sample over SCS, despite indicating that SCS was acceptable. The
296 aforementioned review found that SCS was preferred to provider-collection.¹³ A study assessing
297 the acceptability of self-collected penile swabs among men in the U.S. also found that 77% of
298 participants preferred a self-collection over attending a clinic.³⁹ Data on HPV self-sampling also
299 found that while acceptability was high, participants' preference for SCS versus provider-
300 collection was mixed: in a systematic review among women in mostly high-resource settings,
301 about half of the included studies showed that participants preferred SCS, while the other half
302 showed that women preferred provider-collection because they lacked confidence in their ability
303 to self-collect a sample correctly.⁴⁰ In ten of the 23 included studies, women felt that provider
304 sampling was more reliable than SCS. Data from other settings in SSA, too, show that our
305 findings are not unexpected: women in SSA reportedly preferred provider sampling to HPV self-
306 sampling, or preferred having a provider present during the process, because they feared hurting
307 themselves when self-collecting^{36,41,42} and/or not getting a good sample.^{36,43,44}

308

309 This study was novel in that it explored the acceptability of SCS among a general population of
310 women and men in a low-resource setting and provided participants the opportunity to self-
311 collect. Because they were able to use the swabs themselves, we were able to gather detailed and
312 practical feedback on the ease of use and their experience. Another strength of our study

313 included the qualitative nature of data collection. By using semi-structured interviews, we were
314 able to gather rich descriptions and a breadth of responses. Nevertheless, social desirability bias
315 may have affected our results: because our interviewers were RHSP staff members, participants
316 may have responded more favorably to SCS than they would have otherwise. Additionally, they
317 may have reported a preference for provider-collection out of respect for the RCCS providers,
318 even though confidentiality of responses was assured and reviewed during the informed consent
319 process. We doubt these possibilities strongly influenced our results, given the fact that
320 participants provided both advantages and disadvantages for both collection methods.

321
322 Lastly, another strength of our study was the purposeful selection of adult participants based on
323 both gender and symptom status. This allowed us to assess if acceptability varied between users
324 across these groups, which could help guide the development of future SCS/STI testing
325 interventions. However, this qualitative study focused only on men and women in the inland
326 community and we did not specifically recruit any high-risk groups, such as truck drivers, sex
327 workers or fisherfolk. Given their mobility and sexual risk behaviors, such groups may be
328 priority populations for SCS/STI testing services. Understanding their acceptance of SCS is
329 critical for future program development. Age³⁵ and knowledge of how to self-collect^{45, 46} have
330 also been shown to affect SCS acceptability. Level of education and/or socioeconomic status
331 may also influence participant preferences.^{45, 47, 48} We did not sample based on these criteria, but
332 recommend future studies use mixed methods to explore how such contexts could influence SCS
333 acceptability.

334

335 In conclusion, our study found that SCS were acceptable, but concerns over taking a sample
336 without a provider, self-harm and poor hygiene led the majority of men and women in our
337 population to prefer provider-collection. Nevertheless, users said they would still use SCS in the
338 future. Together, these findings suggest that SCS are an acceptable, additional approach to
339 current STI diagnostic methods. Future health communication messages to promote SCS/STI
340 testing can address user concerns and emphasize the perceived advantages. SSA needs a
341 diversity of strategies to address the burden of STIs; SCS/STI testing may be one useful tool in
342 the toolbox.

343

344 **References**

- 345 1. Cristillo AD, Bristow CC, Peeling R, et al. Point-of-care Sexually Transmitted Infection
346 diagnostics: Proceedings of the STAR Sexually Transmitted Infection-clinical trial group
347 programmatic meeting. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 2017;44(4):211-18. doi:
348 10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000572
- 349 2. World Bank. Sexually Transmitted Infections In Developing Countries: Current concepts and
350 strategies on improving STI prevention, treatment, and control (English). Washington,
351 D.C., 2008:1-55.
- 352 3. Garrett NJ, McGrath N, Mindel A. Advancing STI care in low/middle-income countries: Has
353 STI syndromic management reached its use-by date? *Sexually Transmitted Infections*
354 2017;93(1):4-5. doi: 10.1136/sextrans-2016-052581
- 355 4. Gaydos CA, Melendez JH. Point-by-Point Progress: Gonorrhea Point of Care Tests. *Expert*
356 *Rev Mol Diagn* 2020;20(8):803-13. doi: doi:10.1080/14737159.2020.1778467

- 357 5. Harding-Esch EM, Hollis E, Mohammed H, et al. Self-sampling and self-testing for STIs and
358 HIV: The case for consistent nomenclature. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*
359 2017;93(2):80-80. doi: 10.1136/sextrans-2016-052841
- 360 6. Taylor D, Lunny C, Wong T, et al. Self-collected versus clinician-collected sampling for
361 sexually transmitted infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis protocol.
362 *Systematic Reviews* 2013;2:93-93. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-2-93 [published Online First:
363 2013/10/12]
- 364 7. Kohl KS, Markowitz LE, Koumans EH. Developments in the screening for Chlamydia
365 trachomatis: A review. *Obstetrics and Gynecology Clinics of North America*
366 2003;30(4):637-58. [published Online First: 2004/01/15]
- 367 8. Jamil MS, Hocking JS, Bauer HM, et al. Home-based chlamydia and gonorrhoea screening: a
368 systematic review of strategies and outcomes. *BMC Public Health* 2013;13:189-89. doi:
369 10.1186/1471-2458-13-189 [published Online First: 2013/03/19]
- 370 9. Long L, Abraham C, Paquette R, et al. Brief interventions to prevent sexually transmitted
371 infections suitable for in-service use: A systematic review. *Preventive Medicine*
372 2016;91:364-82. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.06.038
- 373 10. Odesanmi TY, Wasti SP, Odesanmi OS, et al. Comparative effectiveness and acceptability of
374 home-based and clinic-based sampling methods for sexually transmissible infections
375 screening in females aged 14-50 years: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sexual*
376 *Health* 2013;10(6):559-69. doi: 10.1071/sh13029 [published Online First: 2013/10/29]
- 377 11. Geisler WM. Diagnosis and management of uncomplicated Chlamydia trachomatis infections
378 in adolescents and adults: Summary of evidence reviewed for the 2015 Centers for
379 Disease Control and Prevention Sexually Transmitted Diseases treatment guidelines.

- 380 *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2015;61 Suppl 8:S774-84. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ694
- 381 [published Online First: 2015/11/26]
- 382 12. Marrazzo JM, Scholes D. Acceptability of urine-based screening for Chlamydia trachomatis
- 383 in asymptomatic young men: a systematic review. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases*
- 384 2008;35(11 Suppl):S28-33. doi: 10.1097/OLQ.0b013e31816938ca [published Online
- 385 First: 2008/04/18]
- 386 13. Paudyal P, Llewellyn C, Lau J, et al. Obtaining self-samples to diagnose curable sexually
- 387 transmitted infections: a systematic review of patients' experiences. *PLoS One*
- 388 2015;10(4):e0124310-e10. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0124310 [published Online First:
- 389 2015/04/25]
- 390 14. Pavlin NL, Gunn JM, Parker R, et al. Implementing chlamydia screening: What do women
- 391 think? A systematic review of the literature. *BMC Public Health* 2006;6:221-21. doi:
- 392 10.1186/1471-2458-6-221 [published Online First: 2006/09/05]
- 393 15. Ong JJ, Hongyun F, Smith MK, et al. Expanding syphilis testing: a scoping review of
- 394 syphilis testing interventions among key populations. *Expert Review of Anti-infective*
- 395 *Therapy* 2018;16(5):423-32. doi: 10.1080/14787210.2018.1463846
- 396 16. Yared N, Horvath K, Fashanu O, et al. Optimizing screening for Sexually Transmitted
- 397 Infections in men using self-collected swabs: A systematic review. *Sexually Transmitted*
- 398 *Diseases* 2018;45(5):294-300. doi: 10.1097/OLQ.0000000000000739
- 399 17. Hobbs MM, Van Der Pol B, Totten P, et al. From the NIH: Proceedings of a workshop on the
- 400 importance of self-obtained vaginal specimens for detection of Sexually Transmitted
- 401 Infections. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 2008;35(1) doi:
- 402 10.1097/OLQ.0b013e31815d968d

- 403 18. Jones HE, Altini L, de Kock A, et al. Home-based versus clinic-based self-sampling and
404 testing for sexually transmitted infections in Gugulethu, South Africa: randomised
405 controlled trial. *Sex Transm Infect* 2007;83(7):552-57. doi: 10.1136/sti.2007.027060
406 [published Online First: 2007/09/29]
- 407 19. Ogale YP, Yeh PT, Kennedy CE, et al. Self-collection of samples as an additional approach
408 to deliver testing services for sexually transmitted infections: A systematic review and
409 meta-analysis. *BMJ Global Health* 2019;4(e001349)
- 410 20. Jaya ZN, Mapanga W, van Niekerk B, et al. Mapping Evidence of Self-Sampling to
411 Diagnose Sexually Transmitted Infections in Women: A Scoping Review. *Diagnostics*
412 2022;12(8):1803.
- 413 21. Garland SM, Tabrizi SN. Diagnosis of sexually transmitted infections (STI) using self-
414 collected non-invasive specimens. *Sexual Health* 2004;1:121-26. doi: 10.1071/SH03014
- 415 22. Potter Y. Self-screening for sexually transmitted infections. *Nursing Standard*
416 2014;28(41):37-43. doi: 10.7748/ns.28.41.37.e8767
- 417 23. World Health O. WHO consolidated guideline on self-care interventions for health: Sexual
418 and reproductive health and rights. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2019.
- 419 24. Low N, Broutet N, Adu-Sarkodie Y, et al. Global control of sexually transmitted infections.
420 *Lancet* 2006;368:2001-16. doi: 10.1016/S0140
- 421 25. Chang LW, Quinn TC, Reynolds SJ, et al. Heterogeneity of the HIV epidemic in agrarian,
422 trading, and fishing communities in Rakai, Uganda: an observational epidemiological
423 study. 2016;3 doi: 10.1016/S2352-3018(16)30034-0
- 424 26. Grabowski MK, Mpagazi J, Kiboneka S, et al. The HIV and sexually transmitted infection
425 syndemic following mass scale-up of combination HIV interventions in two communities

- 426 in southern Uganda: a population-based cross-sectional study. *Lancet Glob Health*
427 2022;10(12):e1825-e34. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(22)00424-7
- 428 27. Verbi Software. MAXQDA 2018 [computer software]. Berlin, Germany: VERBI Software,
429 2018.
- 430 28. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, et al. Using the framework method for the analysis of
431 qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical Research*
432 *Methodology* 2013;13(117):1-8.
- 433 29. Saldana J. The coding manual for qualitative researchers 2009.
- 434 30. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
435 *Psychology* 2006;3(2):77-101. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
- 436 31. Safaeian M, Kiddugavu M, Gravitt PE, et al. Comparability of self-collected vaginal swabs
437 and physician-collected cervical swabs for detection of human papillomavirus infections
438 in Rakai, Uganda. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 2007;34(7):429-36. doi:
439 10.1097/01.olq.0000243623.67673.22
- 440 32. Serwadda D, Wawer Maria J, Shah Keerti V, et al. Use of a hybrid capture assay of self-
441 collected vaginal swabs in rural Uganda for detection of Human Papillomavirus. *The*
442 *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 1999;180(4):1316-19. doi: 10.1086/315026
- 443 33. Gray RH, Wawer MJ, Girdner J, et al. Use of self-collected vaginal swabs for detection of
444 Chlamydia trachomatis infection. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 1998;25(8):450-50.
- 445 34. Wawer MJ, McNairn D, Wabwire-Mangen F, et al. Self-administered vaginal swabs for
446 population-based assessment of Trichomonas vaginalis prevalence. *The Lancet*
447 1995;345(8942):131-32. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(95)90100-0

- 448 35. Mitchell S, Ogilvie G, Steinberg M, et al. Assessing women's willingness to collect their own
449 cervical samples for HPV testing as part of the ASPIRE cervical cancer screening project
450 in Uganda. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics* 2011;114(2):111-15. doi:
451 10.1016/j.ijgo.2011.01.028
- 452 36. Bansil P, Wittet S, Lim JL, et al. Acceptability of self-collection sampling for HPV-DNA
453 testing in low-resource settings: A mixed methods approach. *BMC Public Health*
454 2014;14(1) doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-14-596
- 455 37. Harichund C, Moshabela M. Acceptability of HIV self-testing in sub-Saharan Africa:
456 Scoping study. *AIDS and Behavior* 2018;22(2):560-68. doi: 10.1007/s10461-017-1848-9
- 457 38. Hlongwa M, Mashamba-Thompson T, Makhunga S, et al. Men's perspectives on HIV self-
458 testing in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review and meta-synthesis. *BMC Public*
459 *Health* 2020;20(1):1-13. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-8184-0
- 460 39. Chai SJ, Aumakhan B, Barnes M, et al. Internet-based screening for sexually transmitted
461 infections to reach nonclinic populations in the community: risk factors for infection in
462 men. *Sex Transm Dis* 2010;37(12):756-63. doi:
463 10.1097/OLQ.0b013e3181e3d771.Internet-based
- 464 40. Morgan K, Azzani M, Khaing SL, et al. Acceptability of women self-sampling versus
465 clinician-collected samples for HPV DNA testing: A systematic review. *Journal of Lower*
466 *Genital Tract Disease* 2019;23(3):193-99. doi: 10.1097/LGT.0000000000000476
- 467 41. Bakiewicz A, Rasch V, Mwaiselage J, et al. “The best thing is that you are doing it for
468 yourself” – perspectives on acceptability and feasibility of HPV self-sampling among
469 cervical cancer screening clients in Tanzania: a qualitative pilot study. *BMC Women's*
470 *Health* 2020;20(1) doi: 10.1186/s12905-020-00917-7

- 471 42. Megersa BS, Busmann H, Bärnighausen T, et al. Community cervical cancer screening:
472 Barriers to successful home-based HPV self-sampling in Dabat district, North Gondar,
473 Ethiopia. A qualitative study. *PLOS ONE* 2020;15(12):e0243036. doi:
474 10.1371/journal.pone.0243036
- 475 43. Berner A, Hassel SB, Tebeu PM, et al. Human papillomavirus self-sampling in Cameroon:
476 Women's uncertainties over the reliability of the method are barriers to acceptance.
477 *Journal of Lower Genital Tract Disease* 2013;17(3):235-41. doi:
478 10.1097/LGT.0b013e31826b7b51
- 479 44. Kohler RE, Elliott T, Monare B, et al. HPV self-sampling acceptability and preferences
480 among women living with HIV in Botswana. *International Journal of Gynecology &*
481 *Obstetrics* 2019;147(3):332-38. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.12963
- 482 45. Dzinamarira T, Muvunyi CM, Kamanzi C, et al. HIV self-testing in Rwanda: awareness and
483 acceptability among male clinic attendees in Kigali, Rwanda: A cross-sectional survey.
484 *Heliyon* 2020;6(3) doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03515
- 485 46. Nodjokoumbaye ZA, Adawaye C, Mboumba Bouassa R-S, et al. A systematic review of
486 self-sampling for HPV testing in Africa. *International Journal of Gynecology &*
487 *Obstetrics* 2020;149(2):123-29. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijgo.13112>
- 488 47. Tisci SE, Shen YH, Fife D, et al. Patient acceptance of self-sampling for human
489 papillomavirus in rural China. *Journal of Lower Genital Tract Disease* 2003;7(2):107-16.
490 doi: 10.1097/00128360-200304000-00007
- 491 48. Van Rooyen H, Tulloch O, Mukoma W, et al. What are the constraints and opportunities for
492 HIVST scale-up in Africa? Evidence from Kenya, Malawi and South Africa. *Journal of*
493 *the International AIDS Society* 2015;18(1):1-9. doi: 10.7448/IAS.18.1.19445

494

495

496 **Table 1. Illustrative quotations by theme. Participants are described by their gender (M:**
 497 **male; F: female) and symptom status (S+: self-reported symptoms; S-: no self-reported**
 498 **symptoms)**
 499

Section header and corresponding text reference	Quotation (Participant description)
Overall experience	
A	<i>To be honest, me, I didn't find any problem with it...It was easy to me and I was very happy about it. (M, S-)</i>
B	<i>This time, we were given a chance to do it by ourselves without any difficulty.... I felt so good I was not scared at all; I did everything as instructed by the musawo <doctor> and I was able to collect the sample myself. (F, S+)</i>
C	<i>[I] am satisfied [with] being checked by a musawo, I don't like self-testing. (F, S+)</i>
SCS advantages	
D	<i>I prefer doing it [collecting a sample] myself...If a musawo collected from me and touches my penis, somehow, I will feel shy. (M, S+);</i>
E	<i>The good thing is that if I self-collect there is nothing like obuswavu <showing your nakedness> compared to when the health worker collects it....when the musawo is collecting the sample I must squat and then the musawo will see my private parts when removing the swab... I prefer collecting it myself. (F, S-)</i>
F	<i>Personally the issue I have noticed there with the musawo collecting the sample is...[because] you were not given proper notice, so probably you came when you have not groomed or prepared yourself well. That is the problem I see.... [laughs] the musawo may find when you are somehow dirty [laughs].... You might come when you have not cleaned up and she says, get ready am collecting the sample and you get embarrassed because you came not well prepared. (F, S+)</i>
G	<i>[Self-collecting] is good, and [secrets don't] spread because it is you that takes it off and give it to the health worker and it stops at you two....[Self-collection] will also continue to keep secrets because it remains with just you. (M, S-)</i>
H	<i>For those people who are afraid of approaching a health worker to tell him/her the truth; it will be good because they will be self-testing and doing everything by themselves...everyone has their own secrets that they are hiding. (F, S+)</i>
I	<i>You may find someone [a provider] who presses [the swab] so hard...but if it is you...[and] you get it yourself very well and find that you do not feel the pain like [when] the musawo does [it]. (M, S-)</i>
J	<i>Musawo, I know my body; the musawo may insert it far. [laughs]...I would be thinking that what if she pierces me. (F, S+)</i>
K	<i>[Because] you can test yourself, it helps you to save money, time say that you would have used from here for example to Kalisizo [the neighboring hospital]. (M, S+)</i>
SCS disadvantages	

L	<i>The health worker is more experienced in carrying out these tests and gets to know the results very fast. As for me, I will be there debating whether I carried out the test in the right way. (M, S-)</i>
M	<i>I might [use the swab] wrongly or insert it wrongly, I might not know exactly how best to insert it and how far it should go, however a musawo knows how best to insert and how far it should go and how best to remove it. (M, S+);</i>
N	<i>My worry is that [I] may insert it wrongly and hurt the uterus which may not be the case when the musawo does it because she knows how everything is. (F, S+);</i>
O	<i>Personally, I would prefer the health worker to collect...she is a health worker, she can't insert it as if she is going to kill you. (F, S+)</i>
P	<i>What causes me to fear is [that the provider] puts on gloves, [inaudible] and yet he has told me to do it with bare hands. Which means I can come when I have cleaned up myself, but someone else may come from the garden, has been digging and then starts from there. Now don't you see his hands, if they have germs and then he touches his genital areas...And it is not good for them. (M, S-)</i>
Preference and future use	
Q	<i>I would use [SCS in the future] because sexually transmitted infections don't just come in a particular time and stop – they come any time – so I would like to keep using this method so that I can know where I stand. (M, S-)</i>