



<https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.infections.100090>

HIV self-testing positivity rate and linkage to confirmatory testing and care: a telephone survey in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal

Arsène Kouassi Kra^{1*}, Arlette Simo Fotso^{1,2}, Nicolas Rouveau¹,
Mathieu Maheu-Giroux³, Marie-Claude Boily⁴, Romain Silhol⁴,
Marc d'Elbée^{1,5}, Anthony Vautier⁶ and Joseph Larmarange^{1,2} on
behalf of the ATLAS team

¹ Centre Population et Développement (Ceped), Université Paris Cité, Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), Inserm, France

² Institut National d'études Démographiques (Ined), France

³ Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada

⁴ MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

⁵ National Institute for Health and Medical Research UMR 1219, Research Institute for Sustainable Development EMR 271, Bordeaux Population Health Centre, University of Bordeaux, France

⁶ Solidarité Thérapeutique et Initiatives pour la Santé (Solthis), Sénégal

*Corresponding author

Correspondence: arsene.kra.kouassi@ceped.org

ABSTRACT

HIV self-testing (HIVST) empowers individuals to decide when and where to test and with whom to share their results. From 2019 to 2022, the ATLAS program distributed ~ 400 000 HIVST kits in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal. It prioritised key populations, including female sex workers and men who have sex with men, and encouraged secondary distribution of HIVST to their partners, peers and clients.

To preserve the confidential nature of HIVST, use of kits and their results were not systematically tracked. Instead, an anonymous phone survey was carried out in two phases during 2021 to estimate HIVST positivity rates (phase 1) and linkage to confirmatory testing (phase 2). Initially,

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35 participants were recruited via leaflets from March to June and completed a sociobehavioural
36 questionnaire. In the second phase (September-October), participants who had reported two
37 lines or who reported a reactive result were recontacted to complete another questionnaire. Of
38 the 2 615 initial participants, 89.7% reported a consistent response between the number of lines
39 on the HIVST and their interpretation of the result (i.e., 'non-reactive' for 1 line, 'reactive' for 2
40 lines).

41 Overall positivity rate based on self-interpreted HIVST results was 2.5% considering complete
42 responses, and could have ranged from 2.4% to 9.1% depending on the interpretation of
43 incomplete responses. Using the reported number of lines, this rate was estimated at 4.5%
44 (ranging from 4.4% to 7.2%). Positivity rates were significantly lower only among respondents
45 with higher education. No significant difference was observed by age, key population profile,
46 country or history of HIV testing.

47 The second phase saw 78 out of 126 eligible participants complete the questionnaire. Of the 27
48 who reported a consistent reactive response in the first phase, 15 (56%, 95%CI: 36 to 74%)
49 underwent confirmatory HIV testing, with 12 (80%) confirmed as HIV-positive, all of whom began
50 antiretroviral treatment.

51 The confirmation rate of HIVST results was fast, with 53% doing so within a week and 91% within
52 three months of self-testing. Two-thirds (65%) went to a general public facility, and one-third to
53 a facility dedicated to key populations.

54 The ATLAS HIVST distribution strategy reached people living with HIV in West Africa. Linkage to
55 confirmatory testing following a reactive HIVST remained relatively low in these first years of
56 HIVST implementation. However, if confirmed HIV-positive, almost all initiated treatment. HIVST
57 constitutes a relevant complementary tool to existing screening services.

58
59 **Keywords:** AIDS; HIV; Self-Testing; Key Populations; MSM; sex-workers; phone-based survey; West Africa;
60 confirmatory testing; follow-up care; public health program evaluation.
61

62
63

64

Introduction

65 Early testing followed by successful linkage to antiretroviral treatment for those diagnosed with HIV can
66 drastically reduce the risk of onward HIV transmission and mortality [1–6]. In 2021, according to the United
67 Nations Program for HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), 81% of the adult population living with HIV in West and Central Africa
68 knew their status. Only 77% of them were on antiretroviral treatment [7], below the 95-95-95 UNAIDS targets
69 for 2025 [8]. The 95-95-95 targets aim for 95% of people living with HIV to know their status, 95% of those
70 diagnosed to receive treatment, and 95% of those on treatment to achieve viral suppression. Improving
71 diagnosis coverage, especially among vulnerable key populations at high risk of HIV acquisition and
72 transmission, is the necessary first step to achieve this goal.

73 HIV self-testing (HIVST) is the process by which a person who wants to know their HIV status collects their
74 own sample (oral fluid or blood), performs the test, and then interprets the results themselves, often in a private
75 setting [9]. It is an innovative tool that empowers individuals and guarantees the confidentiality of the test
76 result [10]. Individuals may decide when and where to test and with whom they want to share their result. It
77 is a tool that is widely accepted by various populations, including key populations [11–18]. It has been shown
78 to be effective in screening populations vulnerable to HIV acquisition and transmission that are often hardly
79 reached through conventional approaches [19–21]. The World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended
80 HIVST as a complementary testing approach since 2016 [22].

81 The HIV Self-Testing in Africa (STAR) project carried in Eastern and Southern Africa and funded by Unitaid
82 aimed to boost the global market for HIVST (<https://www.psi.org/fr/project/star/>). The project unfolded in
83 three phases: Phase 1 ran from September 2015 to August 2017, Phase 2 spanned from August 2017 to July
84 2020, and Phase 3 took place between January 2020 and July 2021. Following the experience gained in Eastern
85 and Southern Africa under the STAR project [11, 23–28], the Unitaid funding agency sought to stimulate HIVST
86 in West Africa, where HIV epidemics are distinguished by their more concentrated and less generalised nature
87 compared to those in Eastern and Southern Africa. In this region, the general population prevalences are
88 relatively low to very low, and key populations (for example, female sex workers and men who have sex with
89 men) are particularly affected and bear a disproportionate share of the HIV burden [29]. The ATLAS programme
90 (*AutoTest de dépistage du VIH : Libre d'Accéder à la connaissance de son Statut*) aimed to promote, implement,
91 and expand HIVST in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal [30] where the national HIV prevalence in 2021 was 1.9%
92 (1.7%-2.2%), 0.8% (0.6%-1%), and 0.3% (0.3%-0.4%) respectively [31].

93 To preserve the anonymity and confidentiality of HIVST and not impede their use, ATLAS decided, in line
94 with WHO recommendations, not to track the use and outcomes of distributed HIVST kits systematically. Such
95 tracking can be logistically challenging and costly and could limit the distribution, redistribution and use of
96 HIVST [32]. Without systematic tracking, it is challenging to obtain information on the users of the HIVST,
97 their results and on linkage to confirmatory testing and treatment, which are crucial indicators to assess
98 program effectiveness and impact. For instance, the positivity rate can reflect the yield of new individuals
99 diagnosed with HIV and if the testing modality is indeed reaching those in need. Diagnosed individuals must
100 seek confirmatory testing and be linked to care to maximise health benefits and decrease onward
101 transmission.

102 We conducted an innovative survey by setting up an anonymous and free telephone platform in Côte
103 d'Ivoire, Mali and Senegal while preserving anonymity and encouraging voluntary participation. In the second
104 phase (September-October), participants who had reported two lines or a self-interpreted HIVST result as
105 reactive were recontacted to complete another questionnaire. Here we present the HIV test positivity rates
106 from the phase 1 questionnaire and the links with confirmatory tests and care.

107

Materials and Methods

108 ATLAS program description


109 ATLAS HIVST distribution was integrated into existing testing policies, programmes and activities in each
110 country; 397 367 HIVST kits were freely distributed between July 2019 and February 2022 as part of the three
111 countries' national AIDS strategies. At the time of ATLAS's implementation in 2019, only small-scale HIVST pilot
112 programs had been previously conducted in Senegal and Côte d'Ivoire, whereas Mali had no previous

113 experience with HIVST. In Senegal, for instance, the first pilot survey took place between April 2017 and June
 114 2018 [33].

115 The design of the different delivery channels and the priority populations were developed with country
 116 stakeholders including national AIDS programs/councils, international institutions including the WHO,
 117 international and national non-governmental organisations involved in local HIV programs, and civil society
 118 and community leaders. ATLAS HIVST distribution was organised through eight different operational delivery
 119 channels (Figure 1), i.e. five facility-based approaches (delivery of HIVST kits through public or community-
 120 based health facilities) and three community-based approaches involving outreach activities engaging female
 121 sex workers (FSW), men who have sex with men (MSM), and people who use drugs (PWUD) [30]. Peer
 122 educators conducted these outreach activities through group activities (e.g. talks, discussion groups, night
 123 visits, social events, or parties) and face-to-face activities (e.g. home visits). Outreach activities represented
 124 the majority (~85%) of ATLAS’s distribution volume.

125

ATLAS delivery channels to reach key populations and other vulnerable populations



126


127 **Figure 1.** ATLAS delivery channels (adapted from [30]). FSW=female sex workers, MSM=men who have
 128 sex with men, PLHIV=people living with HIV PMTCT=prevention of mother-to-child transmission,
 129 PWUD=people who use drugs, STI=sexually transmitted infection.

130

131 ATLAS activities relied on both primary and secondary distribution. HIVST kits were distributed by peer
 132 educators and healthcare professionals to primary contacts for their personal use (primary distribution). With
 133 secondary distribution, primary contacts were provided HIVST kits and invited to redistribute them to their
 134 peers, partners, and clients. These secondary contacts were often members of key populations that can be
 135 more difficult to engage in HIV prevention, along with other peripheral vulnerable populations. This chain-
 136 referral distribution of HIVST implies that end-users were not limited to primary contacts.

137 Only oral self-testing (OraQuick HIV Self-Test®) has been distributed through ATLAS. OraSure Technologies,
 138 the manufacturer of the OraQuick test, accompanies each HIVST kit with a user manual for result
 139 interpretation. OraQuick HIVST results should be interpreted as follow: “reactive” (“positive”) if two lines (C &
 140 T) are visible (even barely), “non-reactive” (“negative”) if only the C (control) line is visible, and “invalid” if no
 141 line is visible or if only the T (test) line is visible. To be noted, the French version of the HIVST instructions
 142 distributed by ATLAS (Figure 2, Figure S1) used the wording “reactive” / “non-reactive” instead of “positive” /
 143 “negative” to qualify the HIVST result, following WHO vocabulary in their HIVST guidelines [20] as an HIVST is
 144 triage test and does not provide a definitive HIV-positive diagnosis. The questionnaire of the survey also used
 145 “reactive” / “non-reactive” wording (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11061878>).

146



IN ALL CASES, IF YOU'RE NOT SURE OF YOUR RESULT, CALL 106 FOR HELP.

147

148

149

150

Figure 2. English translation of the guidelines for interpreting HIVST result, following manufacturer instructions for use (OraQuick HIV Self-Test®), as included in the ATLAS brochure distributed with HIVST (Ivorian version). See <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135> for the original French version.

151

152

153

154

155

156

In addition to the manufacturer's instructions, locally adapted brochures and explanatory videos in French and local languages have been developed to help users perform the test, interpret the result and know what actions should be taken following a non-reactive, a reactive or indeterminate result (for example : <https://youtu.be/laCCjVEKZto> in English or <https://youtu.be/1xzitLD309U> in French). They also encouraged people with a reactive HIVST to seek confirmatory HIV testing and care. Individuals with a non-reactive test

157 were invited to retest after 3 months if still exposed to HIV. Existing toll-free hotlines in each country were
158 strengthened and trained on HIVST, to offer information about HIV, prevention, testing, use and interpretation
159 of HIVST and counseling.

160 **Study design and data collection**

161 The ATLAS program embedded multiple research activities, from qualitative studies to economic analyses,
162 which have been described in detail elsewhere [17, 30, 34–37].

163 The program included a voluntary anonymous phone survey. Between mid-March and mid-June 2021,
164 dedicated survey flyers were distributed with the HIVST kits inviting self-test users in each country to call a toll-
165 free number to complete a questionnaire (phase 1). All calls from the three countries, over the same period,
166 were rerouted to a telephone platform located in Abidjan and operated by Ipsos Côte d'Ivoire, which was
167 selected following an international call for tenders.

168 A pilot survey was initially conducted without offering financial compensation to the participants [38].
169 Following its results, we decided to introduce a reward as a token of appreciation for the time participants
170 dedicated to the survey. Consequently, completion of the questionnaire was rewarded with 2 000 XOF
171 (approximately 3.40 USD) of phone communication credit. This reward was mentioned on the survey flyers. In
172 order to participate in the survey, participants had to be of legal age to use an HIVST on their own without
173 parental permission (16 years in Côte d'Ivoire, 18 years in Mali, and 15 years in Senegal) and had to have used
174 an HIVST provided to them through the ATLAS project.

175 As the survey was anonymous, there was a risk that some HIVST users may participate more than once or
176 that individuals who have never used HIVST tried to participate to receive the financial incentive. To limit these
177 risks, several measures were taken: (i) the leaflet distributed with the HIVST kits had a unique 9-digit number
178 generated by the research team that was requested prior to participation in the survey, (ii) the same unique
179 number could not be used twice, (iii) the financial incentive was only paid out once the questionnaire was fully
180 completed (however individuals could refuse to answer any particular question), (iv) the same telephone
181 number could not be used twice to receive the telephone credit. These unique 9-digit numbers were generated
182 non-sequentially and were grouped by country, delivery channel and implementing partner. Thus, any unique
183 number could indirectly identify the delivery channel where the HIVST kit was initially dispensed.

184 The time when participants received their HIVST kit was not collected. However, as a survey leaflet was
185 mandatory to participate, we could estimate that all participants received their HIVST kit during the survey
186 period (i.e. between mid-March and mid-June 2021).

187 The phase 1 questionnaire, which lasted 20 to 30 minutes, collected information on sociodemographic
188 characteristics of HIVST users (including age, sex, marital status, education level), testing history (having ever
189 tested for HIV before using HIVST and date of last HIV test), sexual and preventive behaviours, HIVST use and
190 difficulties encountered [39]. Specifically, each participant was asked about the number of lines that appeared
191 when reading the HIVST result and their self-interpretation of it (reactive or non-reactive).

192 In total, 2 615 participants were recruited for phase 1[39]. Those who reported two lines or a reactive
193 result (n=126) were asked for their consent to be called back a few months later to participate in a
194 complementary survey and, if consented, to provide a phone contact (n=120). As some individuals may delay
195 their decision to undergo a confirmatory test by several weeks/months after using an HIV self-test, we chose
196 a minimum of 3-month gap between our two surveys to potentially get an estimate of the maximum number
197 of participants who eventually underwent confirmatory testing.

198 From September 27th to October 22nd, 2021, 96 were successfully recontacted and invited to complete a
199 5-minute questionnaire (phase 2). Among those, 89 accepted to participate in phase 2 and 78 fully completed
200 phase 2 questionnaire. Phase 2 questionnaire asked the participants if they had undergone a confirmatory test
201 following their HIVST, reasons for not linking to confirmatory testing (if not linked), time between HIVST and
202 confirmatory testing (if linked), type of facility for confirmatory testing, confirmation test result, linkage to
203 antiretroviral treatment (if confirmed HIV-positive).

204
205 The interviews were conducted in either French, English, Bambara, or Wolof. On-the-fly translation into
206 other local languages was also available. Compensation of XOF 2 000 (≈3.40 USD) in the form of telephone
207 credit was given to participants who completed the phase 2 questionnaire. Unlike in phase 1, it was not a
208 financial incentive as participants were informed about it only at the end of the interview. Interviews were not

209 audio-recorded. Questionnaires' responses were captured on a computer and stored in a database managed
210 by PAC-CI, an Ivorian research institute with expertise in clinical research.

211 At the end of the survey, collected telephone numbers (for appointments and rewards) were deleted from
212 the database. All procedures have been described in a publicly available data management plan
213 (<https://dmp.opidor.fr/plans/3354/export.pdf>). The complete project protocol, including the data
214 management plan (required by the ethics committees), was written in French. Both phase 1 and phase 2
215 questionnaires have been made available online and a link is now provided
216 (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10210464>).

217 **Data analysis**

218 Following a previously published analysis [39], and due to the small numbers of participants in certain
219 distribution channels, distribution channels (Figure 1) were grouped into three categories: FSW-based
220 channels (outreach or facility-based), MSM-based channels (outreach or facility-based) and other channels
221 (PWUD-based channels, index testing, STI consultations). As the profile of participants should differ
222 substantially by sex and distribution channel (women from the FSW-based channel are more likely FSW while
223 those from the MSM-based channel are more likely female partners of MSM; men from the MSM-based
224 channel are more likely MSM while those from the FSW-based channel are more likely partners or clients of
225 FSW, see Figure 1), we decided to combine distribution channel and sex into a single combined variable named
226 key population profile.

227 Based on phase 1 participants' self-reports, we distinguished between those who provided a consistent
228 response, i.e. the reported number of visible lines was consistent with the reported self-interpretation (2
229 visible lines reported as reactive, one line reported as non-reactive, or no/one line and interpreted as invalid),
230 those who provided an inconsistent response, i.e. the number of visible lines was inconsistent with the self-
231 interpretation of the result, or those who returned only a partial response (refusal to answer or answered "I
232 don't know" to one or both questions).

233 Due to the inconsistency of responses, we considered self-reported results and reported number of HIVST
234 lines separately to estimate HIVST positivity rates. For each source, we calculated positivity rates for complete
235 responses (excluding 'don't know' and refusals (DK-R) from the numerator and denominator). We also
236 calculated the potential range of positivity rates by including incomplete responses (highest possible rate, DK-
237 R responses are considered reactive, and lowest possible rate, DK-R responses are considered non-reactive).

238 We conducted two separate multivariable logistic regressions, based respectively on self-interpreted
239 results and the reported number of lines, to analyse differences in positivity rates according to key population
240 profile, country, age group, marital status, educational level, and first-time tester. Global p-values for each
241 variable were computed using likelihood-ratio tests (using the *Anova()* function from 'car' R package). To
242 account for multiple comparisons, q-values were computed with the Bonferroni correction (using the R
243 *p.adjust()* function). We deemed it important to stratify the positivity rates by country, key population profile,
244 and age group (15-24, 25-34, and 35+).

245 We described the selection of eligible participants for phase 2 questionnaires and corresponding
246 participation rates. To assess any participation bias, characteristics of phase 2 participants (country, sex and
247 distribution channel, age group, marital status, educational level, and first-time testers, i.e. whether they ever
248 tested for HIV before using HIVST) were compared with individuals eligible for phase 2 but who did not
249 participate and with phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2. Simple comparisons were conducted using
250 chi-square tests, and multiple comparison was performed using a multivariable multinomial logistic regression
251 model, followed by the calculation of likelihood ratio tests.

252 Among phase 2 eligible participants who completed their questionnaire, linkage to confirmatory testing,
253 the proportion being confirmed HIV positive, and the proportion who initiated treatment were described,
254 stratified by the reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result in phase 1 questionnaire.

255 We also described (i) for those who did not link to confirmatory testing, the main reported reason; and (ii)
256 for those who did link to confirmatory testing, the type of facility attended for confirmation and the time
257 between HIVST and confirmatory testing.

258 A dedicated anonymised dataset and the corresponding R script are available on Zenodo
259 (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135>) to allow replication of the analysis. All analyses have been
260 performed using R version 4.3.1 [40]. All the descriptive tables were generated using the *tbl_summary()*
261 function from the 'gtsummary' package [41]. Confidence intervals (95% confidence interval, 95%CI) were

262 computed using Wilson's method with Yate's continuity correction (*prop.test()* function in the 'stats' package).
263 Multinomial models were computed with *multinom()* from the 'nnet' package and likelihood-ratio tests with
264 *Anova()* from 'car'.
265

266 **Ethics**

267 ATLAS research protocol (version 3.0, October 8 2020) has been approved by the WHO Ethical Research
268 Committee (January 12, 2021, reference: ERC 0003181), the National Ethics Committee for Life Sciences and
269 Health of Côte d'Ivoire (November 27, 2020, reference: 191-20/MSHP/CNESVS-km, IRB:000111917), the Ethics
270 Committee of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy of the University of Bamako, Mali (November 16, 2020,
271 reference: 2020/254/CE/FMPOS/FAPH), and the National Ethics Committee for Health Research of Senegal
272 (January 26, 2021, protocol SEN19/32, n°8 MSAS/CNERS/Sec).

273 The full research protocol was written in French (https://hal.science/ATLAS_ADVIH/hal-04121482v1). The
274 peer-reviewed protocol has been published in English elsewhere [30].

275 **Results**

276 **HIVST results**

277 Of the 2 615 participants recruited in phase 1, 2 346 (89.7%) reported a self-interpreted HIVST result
278 consistent with their reported number of visible lines on the HIVST: 2 292 (88.0%) reported one line self-
279 interpreted as non-reactive, 50 (1.9%) two lines self-interpreted as reactive, and 4 (0.2%) no/one line self-
280 interpreted as invalid (table 1). In contrast, 48 (1.8%) reported an inconsistent response: 10 (0.4%) one line
281 self-interpreted as reactive, 35 (1.3%) two lines self-interpreted as non-reactive/ and 3 (0.1%) no line self-
282 interpreted as non-reactive. Finally, 221 (8.5%) reported a partial result: 147 (5.6%) reported 0, 1 or 2 lines but
283 did not know how to interpret the result or refused to answer, 46 (1.7%) self-interpreted their result but did
284 not know or refused to report the number of lines, and 28 (1.1%) did not know or refused to answer to both
285 questions.

286

287 **Table 1.** Reported self-interpreted HIV self-test (HIVST) result, reported number of lines on the HIVST, and
 288 positivity rates according to different hypotheses among participants of the first phase of the survey in Côte
 289 d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

Phase 1 participants	Formula	2 615 (100%)
Consistent response (C)	$C = C_1 + C_2 + C_3$	2 346 (89.7%)
2 lines / reactive [†]	C_1	50 (1.9%)
1 line / non-reactive	C_2	2 292 (88%)
0-1 line/ invalid	C_3	4 (0.2%)
Inconsistent response (I)	$I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5$	48 (1.8%)
1 line / reactive [†]	I_1	10 (0.4%)
0 line / reactive [†]	I_2	0 (0%)
2 lines/ non-reactive [†]	I_3	35 (1.3%)
0 line / non-reactive	I_4	3 (0.1%)
2 lines/ invalid [†]	I_5	0 (0%)
Partial response (P)	$P = P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_5 + P_6 + P_7$	221 (8.5%)
0 line / DK-R	P_1	1 (<0.1%)
1 line / DK-R	P_2	117 (4.5%)
2 lines/ DK-R [†]	P_3	29 (1.1%)
DK-R / reactive [†]	P_4	2 (<0.1%)
DK-R / non-reactive	P_5	44 (1.7%)
DK-R / invalid	P_6	0 (0%)
DK-R / DK-R	P_7	28 (1.1%)
Positivity Rate		
Based on self-interpreted test results		
Lowest possible rate (DK-R as not reactive)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_4) / n$	62 / 2 615 (2.4 %)
Complete responses (DK-R excluded)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_4) / (C + I + P_4 + P_5 + P_6)$	62 / 2 440 (2.5 %)
Highest possible rate (DK-R as reactive)	$(C_1 + I_1 + I_2 + P_1 + P_2 + P_3 + P_4 + P_7) / n$	237 / 2 615 (9.1%)
Based on the reported number of lines		
Lowest possible rate (DK-R as 1 line)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3) / n$	114 / 2 615 (4.4 %)
Complete responses (DK-R excluded)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3) / (C + I + P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$	114 / 2 541 (4.5 %)
Highest possible rate (DK-R as 2 lines)	$(C_1 + I_3 + I_5 + P_3 + P_4 + P_5 + P_6 + P_7) / (C + I + P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$	188 / 2 615 (7.2 %)
†: Eligible for phase 2 Survey		
DK: don't know. R: refused to answer		

290

291 **HIVST positivity rates**

292 Based on the self-interpreted HIVST results, the overall positivity rate was 2.5% when only complete
 293 responses were considered (Table 1). It would have been similar (2.4%) if DK-R responses were considered
 294 non-reactive (lowest possible rate). Considering DK-Rs as reactive would have increased the positivity rate to
 295 9.1% (highest possible rate). Based on the estimated number of visible lines, the overall positivity rate was
 296 4.5% (complete responses, lowest possible rate: 4.4%, highest possible rate: 7.2%).

297 Multivariable models did not show any significant effect of key population profile, country, age group,
 298 marital status, or being a first-time tester on positivity rates (Tables S1a and S1b). No effect of educational


299 level was observed on positivity rates based on the reported number of visible lines. However, a significant
300 effect of the educational level was observed on positivity rates based on self-reported HIVST results ($p=0.002$,
301 $q=0.014$): individuals with a secondary or a higher level of education have a higher probability of reporting a
302 reactive test (adjusted OR equal to 4.00 [95% confidence interval: 1.44 to 12.9] and 4.12 [1.76 to 12.1]
303 respectively).

304 Although not statistically significant, we observed variations between key population profiles (Figure 3,
305 Table S2). Based on self-reported results, positivity rates were 3.4% for men [possible range from 3.2 to 9.8%]
306 and 1.0% for women [1.0 to 2.9%] in MSM-based channels, 1.7% for men [1.6 to 8.2%] and 2.7% [2.5 to 10.0%]
307 for women in FSW-based channels, vs 0.8% for men [0.7 to 5.8%] and 1.5% for women [1.4 to 8.2%] in the
308 other distribution channels (PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations). Observed positivity
309 rates varied by age group (Table S3): 2.4% for 15-24 years old [2.2 to 7.8%], compared to 2.9% for 25-34 years
310 old [2.7 to 9.5%] and 2.0% for those aged 35 years or older [1.8 to 12.0%].

311 **Participation in phase 2**

312 During phase 1, 126 individuals reported two lines or self-interpreted their result as reactive and were
313 therefore eligible for phase 2 (Table 1). Among them, 6 refused to be recontacted after phase 1 (Figure 4).
314 Among the 120 (95%) who agreed to be recontacted, 24 (20%) were unreachable at the time of the phase 2
315 survey, and 96 (80%) were successfully recontacted. Among the latest, 89 (93%) accepted to participate in the
316 phase 2 survey. Ten dropped out before the end of the interview, and 1 disconnected and was unreachable
317 afterwards. As a result, 78 participants completed phase 2 questionnaire. Of the 78 participants, 39 (50%) were
318 from Côte d'Ivoire, 31 (40%) from Mali, and 8 (10%) from Senegal (Table S2). Participation rates were 54%
319 (27/50) for participants who reported a consistent response (2 lines and reactive), 71% (32/45) for those with
320 an inconsistent response (either 2 lines & non-reactive, or 1 line & reactive), and 66% (19/31) for those
321 reporting a partial response (2 lines & DK-R or DK-R & reactive).


322 The participants who completed the phase 2 questionnaire had similar sociodemographic characteristics
323 (e.g. country, sex, distribution channel, age group, marital status) compared to those eligible for phase 2, but
324 that did not complete it, and to phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2 (Table S4). For most participants
325 (86%), phase 2 questionnaire was completed between 4 and 6 months after phase 1 questionnaire (Table S5).



327

328
329
330
331

Figure 3. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by key population profiles and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021). Error bars indicate possible range. An asterisk indicates that there was less than 25 participants in that distribution channel. FSW=female sex worker, MSM=men who have sex with men. MSM-based channels include facility-based and outreach. FSW-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.



332

333

334

335

Figure 4. Flow chart of the participant selection process for the 2nd phase of the survey in Côte d'Ivoire (CI), Mali (ML), and Senegal (SN) (2021).

336 **Linkage to confirmatory testing and care**

337 Overall, 34 of the 78 who completed the phase 2 questionnaire (44%) reported having performed
338 confirmatory testing. Linkage was higher for those who reported 2 lines and correctly self-interpreted their
339 result as reactive (56%, 95%CI: 36-74%), than for those who reported two lines but did not know or refused
340 to report their test interpretation (44%, (95%CI: 22-69%) and those who reported 2 lines but incorrectly
341 self-interpreted the result as non-reactive (36%, 95%CI: 19-57%) (Table 3). Finally, among the 8 participants
342 who reported none/one line or did not know how many lines and incorrectly self-interpreted the result as
343 reactive, only 2 linked to confirmatory testing.

344 The main reason given for not linking to confirmatory testing was that *"their HIVST was non-reactive"*
345 (18/44, 41%, and although 8 of these 18 reported a reactive result in phase 1 questionnaire), followed by
346 *"not knowing that a confirmation test was required"* (10/44, 23%), and *"not having time"* (8/44, 18%) (Table
347 S6).

348 When participants were linked to confirmatory testing, it was usually shortly after performing their
349 HIVST: 53% linked in less than one week and 91% in less than 3 months (Table S5). Most participants (65%)
350 performed their confirmatory testing in a general public facility (health centre, hospital, clinic or maternity)
351 whereas 35% chose a community-based clinic or health centre dedicated to key populations (Table S7).

352 Among the 34 that linked to confirmatory testing, 19 (56%, 95%CI: 38-72%) were confirmed HIV-
353 positive, and 18 (95%, 95%CI: 72-100%) initiated antiretroviral treatment. Of the 18 participants who
354 initiated ART, 11 (72%) underwent their confirmation test less than a week after their self-test, 2 (11%) did
355 so between 1 and 2 weeks, 1 (5.6%) between 3 and 4 weeks, 1 (5.6%) waited between 1 and 2 months, and
356 1 (5.6%) proceeded with the test three months later. Among the 27 who reported a consistent reactive
357 response in the phase 1 questionnaire, 15 (56%, 95%CI: 36-74%) linked to confirmatory test, 12 (80%) were
358 confirmed HIV-positive and all started treatment (100%).
359
360

361
362

Table 2. Linkage to confirmatory testing, proportion being confirmed HIV positive and treatment initiation, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result among eligible participants of the second phase of the survey who completed their questionnaire in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

Reported number of lines/ self-interpreted HIVST result	Completed phase 2 n	Linked to confirmatory testing		Confirmed HIV positive		Initiated ART	
		n (%)	95%CI	n (%)	95%CI	n (%)	95%CI
Overall	78	34 (44%)	33% to 55%	19 (56%)	38% to 72%	18 (95%)	72% to 100%
2 lines / reactive	27	15 (56%)	36% to 74%	12 (80%)	51% to 95%	12 (100%)	70% to 100%
1 line / reactive	7	1 (14%)	1% to 58%	0 (0%)	0% to 80%		
2 lines / non-reactive	25	9 (36%)	19% to 57%	3 (33%)	9% to 69%	3 (100%)	31% to 100%
2 lines / DK-R	18	8 (44%)	22% to 69%	4 (50%)	22% to 78%	3 (75%)	22% to 99%
DK-R / reactive	1	1(100%)	5% to 100%	0 (0%)	0% to 95%		

363
364

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer. CI: confidence interval.

365

Discussion

366 Our study shows that the strategy implemented by the ATLAS program, through primary and secondary
367 distribution of HIVST kits and dedicated channels, achieved HIV positivity rates of 2.5% (central hypothesis,
368 low: 2.4%, high: 9.1%) based on self-interpreted results, and 4.5% (central hypothesis, low: 4.4%, high:
369 7.2%) based on the reported number of lines. The proportion of participants with a reactive HIVST that
370 sought confirmatory testing was 44% (95% CI: 33%-55%). Of those who underwent confirmatory testing,
371 56% (95% CI: 38%-72%) were found to be HIV-positive and, among them, 95% (95% CI: 72%-100%) initiated
372 treatment. Among the participants who confirmed their reactive HIVST with a traditional facility-based HIV
373 test, 65% did so within a week and 91% within three months.

374
375 According to our estimates, HIVST positivity rates in Côte d'Ivoire were 2.0% (complete responses,
376 lowest possible: 1.8%, highest possible: 9.8%) based on self-interpreted results and 3.9% (3.8% to 5.4%)
377 based on the number of lines reported. In Mali, these rates were respectively 3.6% (3.5 to 6.7%) and 5.0%
378 (4.9% to 7.8%), while, in Senegal, they were 1.4% (1.2 to 15.0%) and 6.0% (5.4% to 14.9%). Overall, these
379 results for HIVST positivity are generally higher than the average overall positivity of HIV testing services
380 (excluding HIVST) in West Africa. For instance, in 2020 an estimated 1.9% of all HIV tests performed were
381 found to be positive in the region (95% credible intervals: 1.3 to 2.7%) [42]. Our results are in line with
382 data collected by ATLAS implementing partners. Between 2020 and 2021, these ATLAS partners collected
383 spontaneous feedback from HIVST users. This unpublished data collection was non-systematic and varied
384 from one partner to another. Among 4 463 documented feedbacks, HIVST was reactive for 188 cases
385 (4.2%), consistent with our estimates based on the reported number of visible lines (4.5%). In 2021, a study
386 based on the UNAIDS-supported *Shiny90* mathematical model [43] estimated, using data from 184
387 population surveys and reports from national HIV screening programs from 40 sub-Saharan African
388 countries, that the positivity rates for conventional HIV testing were 1.4% in Côte d'Ivoire, 2.2% in Mali,
389 and 1.0% in Senegal. Our estimates for HIVST were higher than these estimates for conventional testing.
390 Collectively, these results provide evidence that HIVST is a high-yield testing modality that can address the
391 unmet HIV testing needs of key populations and their partners.

392
393 It is important to interpret HIV positivity rates while considering the treatment-adjusted prevalence
394 (i.e., removing those on treatment from the numerator and denominator of HIV prevalence), a more
395 reliable indicator for evaluating the effectiveness and positivity rates of targeted screening programs [44].
396 In West Africa, the treatment-adjusted prevalence remained relatively low in 2021: 0.6% in Côte d'Ivoire,
397 0.7% in Mali, and 0.06% in Senegal, according to UNAIDS data (<https://aidsinfo.unaids.org/>). Our positivity
398 rates in each country are higher than the treatment-adjusted prevalence, suggesting that the ATLAS HIVST
399 distribution strategy successfully reached a hard-to-reach population and at positivity levels at least as high
400 as with passive surveillance.

401
402 In our study, 2.0% of the participants reported an inconsistent response between the number of visible
403 lines and their self-interpretation of the result and 6.0% reported a number of lines but didn't know how
404 to interpret it or refused to answer, suggesting potential issues in interpreting the number of visible lines
405 on HIVST kits. In the context of the ATLAS program, the distribution strategy combining primary and
406 secondary approaches has led many HIVST users to perform their HIVST without receiving advice from a
407 healthcare professional or a trained peer educator. Although the HIVST is not designed to require
408 supervision, it is essential to have received information on its use before proceeding with the test. A study
409 conducted within the framework of the ATLAS program demonstrated that the manufacturer's instructions
410 alone were insufficient in a multilingual context with low literacy levels. The use of additional aid, such as
411 a demonstration video or a toll-free helpline, proved to be necessary [45]. Similarly, a study carried out in
412 China in 2018 on the unsupervised use of HIVST among 27 MSM found that only 5 (or 19%) made no errors,
413 and 44% received an invalid test result due to various mistakes made [46]. However, the lack of supervision
414 is likely insufficient to explain the inconsistencies observed [23]. Some inconsistencies may result from a
415 misunderstanding of the terms "reactive" and "non-reactive", particularly considering that HIVST was a
416 new tool in our context and that traditional terms used to describe conventional HIV testing are "positive"
417 and "negative". This possible misunderstanding of the terms is also highlighted by the fact that 8

418 participants reported a “reactive” result in phase 1 questionnaire and then in phase 2 that their test was
419 “non-reactive” as the main reason for not linking to confirmatory testing. It is also suggested by the fact
420 that, in our multivariable logistic regression models, individuals with a low level of education were
421 significantly less likely to report a reactive HIVST result, while no significant difference was observed
422 regarding the reported number of visible lines. Specific qualitative interviews or focus groups discussion
423 with HIVST users could help better understand how they perceive different terms.
424

425 Linkage to confirmatory testing following a reactive test was 44% (95% confidence interval from 33%
426 to 55%). However, this estimate includes some individuals who did not adequately self-interpreted their
427 HIVST result as reactive. When considering only those who reported two lines and self-interpreted their
428 result as reactive, the linkage rate increased to 56% (36% to 74%). This percentage is closer to that was
429 observed in a study conducted in Kenya on HIV testing of FSW male partners using HIVST secondary
430 distribution, where 65% of men with a reactive result had a confirmatory test [47]. Our estimates were
431 based on small numbers resulting in large confidence intervals, but are still showing a low rate.

432 Linkage to confirmatory testing happened relatively quickly after HIVST use: 53% did it in less than a
433 week and 91% in less than three months. Similar results were observed in a study in the general population
434 in Zambia[48], and a study among MSM in Nigeria [49].
435

436 The main reasons given for not linking to confirmatory testing suggest potential misinterpretation of
437 the result or misunderstanding about the need to perform a confirmatory HIV test, highlighting the need
438 to improve messaging around HIVST, in particular when HIV self-testing policies will be scaled-up. For those
439 who did confirmatory testing and were confirmed HIV positive, initiation of antiretroviral treatment was
440 almost systematic, showing good linkage to care after confirmatory testing, as observed in many HIVST
441 studies in sub-Saharan Africa [50–52].
442

443 Previous analyses of ATLAS data showed that HIVST could reach people not reached by conventional
444 HIV testing approaches [53], particularly partners and clients of key populations and key population
445 members not self-identifying as such [54]. It is consistent with the finding that two-thirds of participants
446 who did confirmatory testing went to a general health facility rather than a community clinic dedicated to
447 key populations. In a study conducted in 2018 in Côte d’Ivoire among MSM, one-third of the participants
448 preferred community-based testing, one-third expressed no preference, and one-third preferred
449 undifferentiated HIV testing services (general population), mentioning the lack of discretion and anonymity
450 of community-based sites and the desire to avoid the gaze of others [55].
451

452 The implementation of a telephone survey, aimed at gathering information from HIVST users while
453 preserving anonymity and without interfering with secondary distribution, has proven to be very useful to
454 evaluate the ATLAS program. However, its high cost makes it difficult to integrate it into national strategies
455 for assessing the impact of HIVST. In addition, due to the small number of observations, we had low
456 statistical power regarding the estimates of positivity rates and linkage to confirmatory testing.
457 Nevertheless, other impact evaluation methods, such as data triangulation [36] and modelling [37], may
458 prove more suitable for routine monitoring of HIVST’s impacts.
459

460 A previous analysis of this survey among ATLAS HIVST users showed that HIVST secondary distribution
461 was feasible and acceptable [39]: participants reported that they appreciated the ease of use of HIVST, its
462 discretion and the fact that they are autonomous in carrying out the test. Finally, HIVST appeared as a
463 relevant additional approach for those usually distant from community activities and HIV testing services,
464 and has the potential to reach, beyond key populations, partners, clients, and other groups vulnerable to
465 HIV.
466

467 ATLAS’ HIVST distribution strategy successfully reached people living with HIV in West Africa, although
468 linkage to confirmatory testing following a reactive HIVST remained relatively low in these first years of
469 HIVST implementation, and sub-optimal in the perspective of achieving UNAIDS 95-95-95 targets.
470 However, among participants who confirmed their reactive self-test result with a traditional facility-based
471 HIV test, a substantial proportion quickly proceeded with this confirmation (more than half in less than a

472 week and the vast majority in less than three months). Furthermore, if individuals were confirmed HIV-
473 positive, almost all began antiretroviral treatment. We showed that HIVST has the potential to reach more
474 hidden populations and constitutes a relevant complementary tool to existing screening services. To fully
475 harness the potential of self-tests, messaging around HIVST and its interpretation could be improved.

476

Acknowledgements

477 We wish to acknowledge the commitment and determination of all the ATLAS program teams, which
478 made this research possible. We would also like to thank the interviewers for their professionalism in
479 collecting this sensitive data. Finally, we are grateful to the participants who were kind enough to give us
480 some of their time by agreeing to take part in the survey.

481

Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

482 Data, scripts and code are available online(<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11086135>) as well as the
483 survey questionnaires (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10210464>). Supplementary figures and tables are
484 provided in the appendices.

485

Conflict of interest disclosure

486 The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of no financial conflicts of interest in relation to
487 the content of the article. They declare no conflict of interest.

488

Funding

489 This work was supported by Unitaid (Grant Number: 2018-23 ATLAS) with additional funding from
490 Agence Française pour le Développement (AFD). AKK benefits from an ANRS thesis allowance. MMG's
491 research program is supported by a Canada Research Chair (Tier 2) in Population Health Modeling. The
492 funding bodies were not involved in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of
493 data and in writing the manuscript.

494 MCB and RS acknowledge funding from the MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (reference
495 MR/R015600/1), jointly funded by the UK Medical Research Council (MRC) and the UK Foreign,
496 Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), under the MRC/FCDO Concordat agreement and is also
497 part of the EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union. For the purpose of open access, the
498 author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license to any Author Accepted Manuscript
499 version arising.

500

501

References

- 502 1. Das M, Chu PL, Santos G-M, Scheer S, Vittinghoff E, McFarland W, et al. Decreases in Community
503 Viral Load Are Accompanied by Reductions in New HIV Infections in San Francisco. *PLoS ONE*.
504 2010;5:e11068.
- 505 2. Lima VD, Johnston K, Hogg RS, Levy AR, Harrigan PR, Anema A, et al. Expanded Access to Highly
506 Active Antiretroviral Therapy: A Potentially Powerful Strategy to Curb the Growth of the HIV
507 Epidemic. *J Infect Dis*. 2008;198:59–67.
- 508 3. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, Gamble T, Hosseinipour MC, Kumarasamy N, et al. Prevention
509 of HIV-1 Infection with Early Antiretroviral Therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:493–505.
- 510 4. Quinn TC, Wawer MJ, Sewankambo N, Serwadda D, Li C, Wabwire-Mangen F, et al. Viral Load
511 and Heterosexual Transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1. *N Engl J Med*.
512 2000;342:921–9.
- 513 5. Hayes RJ, Donnell D, Floyd S, Mandla N, Bwalya J, Sabapathy K, et al. Effect of Universal Testing
514 and Treatment on HIV Incidence — HPTN 071 (PopART). *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381:207–18.

- 515 6. Grinsztejn B, Hosseinipour MC, Ribaud H, Swindells S, Eron J, Chen YQ, et al. Effects of early
516 versus delayed initiation of antiretroviral treatment on clinical outcomes of HIV-1 infection: results
517 from the phase 3 HPTN 052 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2014;14:281–90.
- 518 7. UNAIDS. UNAIDS data 2021. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on
519 HIV/AIDS;UNAIDS/JC3032E. Geneva; 2021.
- 520 8. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. Fast-Track - Ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030.
521 https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/JC2686_WAD2014report_en.pdf. Geneva;
522 2014.
- 523 9. Johnson C, Baggaley R, Forsythe S, van Rooyen H, Ford N, Napierala Mavedzenge S, et al. Realizing
524 the Potential for HIV Self-Testing. *AIDS Behav.* 2014;18:391–5.
- 525 10. Njau B, Covin C, Lisasi E, Damian D, Mushi D, Boule A, et al. A systematic review of qualitative
526 evidence on factors enabling and deterring uptake of HIV self-testing in Africa. *BMC Public Health.*
527 2019;19:1289.
- 528 11. Hector J, Davies M-A, Dekker-Boersema J, Aly MM, Abdalad CCA, Langa EBR, et al.
529 Acceptability and performance of a directly assisted oral HIV self-testing intervention in adolescents in
530 rural Mozambique. *PloS One.* 2018;13:e0195391.
- 531 12. Grésenguet G, Longo J de D, Tonen-Wolyec S, Bouassa R-SM, Belec L. Acceptability and Usability
532 Evaluation of Finger-Stick Whole Blood HIV Self-Test as An HIV Screening Tool Adapted to The
533 General Public in The Central African Republic. *Open AIDS J.* 2017;11:101–18.
- 534 13. Harichund C, Moshabela M, Kunene P, Abdool Karim Q. Acceptability of HIV self-testing among
535 men and women in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *AIDS Care.* 2019;31:186–92.
- 536 14. Kalibala S, Tun W, Cherutich P, Nganga A, Oweya E, Oluoch P. Factors Associated with
537 Acceptability of HIV Self-Testing Among Health Care Workers in Kenya. *AIDS Behav.* 2014;18:405–
538 14.
- 539 15. Kelvin EA, Cheruvillil S, Christian S, Mantell JE, Milford C, Rambally-Greener L, et al. Choice in
540 HIV testing: the acceptability and anticipated use of a self-administered at-home oral HIV test among
541 South Africans. *Afr J AIDS Res.* 2016;15:99–108.
- 542 16. Martínez Pérez G, Steele SJ, Govender I, Arellano G, Mkwamba A, Hadebe M, et al. Supervised
543 oral HIV self-testing is accurate in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Trop Med Int Health.*
544 2016;21:759–67.
- 545 17. Ky-Zerbo O, Desclaux A, Boye S, Vautier A, Rouveau N, Kouadio BA, et al. Willingness to use
546 and distribute HIV self-test kits to clients and partners: A qualitative analysis of female sex workers’
547 collective opinion and attitude in Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal. *Womens Health.*
548 2022;18:174550572210922.
- 549 18. Kurth AE, Cleland CM, Chhun N, Sidle JE, Were E, Naanyu V, et al. Accuracy and Acceptability
550 of Oral Fluid HIV Self-Testing in a General Adult Population in Kenya. *AIDS Behav.* 2016;20:870–9.
- 551 19. Johnson CC, Kennedy C, Fonner V, Siegfried N, Figueroa C, Dalal S, et al. Examining the effects
552 of HIV self-testing compared to standard HIV testing services: a systematic review and meta-analysis.
553 *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2017;20:21594.

- 554 20. World Health Organization. RECOMMENDS HIV SELFTESTING – EVIDENCE UPDATE AND
555 CONSIDERATIONS FOR SUCCESS. [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/329968/WHO-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/329968/WHO-CDS-HIV-19.36-eng.pdf)
556 CDS-HIV-19.36-eng.pdf. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019.
- 557 21. Choko AT, Jamil MS, MacPherson P, Corbett E, Chitembo L, Ingold H, et al. Measuring linkage to
558 HIV treatment services following HIV self-testing in low-income settings. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2020;23.
- 559 22. World Health Organization. Guidelines on HIV self-testing and partner notification: supplement to
560 Consolidated guidelines on HIV testing services. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/251655>. 2016.
- 561 23. Asiimwe S, Oloya J, Song X, Whalen CC. Accuracy of Un-supervised Versus Provider-Supervised
562 Self-administered HIV Testing in Uganda: A Randomized Implementation Trial. *AIDS Behav.*
563 2014;18:2477–84.
- 564 24. Figueroa C, Johnson C, Ford N, Sands A, Dalal S, Meurant R, et al. Reliability of HIV rapid
565 diagnostic tests for self-testing compared with testing by health-care workers: a systematic review and
566 meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV.* 2018;5:e277–90.
- 567 25. Chanda MM, Ortblad KF, Mwale M, Chongo S, Kanchele C, Kamungoma N, et al. HIV self-testing
568 among female sex workers in Zambia: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *PLOS Med.*
569 2017;14:e1002442.
- 570 26. Tonen-Wolyec S, Filali M, Mboup S, Bélec L. HIV self-testing in Africa: stakes and challenges.
571 *Médecine Santé Trop.* 2018;28:144–9.
- 572 27. Pant Pai N, Behlim T, Abrahams L, Vadnais C, Shivkumar S, Pillay S, et al. Will an Unsupervised
573 Self-Testing Strategy for HIV Work in Health Care Workers of South Africa? A Cross Sectional Pilot
574 Feasibility Study. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8:e79772.
- 575 28. Brown AN, Djimeu EW, Cameron DB. A Review of the Evidence of Harm from Self-Tests. *AIDS*
576 *Behav.* 2014;18:445–9.
- 577 29. Dwyer-Lindgren L, Cork MA, Sligar A, Steuben KM, Wilson KF, Provost NR, et al. Mapping HIV
578 prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa between 2000 and 2017. *Nature.* 2019;570:189–93.
- 579 30. Rouveau N, Ky-Zerbo O, Boye S, Fotso AS, d’Elbée M, Maheu-Giroux M, et al. Describing,
580 analysing and understanding the effects of the introduction of HIV self-testing in West Africa through
581 the ATLAS programme in Côte d’Ivoire, Mali and Senegal. *BMC Public Health.* 2021;21:181.
- 582 31. UNAIDS. UNAIDS DATA 2022. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on
583 HIV/AIDS;UNAIDS/JC3063E.[https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/data-book-](https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/data-book-2022_en.pdf)
584 2022_en.pdf. Geneva: Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS; 2022.
- 585 32. World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on HIV prevention, testing, treatment, service
586 delivery and monitoring: recommendations for a public health approach.
587 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK572729/>. 2021 update. Geneva: World Health Organization;
588 2021.
- 589 33. Lyons CE, Coly K, Bowring AL, Liestman B, Diouf D, Wong VJ, et al. Use and Acceptability of
590 HIV Self-Testing Among First-Time Testers at Risk for HIV in Senegal. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23:130–
591 41.
- 592 34. Boye S, Bouaré S, Ky-Zerbo O, Rouveau N, Simo Fotso A, d’Elbée M, et al. Challenges of HIV
593 Self-Test Distribution for Index Testing When HIV Status Disclosure Is Low: Preliminary Results of a
594 Qualitative Study in Bamako (Mali) as Part of the ATLAS Project. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:653543.

- 595 35. d'Elbée M, Traore MM, Badiane K, Vautier A, Simo Fotso A, Kabemba OK, et al. Costs and Scale-
596 Up Costs of Integrating HIV Self-Testing Into Civil Society Organisation-Led Programmes for Key
597 Populations in Côte d'Ivoire, Senegal, and Mali. *Front Public Health*. 2021;9:653612.
- 598 36. Simo Fotso A, Johnson C, Vautier A, Kouamé KB, Diop PM, Silhol R, et al. Routine programmatic
599 data show a positive population-level impact of HIV self-testing: the case of Côte d'Ivoire and
600 implications for implementation. *AIDS*. 2022;36:1871–9.
- 601 37. Silhol R, Maheu-Giroux M, Soni N, Fotso AS, Rouveau N, Vautier A, et al. Assessing the potential
602 population-level impacts of HIV self-testing distribution among key populations in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali,
603 and Senegal: a mathematical modelling analysis. preprint. *HIV/AIDS*; 2023.
- 604 38. Simo Fotso A, Kra AK, Maheu-Giroux M, Boye S, d'Elbée M, Ky-zerbo O, et al. Is it possible to
605 recruit HIV self-test users for an anonymous phone-based survey using passive recruitment without
606 financial incentives? Lessons learned from a pilot study in Côte d'Ivoire. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*.
607 2022;8:4.
- 608 39. Kra AK, Fosto AS, N'guessan KN, Geoffroy O, Younoussa S, Kabemba OK, et al. Can HIV self-
609 testing reach first-time testers? A telephone survey among self-test end users in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali,
610 and Senegal. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2023;22:972.
- 611 40. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org/)
612 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/). 2021.
- 613 41. Sjoberg D D, Whiting K, Curry M, Lavery J A, Larmarange J. Reproducible Summary Tables with
614 the gtsummary Package. *R J*. 2021;13:570.
- 615 42. Giguère K, Eaton JW, Marsh K, Johnson LF, Johnson CC, Ehui E, et al. Trends in knowledge of
616 HIV status and efficiency of HIV testing services in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000–20: a modelling study
617 using survey and HIV testing programme data. *Lancet HIV*. 2021;8:e284–93.
- 618 43. Maheu-Giroux M, Marsh K, Doyle CM, Godin A, Lanièce Delaunay C, Johnson LF, et al. National
619 HIV testing and diagnosis coverage in sub-Saharan Africa: a new modeling tool for estimating the 'first
620 90' from program and survey data. *AIDS*. 2019;33 Supplement 3:S255–69.
- 621 44. Tippet Barr B, Lowrance D, Case Johnson C, Baggaley RC, Rogers J, Balachandra S, et al.
622 Treatment-adjusted prevalence to assess HIV testing programmes. *Bull World Health Organ*.
623 2021;99:874–82.
- 624 45. Vautier A. Is manufacturer's Instructions-For-Use sufficient in a multilingual and low literacy
625 context? The example of HIV self-testing in West Africa. INTEREST Workshop, Dec 2020, virtual
626 conference, Netherlands. <https://hal.science/hal-04120869>. 2020.
- 627 46. Wei C, Yan L, Li J, Su X, Lippman S, Yan H. Which user errors matter during HIV self-testing? A
628 qualitative participant observation study of men who have sex with men (MSM) in China. *BMC Public*
629 *Health*. 2018;18:1108.
- 630 47. Thirumurthy H, Masters SH, Mavedzenge SN, Maman S, Omanga E, Agot K. Promoting male
631 partner HIV testing and safer sexual decision making through secondary distribution of self-tests by
632 HIV-negative female sex workers and women receiving antenatal and post-partum care in Kenya: a
633 cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2016;3:e266–74.
- 634 48. Chipungu J, Bosomprah S, Zanolini A, Thimurthy H, Chilengi R, Sharma A, et al. Understanding
635 linkage to care with HIV self-test approach in Lusaka, Zambia - A mixed method approach. *PLOS*
636 *ONE*. 2017;12:e0187998.

- 637 49. Tun W, Vu L, Dirisu O, Sekoni A, Shoyemi E, Njab J, et al. Uptake of HIV self-testing and linkage
638 to treatment among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Nigeria: A pilot programme using key
639 opinion leaders to reach MSM. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2018;21:e25124.
- 640 50. Choko AT, MacPherson P, Webb EL, Willey BA, Feasy H, Sambakunsi R, et al. Uptake, Accuracy,
641 Safety, and Linkage into Care over Two Years of Promoting Annual Self-Testing for HIV in Blantyre,
642 Malawi: A Community-Based Prospective Study. *PLOS Med.* 2015;12:e1001873.
- 643 51. Green KE, Vu BN, Phan HT, Tran MH, Ngo HV, Vo SH, et al. From conventional to disruptive:
644 upturning the HIV testing status quo among men who have sex with men in Vietnam. *J Int AIDS Soc.*
645 2018;21 Suppl 5:e25127.
- 646 52. Hlongwa M, Hlongwana K, Makhunga S, Choko AT, Dzinamarira T, Conserve D, et al. Linkage to
647 HIV Care Following HIV Self-testing Among Men: Systematic Review of Quantitative and Qualitative
648 Studies from Six Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. *AIDS Behav.* 2023;27:651–66.
- 649 53. Ky-Zerbo O, Desclaux A, Kouadio AB, Rouveau N, Vautier A, Sow S, et al. Enthusiasm for
650 Introducing and Integrating HIV Self-Testing but Doubts About Users: A Baseline Qualitative Analysis
651 of Key Stakeholders' Attitudes and Perceptions in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali and Senegal. *Front Public Health.*
652 2021;9.
- 653 54. Kouassi AK, Fosto AS, N'Guessan NK, Geoffroy O, Younoussa S, Kabemba OK, et al. Reaching
654 key and peripheral populations: a phone-based survey of HIV self-test users in West Africa. Durban:
655 poster #PEC004. <https://hal.science/hal-04121478>. 2021.
- 656 55. Inghels M, Kouassi AK, Niangoran S, Bekelynck A, Carilon S, Sika L, et al. Preferences and access
657 to community-based HIV testing sites among men who have sex with men (MSM) in Côte d'Ivoire.
658 *BMJ Open.* 2022;12:e052536.
- 659

660

Appendices

661

662

663

Table S1a: Factors associated (logistic regression) with positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021)

	Adjusted OR	95% CI	p-value	q-value
(Intercept)	0.04	0.01, 0.10	<0.001	<0.001
Key population profile			0.5	>0.9
Man : MSM-based channels	—	—		
Woman : MSM-based channels	1.14	0.38, 2.73		
Man : FSW-based channels	0.90	0.54, 1.49		
Woman : FSW-based channels	0.69	0.40, 1.17		
Man: Other delivery channels	0.46	0.13, 1.29		
Woman : Other delivery channels	0.40	0.06, 1.49		
Country			0.3	>0.9
Côte d'Ivoire	—	—		
Mali	1.22	0.80, 1.88		
Senegal	1.79	0.84, 3.59		
Age group			0.079	0.6
15-24 years or less	—	—		
25-34 years	1.56	1.02, 2.42		
35 years or more	1.78	0.92, 3.34		
Marital status			0.2	>0.9
single	—	—		
divorced / separated / widowed	0.48	0.21, 1.22		
living with partner / married	0.64	0.28, 1.60		
Educational level			0.2	>0.9
none / primary	—	—		
secondary	1.49	0.78, 2.86		
higher	1.56	0.95, 2.64		
First time tester			0.083	0.6
no	—	—		
yes	1.44	0.95, 2.16		

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

664

665

666
667

Table S1b: Factors associated (logistic regression) with positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021)

	adjusted OR	95% CI	p-value	q-value
(Intercept)	0.01	0.00, 0.06	<0.001	<0.001
Key population profile			0.13	>0.9
Man : MSM-based channels	—	—		
Woman : MSM-based channels	0.28	0.02, 1.35		
Man : FSW-based channels	0.42	0.19, 0.86		
Woman : FSW-based channels	0.55	0.28, 1.05		
Man: Other delivery channels	0.25	0.01, 1.40		
Woman : Other delivery channels	0.42	0.02, 2.42		
Country			0.2	>0.9
Côte d'Ivoire	—	—		
Mali	1.48	0.85, 2.62		
Senegal	0.69	0.15, 2.31		
Age group			0.3	>0.9
15-24 years or less	—	—		
25-34 years	1.57	0.89, 2.79		
35 years or more	1.35	0.48, 3.39		
Marital status			0.5	>0.9
single	—	—		
divorced / separated / widowed	0.53	0.18, 1.98		
living with partner / married	0.48	0.16, 1.79		
Educational level			0.002	0.014
none / primary	—	—		
secondary	4.00	1.44, 12.9		
higher	4.12	1.76, 12.1		
First time tester			0.10	0.7
no	—	—		
yes	1.58	0.91, 2.78		

668
669

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

670
671
672

Table S2. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by distribution channel, sex and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021). FSW-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.

		MSM-based channels		FSW-based channels		Others delivery channels		Total	
		Man	Woman	Man	Woman	Man	Woman		
Positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST results	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	2.5% (16/650)	1.4% (1/73)	1.5% (5/339)	1.2% (3/245)	0% (0/60)	0% (0/23) †	1.8% (25/1 390)
		Mali	4.6% (14/306)	0% (0/29)	1.9% (5/269)	3.9% (14/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	3.5% (34/984)
		Senegal	4.9% (2/41)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/12) †	0% (0/80)	0% (0/66)	2.4% (1/41)	1.2% (3/241)
		Overall	3.2% (32/997)	1.0% (1/103)	1.6% (10/620)	2.5% (17/685)	0.7% (1/137)	1.4% (1/73)	2.4% (62/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	2.7% (16/597)	1.4% (1/71)	1.6% (5/311)	1.4% (3/221)	0% (0/58)	0% (0/21) †	2.0% (25/1 279)
		Mali	4.7% (14/301)	0% (0/29)	1.9% (5/257)	4.1% (14/345)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	3.6% (34/952)
		Senegal	6.1% (2/33)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/11) †	0% (0/65)	0% (0/61)	2.6% (1/38)	1.4% (3/209)
		Overall	3.4% (32/931)	1.0% (1/101)	1.7% (10/579)	2.7% (17/631)	0.8% (1/130)	1.5% (1/68)	2.5% (62/2 440)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	10.6% (69/650)	4.1% (3/73)	9.7% (33/339)	11% (27/245)	3.3% (2/60)	8.7% (2/23)	9.8% (136/1 390)
		Mali	6.2% (19/306)	0% (0/29)	6.3% (17/269)	8.1% (29/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	6.7% (66/984)
		Senegal	24.0% (10/41)	0.0% (0/1) †	8.3% (1/12) †	19.0% (15/80)	7.6% (5/66)	9.8% (4/41)	15.0% (35/241)
		Overall	9.8% (98/997)	2.9% (3/103)	8.2% (51/620)	10.0% (71/685)	5.8% (8/137)	8.2% (6/73)	9.1% (237/2 615)
Positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	4.2% (27/650)	5.5% (4/73)	4.7% (16/339)	2.0% (5/245)	0% (0/60)	4.3% (1/23)	3.8% (53/1 390)
		Mali	4.9% (15/306)	3.4% (1/29)	4.5% (12/269)	5.3% (19/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	4.9% (48/984)
		Senegal	12.2% (5/41)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/12) †	5.0% (4/80)	4.5% (3/66)	2.4% (1/41)	5.4% (13/241)
		Overall	4.7% (47/997)	4.9% (5/103)	4.5% (28/620)	4.1% (28/685)	2.9% (4/137)	2.7% (2/73)	4.4% (114/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	4.2% (27/641)	5.5% (4/73)	4.8% (16/331)	2.1% (5/241)	0% (0/60)	4.5% (1/22) †	3.9% (53/1 368)
		Mali	5.0% (15/298)	3.4% (1/29)	4.5% (12/264)	5.5% (19/344)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	5.0% (48/955)
		Senegal	13.2% (5/38)	0% (0/1) †	0% (0/10) †	5.3% (4/75)	5.3% (3/57)	2.7% (1/37)	6.0% (13/218)
		Overall	4.8% (47/977)	4.9% (5/103)	4.6% (28/605)	4.2% (28/660)	3.1% (4/128)	2.9% (2/68)	4.5% (114/2 541)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	5.5% (36/650)	5.5% (4/73)	7.1% (24/339)	3.7% (9/245)	0% (0/60)	8.7% (2/23) †	5.4% (75/1 390)
		Mali	7.5% (23/306)	3.4% (1/29)	6.3% (17/269)	9.7% (35/360)	9.1% (1/11) †	0% (0/9) †	7.8% (77/984)
		Senegal	19.5% (8/41)	0% (0/1) †	16.7% (2/12) †	11.2% (9/80)	18.2% (12/66)	12.2% (5/41)	14.9% (36/241)
		Overall	6.7% (67/997)	4.9% (5/103)	6.9% (43/620)	7.7% (53/685)	9.5% (13/137)	9.6% (7/73)	7.2% (188/2 615)

673
674
675
676
677

DK: don't know. R: refusals. FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men, PR: positivity rate.

†: indicated cells with less than 25 participants.

Lowest possible rate: DK-R as non-reactive or 1 line. Complete responses: DK-R excluded from the numerator and the denominator. Highest possible rate: DK-R as reactive or 2 lines.

678
679

Table S3. Positivity rates based on self-interpreted HIVST results or the reported number of visible lines, by age group and country, among participants of the first survey phase in Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, and Senegal (2021).

			15-24 years	25-34 years old	35 years or more	Total
Positivity rate based on self-reported HIVST results	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	1.7% (11/645)	2.0% (11/553)	1.6% (3/192)	1.8% (25/1 390)
		Mali	3.3% (15/455)	3.9% (16/415)	2.6% (3/114)	3.5% (34/984)
		Senegal	0.0% (0/64)	2.1% (2/95)	1.2% (1/82)	1.2% (3/241)
		Overall	2.2% (26/1 164)	2.7% (29/1 063)	1.8% (7/388)	2.4% (62/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	1.8% (11/604)	2.2% (11/506)	1.8% (3/169)	2.0% (25/1 279)
		Mali	3.4% (15/439)	4.0% (16/403)	2.7% (3/110)	3.6% (34/952)
		Senegal	0.0% (0/56)	2.4% (2/82)	1.4% (1/71)	1.4% (3/209)
		Overall	2.4% (26/1 099)	2.9% (29/991)	2.0% (7/350)	2.5% (62/2 440)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	8.1% (52/645)	10.0% (58/553)	14.0% (26/192)	9.8% (136/1 390)
		Mali	6.8% (31/455)	6.7% (28/415)	6.1% (7/114)	6.7% (66/984)
		Senegal	13.0% (8/64)	16.0% (15/95)	15.0% (12/82)	15.0% (35/241)
		Overall	7.8% (91/1 164)	9.5% (101/1 063)	12.0% (45/388)	9.1% (237/2 615)
Positivity rate based on the reported number of visible lines	Lowest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	3.1% (20/645)	4.5% (25/553)	4.2% (8/192)	3.8% (53/1 390)
		Mali	4.8% (22/455)	4.8% (20/415)	5.3% (6/114)	4.9% (48/984)
		Senegal	1.6% (1/64)	7.4% (7/95)	6.1% (5/82)	5.4% (13/241)
		Overall	3.7% (43/1 164)	4.9% (52/1 063)	4.9% (19/388)	4.4% (114/2 615)
	Complete responses	Côte d'Ivoire	3.1% (20/637)	4.6% (25/546)	4.3% (8/185)	3.9% (53/1 368)
		Mali	4.9% (22/447)	5.0% (20/401)	5.6% (6/107)	5.0% (48/955)
		Senegal	1.9% (1/54)	8.2% (7/85)	6.3% (5/79)	6.0% (13/218)
		Overall	3.8% (43/1 138)	5.0% (52/1 032)	5.1% (19/371)	4.5% (114/2 541)
	Highest possible rate	Côte d'Ivoire	4.3% (28/645)	5.8% (32/553)	7.8% (15/192)	5.4% (75/1 390)
		Mali	6.6% (30/455)	8.2% (34/415)	11.0% (13/114)	7.8% (77/984)
		Senegal	17.0% (11/64)	18.0% (17/95)	9.8% (8/82)	15.0% (36/241)
		Overall	5.9% (69/1 164)	7.8% (83/1 063)	9.3% (36/388)	7.2% (188/2 615)

680
681

682
683
684

Table S4. Eligibility and participation in phase 2 survey by sociodemographic characteristics, distribution channel, and HIV testing history (bivariable comparison and multivariable multinomial regression model). FSW-based channels and MSM-based channels include facility-based and outreach. Other channels include PWUD-based channels, index testing and STI consultations.

	completed phase 2 questionnaire N = 78	eligible for phase 2 but did not complete the questionnaire N = 48	phase 1 participants not eligible for phase 2 N = 2 489	Bivariable comparison p-value (Chi ² test)	Multivariable multinomial regression model p-value	Overall N = 2 615 (phase 1 participants)
Country				0.9	0.8	
Côte d'Ivoire	39 (50%)	23 (48%)	1 328 (53%)			1 390 (53%)
Mali	31 (40%)	20 (42%)	933 (37%)			984 (38%)
Senegal	8 (10%)	5 (10%)	228 (9.2%)			241 (9.2%)
Sex and distribution channel				0.3	0.06	
Man: MSM-based channels	35 (45%)	18 (38%)	944 (38%)			997 (38%)
Woman: MSM-based channels	5 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	98 (3.9%)			103 (3.9%)
Man: FSW-based channels	22 (28%)	10 (21%)	588 (24%)			620 (24%)
Woman: FSW-based channels	14 (18%)	16 (33%)	655 (26%)			685 (26%)
Man: Other delivery channels	1 (1.3%)	3 (6.3%)	133 (5.3%)			137 (5.2%)
Woman: Other delivery channels	1 (1.3%)	1 (2.1%)	71 (2.9%)			73 (2.8%)
Age group				0.5	0.11	
15-24 years or less	27 (35%)	21 (44%)	1 116 (45%)			1 164 (45%)
25-34 years	38 (49%)	20 (42%)	1 005 (40%)			1 063 (41%)
35 years or more	13 (17%)	7 (15%)	368 (15%)			388 (15%)
Marital status				0.3	0.5	
single	54 (69%)	32 (67%)	1 675 (67%)			1 761 (67%)
divorced / separated / widowed	6 (7.7%)	2 (4.2%)	89 (3.6%)			97 (3.7%)
living with partner / married	18 (23%)	14 (29%)	725 (29%)			757 (29%)
Educational level				0.079	0.09	
none / primary	13 (17%)	13 (27%)	477 (19%)			503 (19%)
secondary	50 (64%)	29 (60%)	1 353 (54%)			1 432 (55%)
higher	15 (19%)	6 (13%)	659 (26%)			680 (26%)
First-time tester				0.2	0.228	
no	40 (51%)	25 (52%)	1 472 (59%)			1 537 (59%)
yes	38 (49%)	23 (48%)	1 017 (41%)			1 078 (41%)

FSW: female sex workers, MSM: men having sex with men.

685
686

687
688
689
690

Table S5. Time between HIVST and confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
less than a week	18 (53%)	12 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (75%)	0 (0%)
between 1 and 2 weeks	4 (12%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)
between 3 and 4 weeks	2 (5.9%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (12%)	0 (0%)
between 1 and 2 months	7 (21%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
more than 3 months	3 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

691
692
693
694

Table S6. Main reason for not linking to confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did not link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R
My test was non-reactive	18 (41%)	6 (50%)	2 (33%)	5 (31%)	5 (50%)
I didn't know we should get a confirmatory test	10 (23%)	2 (17%)	2 (33%)	5 (31%)	1 (10%)
I didn't have time	8 (18%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)	3 (19%)	2 (20%)
I feared that others would know the result	2 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.2%)	1 (10%)
I already knew the result before using HIVST	2 (4.5%)	1 (8.3%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
I had no specific reason	2 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	1 (6.2%)	0 (0%)
I didn't know where to take the test	1 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (6.2%)	0 (0%)
The testing site was too far away	1 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

695
696

697
698

Table S7. Place of confirmatory testing among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
Health Center / Hospital / Clinic / Maternity	12 (35%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	3 (38%)	0 (0%)
Community Clinic / KP-dedicated Health Center	22 (65%)	12 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (33%)	5 (62%)	1 (100%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

699
700
701
702

Table S8. Time between phase 1 and phase 2 interviews among phase 2 participants who did link to confirmatory testing, by reported number of lines and self-interpreted HIVST result.

	Overall	2 lines /reactive	1 line /reactive	2 lines /non-reactive	2 lines /DK-R	DK-R / reactive
less than 4 months	8 (10%)	3 (11%)	0 (0%)	4 (16%)	1 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
between 4 and 6 months	67 (86%)	24 (89%)	5 (71%)	21 (84%)	17 (94%)	0 (0%)
more than 6 months	3 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Total	34 (100%)	15 (44.2%)	1 (2.9%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (23.5%)	1 (2.9%)

DK: don't know. R: refuse to answer

703
704
705
706