

1 **Title: Understanding the cervical cancer self-collection preferences of women living in**  
2 **urban and rural Rwanda**

3  
4 **Running head:** Cervical cancer self-collection preferences in Rwanda

5  
6 **Authors:** Varun Nair<sup>1,2</sup>, Hallie Dau<sup>1,3</sup>, Marianne Vidler<sup>4</sup>, Maryam AboMoslim<sup>1,3</sup>, Barbra  
7 Mutamba<sup>5</sup>, McKerron Scott<sup>6</sup>, Zoey Nesbitt<sup>3</sup>, John Deodatha<sup>5</sup>, Schadrack Danson  
8 Byiringiro<sup>5</sup>, Charles Niyotwiringiye<sup>5</sup>, Nadia Mithani<sup>1,3</sup>, Laurie Smith<sup>1,7</sup>,  
9 Gina Ogilvie<sup>1,3,8</sup>, Stephen Rulisa<sup>9</sup>

10  
11 **Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup> Women's Health Research Institute, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada  
12 <sup>2</sup> Integrated Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British  
13 Columbia, Canada  
14 <sup>3</sup> School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia,  
15 Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada  
16 <sup>4</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of British Columbia,  
17 Vancouver, BC, Canada  
18 <sup>5</sup>Eagle Research Center, Kigali, Rwanda  
19 <sup>6</sup> Queens University, Kingston, Canada  
20 <sup>7</sup> BC Cancer, Vancouver, Canada  
21 <sup>8</sup> BC Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, Canada  
22 <sup>9</sup> School of Medicine and Pharmacy, University Teaching Hospital of Kigali,  
23 University of Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda  
24

25 **Corresponding author:** Gina Ogilvie, MD MSc FCFP DrPH  
26 BC Women's Hospital and Health Centre  
27 Box 42, Room H203G - 4500 Oak Street  
28 Vancouver, BC, V6H 3N1  
29 (604) 875-2424 Ext 6488  
30 Gina.Ogilvie@bccdc.ca

31  
32

33 **Abstract (285/300)**

34 PURPOSE

35 Cervical cancer is a leading cause of cancer among women in low- and middle-income  
36 countries. Women in Rwanda have high rates of cervical cancer due to limited access to  
37 effective screening methods. Research in other low-resource settings similar to Rwanda has  
38 shown that HPV-based self-collection is an effective cervical cancer screening method. This  
39 study aims to compare the preferences of Rwandan women in urban and rural settings toward  
40 self-collection and to report on factors related to self-collection amenability.

41 METHODS

42 A cross-sectional survey was conducted from June 1-9, 2022. Women were recruited from one  
43 urban and one rural clinic in Rwanda. Women were eligible for the study if they were  $\geq 18$  years  
44 and spoke Kinyarwanda or English. The survey consisted of 51 questions investigating  
45 demographics and attitudes towards self-collection for cervical cancer screening. We reported  
46 descriptive statistics stratified by urban and rural sites.

47 RESULTS

48 In total, 169 urban and 205 rural women completed the survey. The majority of respondents at  
49 both sites had a primary school or lower education and were in a relationship. Both urban and  
50 rural respondents were open to self-collection; however, rates were higher in the rural site  
51 (79.9% urban and 95.6% rural;  $p$ -value $<0.001$ ). Similarly, women in rural areas were more likely  
52 to report feeling unembarrassed about self-collection (65.3% of urban, 76.8% of rural;  $p$ -  
53 value $<0.001$ ). Notably, almost all urban and rural respondents (97.6% urban and 98.5% rural)  
54 stated they would go for a cervical cancer pelvic examination to a nearby health center if their  
55 self-collected results indicated any concern ( $p$ -value=0.731).

56 CONCLUSION

57 Rwandan women in both urban and rural areas largely support self-collection for cervical cancer  
58 screening. Further research is needed to better understand how to implement self-collection  
59 screening services in Rwanda.

60 **Keywords:** cervical cancer screening, self-collection, low- and middle-income countries,  
61 Rwanda

## 62 INTRODUCTION

63 Cervical cancer is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality in low- and middle-income  
64 countries (LMIC), despite being a largely preventable disease. Compared to high-income  
65 countries (HIC), LMIC bear a highly disproportionate burden of cervical cancer with 85% of  
66 global deaths(1,2). This disproportionate impact in LMICs can, in part, be attributed to limitations  
67 in access to appropriate and timely primary prevention, screening, diagnostic, and treatment  
68 services(2,3). Due to these limitations, women in LMICs are often diagnosed with an advanced  
69 stage of the disease(4).

70 In 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) called for the elimination of cervical  
71 cancer(5). One of the key goals of this initiative is to have 70% of women screened with a high-  
72 performance test by 35 years of age and again by 45 years of age(5). Currently, visual  
73 inspection with acetic acid (VIA) is the most common method used to screen women in  
74 LMICs(6). However, due to its low sensitivity and need for a healthcare professional to  
75 administer the test it poses challenges in resource limited settings (6–8). Human papillomavirus  
76 (HPV)-based self-collection has emerged as a reliable alternative in LMIC contexts(9–13). Self-  
77 collected vaginal samples for cervical screening allow women to self-screen under the  
78 supervision of a healthcare professional or independently(14). HPV-based screening methods  
79 are highly effective in the early detection of cervical cancer (15,16). Furthermore, self-collection-  
80 based cervical cancer screening methods have shown to be highly acceptable among women in  
81 LMICs (13,17–19).

82 HPV-based self-collection offers the opportunity to improve equitable access to cervical  
83 screening by reducing multiple barriers, offering flexibility in programming and being cost-  
84 effective in resource poor settings. The WHO in 2022 recommended self-collection for cervical  
85 cancer screening to combat cervical cancer in their guidance on self-care interventions for  
86 improving health and well-being(20).

87           Within the context of Eastern Africa, Rawat et al. in 2021 examined the acceptability of  
88   and women’s preferences for self-collection in cervical cancer screening in Uganda. They found  
89   that self-collection was acceptable if offered with the convenience of users in mind, such as at  
90   beneficial times and locations (11). Furthermore, in 2019, Munoru et al. found in Kenya that  
91   such integration of self-collection for cervical cancer screening into primary care services  
92   empowers the women seeking these services to be champions of their own health by improving  
93   their knowledge of cervical cancer, increasing their amenability to being screened, and boosting  
94   overall health outcomes(21).

95           Rwanda has high incidence rates of pre-cancer and invasive cervical cancer (59 per  
96   100,000 and 17 per 100,000, respectively)(22). This can be attributed in part to a lack of wide-  
97   spread available screening(22). Niyonsenga et al. reported in their 2021 cross-sectional study of  
98   urban Rwandan women an estimated screening access rate of 28.3% in the capital city of  
99   Kigali(23). HPV-based self-collection for cervical cancer screening has the potential to help  
100   expand access to cervical cancer screening in Rwanda. In order to implement this type of  
101   screening program, it is important to understand the preferences of urban and rural women in  
102   Rwanda in order to ensure that such a program would benefit all its users. This study sought to  
103   compare and describe the preferences of Rwandan women in urban and rural settings towards  
104   self-collection-based cervical cancer screening and to report on factors related to self-collection  
105   amenability.

## 106   METHODS

### 107   *Design, setting, and study population*

108   This was a cross-sectional study using convenience sampling at Muhima and Nyamata District  
109   Hospitals in Rwanda, which represent the urban and rural sites, respectively. Women were  
110   recruited from June 1-9, 2022 and were eligible if they were 18 years of age and over, spoke

111 English or Kinyarwanda, and were able to provide informed consent. Participants were recruited  
112 from the waiting room at each site by four study team members. Surveys were administered in a  
113 separate location to maximize privacy of participants and their responses. All participants  
114 provided informed consent. Survey administrators were not involved in the direct care of  
115 participants and had no prior relationships with participants. Participant responses were  
116 captured by study team members on electronic tablets and entered directly into a REDCap(24),  
117 a secure web application for research data management. Respondents were compensated  
118 1050 Rwanda Franc (\$1 USD) for their involvement in the study.

### 119 *Survey*

120 The survey contained 51 questions which included demographics, behaviours, attitudes and  
121 knowledge of cervical cancer, cervical cancer screening and follow-up history, knowledge of  
122 HPV vaccination, preferences on integrated service delivery for HPV screening, and attitudes  
123 toward self-collection at home. Survey questions were informed by and constructed using two  
124 survey instruments. The first was the Improving Data for Decision Making in Global Cervical  
125 Cancer Programs Toolkit-Part 2 (IDCCP), which is a resource that consolidates operational  
126 resources for improving access to high-quality data for decision-making when it comes to  
127 constructing cervical cancer programs in LMIC(25). Secondly, a questionnaire administered in  
128 Kisenyi, Uganda by Mitchell et al. in 2017 further informed various sections of this study's  
129 survey, such as the behaviours, screening and follow-up, and attitudes towards self-collection at  
130 home sections(12). Mitchell et al.'s survey included questions on women's intentions to provide  
131 self-collected samples for cervical cancer screening and were reviewed by local and  
132 international experts in women's health(12), allowing us to seamlessly adapt its items to this  
133 survey.

134 The primary outcome for this analysis is the respondents' willingness to self-collect for  
135 cervical cancer screening. During data collection, research assistants read a script to

136 respondents describing the self-collection procedure. This was done in order to provide context  
137 to respondents who were not aware of what self-collection entailed. Responses were recorded  
138 on a five-point Likert scale and included: very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, neither likely nor  
139 unlikely, somewhat likely, and very likely; or disagree, not sure, and agree. Additional questions  
140 on attitudes towards self-collection included willingness to have an outreach worker bring self-  
141 collection kits to respondents' residences and willingness to go to the nearest health center  
142 themselves to deposit the swab after self-collection.

143 Furthermore, women were asked if they would: be embarrassed to perform self-  
144 collection at home, be worried they would not be able to perform self-collection correctly, be  
145 afraid of receiving a cervical cancer diagnosis after testing themselves, be afraid that other  
146 people would think they had HPV or cervical cancer if respondents told them they had tested  
147 themselves, be afraid that performing self-collection with a swab would be painful, need their  
148 partner's approval to perform self-collection, and if their religion/spiritual beliefs would affect  
149 their decision to be screened for cervical cancer. These were similarly measured using a three-  
150 point Likert scale (disagree, not sure, agree, declined to answer). Participants were also asked  
151 whether they would go to a clinic for a pelvic examination for cervical cancer if their self-  
152 collected sample indicated any concern (response options: I would go, not sure, and I would not  
153 go).

154 Demographic variables captured included clinic location (urban or rural), age, marital  
155 status (in a relationship and not in a relationship), education level (less than primary school  
156 education and primary school education or above), religious identity (Protestant, Catholic, and  
157 other), number of partners, age at first intercourse (less than 18 years and 18 years or above),  
158 number of pregnancies, age at first pregnancy, history of chronic diseases (malaria, respiratory  
159 disease, HIV/AIDS, high blood pressure, hepatitis, heart disease, tuberculosis, and cancer), and  
160 history of health services accessed (child's health, acute care, antenatal care (ANC),  
161 sexual/reproductive health, malaria, HIV/ARV, chronic conditions, and tuberculosis).

162 *Data analysis*

163 Bivariate descriptive statistics for all survey questions were generated for all respondents by  
164 stratifying the respondents by urban and rural sites. Missing data for all questions analyzed in  
165 this study were included during analysis and reported in this study's findings. Fisher's exact  
166 tests were used to compare differences in response between urban and rural respondents. An  
167 alpha-value ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.05 was used to determine the significance of inter-site comparisons, with  $p$   
168  $< \alpha$  indicating a statistically significant difference(26). All statistical analysis was completed  
169 using R (version 4.0.3) (27).

170 *Ethics statement*

171 This study received ethics approvals from the University of British Columbia Research Ethics  
172 Board (H22-01335) and the Rwanda National Ethics Committee (125/RNEC/2022). Formal  
173 written consent was obtained from all participants. Authors did not have access to information  
174 that could identify participants either during or after data collection.

175 RESULTS

176 In total, 374 respondents completed the survey, with 169 respondents from the urban site  
177 (Muhima; 45.2%) and 205 respondents from the rural site (Nyamata; 54.8%) (Table 1). The  
178 majority of respondents at both sites were between 25-45 years of age (urban n=124, 73.1%;  
179 rural n=135, 65.8%;  $p=0.016$ ), had a primary school or less education (urban n=81, 48.2%; rural  
180 n=132, 64.4%,  $p=0.007$ ), and were in a relationship (urban n=123, 72.8%; rural n=164, 80.4%;  
181  $p=0.107$ ). Rural respondents were significantly more likely than urban respondents to report  
182 having had their first intercourse at or above the age of 18 years (urban n=129, 76.3%; rural  
183 n=162, 79.0%;  $p=0.046$ ). Further details for the demographic characteristics are provided in  
184 **Table 1.**



185  
186

**Table 1.** Demographics stratified by urban and rural sites

Variable	Level	Urban	Rural	Overall	p-value
		N=169 n (%)	N=205 n (%)	N=374 n (%)	
Age	18-25 years	30 (17.8)	52 (25.4)	82 (21.9)	0.016
	26-35 years	68 (40.2)	70 (34.1)	138 (36.9)	
	36-45 years	56 (33.1)	65 (31.7)	121 (32.4)	
	46+ years	9 (5.3)	18 (8.8)	27 (7.2)	
	<i>Missing</i>	6	0	6	
Marital Status	Not in a relationship	46 (27.2)	40 (19.6)	86 (23.0)	0.107
	In a relationship	123 (72.8)	164 (80.4)	287 (76.7)	
	<i>Missing</i>	0	1	1	
Religious Identity	Protestant	61 (36.3)	77 (37.6)	138 (36.9)	0.635
	Catholic	49 (29.2)	51 (24.9)	100 (26.7)	
	Other <sup>a</sup>	58 (34.5)	77 (37.6)	135 (36.1)	
	<i>Missing</i>	1	0	1	
Education Level	≤ primary school	81 (48.2)	132 (64.4)	213 (57.0)	0.007
	> primary school	79 (47.0)	67 (32.7)	146 (39.0)	
	<i>Missing</i>	9	6	15	
Number of Partners	1 partner	35 (21.2)	45 (22.2)	80 (21.4)	0.004
	2-5 partners	108 (65.5)	150 (73.9)	258 (69.0)	
	6+ partners	22 (13.3)	8 (3.9)	30 (8.0)	
	<i>Missing</i>	4	2	6	
Age at First Intercourse	< 18 years	35 (20.7)	43 (21.0)	78 (20.9)	0.046
	≥ 18 years	129 (76.3)	162 (79.0)	291 (77.8)	
	Declined to answer	5 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (1.3)	
Number of Pregnancies	0	15 (8.9)	3 (1.5)	18 (4.0)	0.001
	1-2	76 (45.0)	105 (51.2)	181 (48.4)	
	3-4	51 (30.2)	45 (22.0)	96 (25.7)	
	5+	27 (16.0)	52 (25.4)	79 (21.1)	
Mean age at 1 <sup>st</sup> pregnancy (SD)		22.13 (4.62)	21.57 (4.26)	374 (100.0)	0.252

Do you have a history of any of the

following chronic disease/s?<sup>a</sup>

None	83 (49.1)	121 (59.0)	204 (54.5)	0.07
Malaria	45 (26.6)	58 (28.3)	103 (27.5)	0.808
Respiratory disease	18 (10.7)	22 (10.7)	40 (10.7)	1
HIV/AIDS	15 (8.9)	8 (3.9)	23 (6.1)	0.076
High blood pressure	8 (4.7)	7 (3.4)	15 (4.0)	0.702
Hepatitis	2 (1.2)	3 (1.5)	5 (1.3)	1
Heart disease	1 (0.6)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.5)	1
Tuberculosis	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	0.923
Cancer	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	-
Other	20 (11.8)	40 (19.5)	60 (16.0)	0.061

What health services have you accessed in the past?<sup>a</sup>

Child's health	55 (32.5)	103 (50.2)	158 (42.2)	0.001
Acute care	55 (32.5)	97 (47.3)	152 (40.6)	0.005
ANC	43 (25.4)	87 (42.4)	130 (34.8)	0.001
Sexual/reproductive health	41 (24.3)	82 (40.0)	123 (32.9)	0.002
Malaria	34 (20.1)	46 (22.4)	80 (21.4)	0.676
HIV/ARV	18 (10.7)	8 (3.9)	26 (7.0)	0.019
Chronic condition/s	12 (7.1)	8 (3.9)	20 (5.3)	0.255
Tuberculosis	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	-
Other	11 (6.5)	30 (14.6)	41 (11.0)	0.019
Declined to answer	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	1

189 When asked if they would be willing to independently self-collect samples for cervical cancer  
 190 screening at home if they were provided with the appropriate instruction, 135 (79.9%) urban and  
 191 196 (95.6%) rural respondents expressed either very or somewhat willing ( $p < 0.001$ ) (**Table 2**).  
 192 Similarly, 139 (82.2%) urban respondents and 193 (94.6%) rural respondents were in favor of  
 193 having a community outreach worker supply them with a self-collection swab at their home  
 194 ( $p < 0.001$ ). When asked about their willingness to drop off their self-collected sample at the  
 195 health centre closest to them, 134 (79.3%) urban respondents and 192 (93.7%) rural  
 196 respondents expressed a willingness to do so ( $p < 0.001$ ). Additionally, 156 (76.8%) rural  
 197 respondents disagreed with the notion that they would be embarrassed to perform self-  
 198 collection procedures at home ( $p < 0.001$ ). Furthermore, 139 (68.1%) rural respondents  
 199 disagreed when presented the statement that they would be afraid that self-collection would  
 200 show they had cervical cancer ( $p = 0.039$ ). Interestingly, 96 (56.8%) rural respondents and 142  
 201 (69.6%) urban respondents disagreed that they were worried about incorrectly performing the  
 202 self-collection procedure ( $p < 0.001$ ). In the most overwhelmingly positive response regarding  
 203 self-collection for cervical cancer screening in this survey, 162 (97.6%) urban respondents and  
 204 200 (98.5%) rural respondents expressed willingness to go for a pelvic examination to check for  
 205 cervical cancer following self-collection if, upon further analysis, their self-collected sample  
 206 indicated any concern ( $p = 0.731$ ).

207 **Table 2.** Responses to questions investigating willingness to self-collect cervical samples  
 208 stratified by urban and rural sites

		Urban	Rural	Overall	
		<i>N</i> =169	<i>N</i> =205	<i>N</i> =374	
		<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<b>p-value</b>
	<b>Level</b>				
Would you be willing to collect a sample by yourself in your home, if you were given instructions on how to collect the sample?	Very unwilling	30 (17.8)	7 (3.4)	37 (9.9)	<0.001
	Somewhat unwilling	3 (1.8)	2 (1.0)	5 (1.3)	
	Not sure	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
	Somewhat willing	70 (41.4)	103 (50.2)	173 (46.3)	
	Very willing	65 (38.5)	93 (45.4)	158 (42.2)	
Would you go to the clinic for	Would go	162 (97.6)	200 (98.5)	362 (96.8)	0.731

a cervical cancer examination AFTER self-collection if the self-collected results indicated any concern?	Not sure	2 (1.2)	2 (1.0)	4 (1.1)	
	Would not go	1 (0.6)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.5)	
	Declined	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
	<i>Missing</i>	3	2	5 (1.3)	
I would be willing to have an outreach worker drop off a swab for self-collection at my house.	Disagree	27 (16.0)	10 (4.9)	37 (9.9)	0.001
	Not sure	3 (1.8)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.8)	
	Agree	139 (82.2)	193 (94.6)	332 (88.8)	
	Declined	0 (0.0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	
	<i>Missing</i>	0	1	1 (0.3)	
I would be willing to go to the nearest health center to drop off a swab I had used for self-collection.	Disagree	31 (18.3)	10 (4.9)	41 (11.0)	<0.001
	Not sure	3 (1.8)	2 (1.0)	5 (1.3)	
	Agree	134 (79.3)	192 (93.7)	326 (87.2)	
	Declined	1 (0.6)	1 (0.5)	2 (0.5)	
I would be embarrassed to do HPV self-collection at home.	Disagree	109 (65.3)	156 (76.8)	265 (70.9)	<0.001
	Not sure	11 (6.6)	22 (10.8)	33 (8.8)	
	Agree	47 (28.1)	25 (12.3)	72 (19.3)	
	<i>Missing</i>	2	2	4 (1.1)	
I'm worried that I would not be able to perform a self-collection properly/correctly.	Disagree	96 (56.8)	142 (69.6)	238 (63.6)	<0.001
	Not sure	7 (4.1)	21 (10.3)	28 (7.5)	
	Agree	66 (39.1)	41 (20.1)	107 (28.6)	
	<i>Missing</i>	0	1	1 (0.3)	
I'm afraid that testing myself for HPV would show I had cervical cancer.	Disagree	105 (62.5)	139 (68.1)	244 (65.2)	0.039
	Not sure	6 (3.6)	16 (7.8)	22 (5.9)	
	Agree	57 (33.9)	49 (24.0)	106 (28.3)	
	<i>Missing</i>	1	1	2 (0.5)	
I'm afraid that other people would think I have HPV or cervical cancer if I told them I was testing myself for HPV.	Disagree	148 (87.6)	185 (90.2)	333 (89.0)	0.62
	Not sure	6 (3.6)	7 (3.4)	13 (3.5)	
	Agree	14 (8.3)	13 (6.3)	27 (7.2)	
	Declined	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.3)	
I'm worried doing a self-collection with a swab in my vagina would be painful.	Disagree	89 (53.0)	144 (71.3)	233 (62.3)	<0.001
	Not sure	13 (7.7)	30 (14.9)	43 (11.5)	
	Agree	66 (39.3)	28 (13.9)	94 (25.1)	
	<i>Missing</i>	1	3	4 (1.1)	
I would NEED my partner's approval to do self-collection.	Disagree	73 (43.2)	83 (40.7)	156 (41.7)	0.814
	Not sure	3 (1.8)	3 (1.5)	6 (1.6)	
	Agree	91 (53.8)	117 (57.4)	208 (55.6)	

	Declined	2 (1.2)	1 (0.5)	3 (0.8)	
	Missing	0	1	1 (0.3)	
My religion/spiritual beliefs would affect my decision to get screened for cervical cancer.	Disagree	167 (98.8)	201 (98.0)	368 (98.4)	0.841
	Not sure	1 (0.6)	2 (1.0)	3 (0.8)	
	Agree	1 (0.6)	2 (1.0)	3 (0.8)	

209

## 210 DISCUSSION

211 In this study, we evaluated willingness to self-collect for cervical screening from women in  
 212 Muhima and Nyamata District Hospitals. We found that women in both urban and rural settings  
 213 were willing to self-collect for cervical cancer screening. Furthermore, women reported that they  
 214 would be able to perform the test given proper instruction with women in rural areas being  
 215 statistically more willing than urban.

216 We found that the majority of women in both urban and rural Rwanda were willing to  
 217 self-collect at home for cervical cancer screening. This finding aligns with current research on  
 218 self-collection in low-resource settings(12)(28)(29). For example, a 2011 cross-sectional study  
 219 in Kisenyi, Uganda by Mitchell et al. reported that 80.6% of Ugandan women were willing to self-  
 220 collect for cervical cancer screening(12). Our findings in rural Rwanda also aligned with similar  
 221 research conducted in other rural, low-resource settings, such a studies conducted by Swanson  
 222 et al. in rural Kenya(30), Gottschlich et al. in rural Guatemala(31), and Mremi et al. in rural  
 223 Tanzania(32). That women at both urban and rural areas exhibited such positivity towards self-  
 224 collection is highly encouraging for the prospects of implementing formal self-collection-based  
 225 cervical cancer screening program which in turn could improve access to consistent cervical  
 226 cancer screening for women in Rwanda. Our finding that rural respondents are significantly  
 227 more willing to participate in self-collection warrants further research to understand why there  
 228 might exist a difference between urban and rural settings in Rwanda. This finding also tells us  
 229 that a uniformly-delivered self-collection-based cervical cancer screening program in Rwanda

230 would have different levels of uptake in urban and rural areas, prompting the need to for the  
231 program to be built such that it is contextually adapted to barriers in different regions.

232 Women in both of urban and rural areas were willing to have a community outreach  
233 worker drop off a self-collection kit at their homes and were similarly willing to go to a nearby  
234 health centre to deposit their self-collected samples. From this, it is evident that the logistics of  
235 self-collection do not negatively impact Rwandan women's amenability to self-collect, nor do  
236 they impact their willingness to continue along the care pathway. This latter finding is similar to  
237 the case in rural Uganda, where Rawat et al. found that 83% of women were willing to have a  
238 community health worker (CHW) drop off self-collection kits at their homes(11). Arrossi et al.  
239 also found CHW-led drop-off of self-collection resources to be both acceptable in their  
240 evaluation of a self-collection-based cervical cancer screening program in rural Argentina(33).  
241 Interestingly, our findings in urban Rwanda differ from research conducted by Ogilvie et al. in  
242 urban Uganda, where 68.7% of respondents reported an unwillingness to go to a nearby health  
243 centre to deposit their self-collected samples(34). Little research exists on the acceptability of  
244 CHW-led drop-off of self-collection resources in urban LMIC settings, making this finding an  
245 area for further research. Even so, given the positivity of our research in this regard in both  
246 urban and rural Rwanda, our results are highly encouraging in showcasing the potential success  
247 of an integrated self-collection-based cervical cancer screening program for women in Rwanda  
248 wherein CHWs are the leaders of resource delivery to enable self-collection to occur.

249 Our findings demonstrate that social stigma and religious beliefs would not deter women  
250 from self-collecting. However, we did find that the majority of participants at both sites believed  
251 that they would need their partner's approval to self-collect for cervical cancer screening. This  
252 presents a notable barrier when considering the implementation of self-collection to cervical  
253 cancer screening in Rwanda. In rural Malawi, Lee et al. found that male partners were indeed  
254 reported to be a barrier to consistently accessing a self-collection-based cervical cancer  
255 screening program by women in their study(35). Recent studies by Moucheraud et al. in Malawi

256 in 2020(36), Binka et al. in Ghana in 2019(37), and Buchanan Lunsford et al.(38) and Adewumi  
257 et al.(39) in Kenya in 2017 and 2019, respectively, also corroborate this notion that male partner  
258 approval is an important factor that must be considered and navigated with intention when  
259 designing a successful self-collection-based cervical cancer screening program. A successful  
260 screening program in Rwanda may not be possible without support from partners. As such,  
261 continued exploration must seek to understand the views of partners regarding self-collection in  
262 Rwanda, and what steps are necessary to ensure greater access to a self-collection-based  
263 cervical cancer screening program in Rwanda.

264 This study is strengthened by the expertise of the team conducting the project. The  
265 study team is highly knowledgeable in cervical cancer self-collection and is familiar working in  
266 low-resource settings. Furthermore, local research assistants collected the data in respondents'  
267 native languages and were familiar with the region and data collection procedures. The use of  
268 convenience sampling remains a limitation as it can contribute to sampling bias(40).  
269 Furthermore, as the data was self-reported, it is possible that there was some misreporting  
270 either due to social desirability or recall bias from the respondents(41). Lastly, given that our  
271 respondents were recruited from only two sites overall and only one site each from urban and  
272 rural settings, our study population may not be representative of the true population of Rwanda,  
273 thereby limiting the broader applicability of our results across Rwanda.

274 In conclusion, the results from our study show that women in Rwanda show a clear  
275 support for self-collection as a means of sampling for cervical cancer screening. As such, further  
276 research is needed on how to most effectively implement a such a program in Rwanda. An  
277 accessible cervical cancer screening program that is amenable for all Rwandan women is  
278 crucial to not only eliminate cervical cancer in Rwanda, but worldwide.

279 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank Muhima and Nyamata District Hospitals for their  
280 assistance in this study.

281

282

283

284

285

286



287

## References

- 288 1. Cervical cancer [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 13]. Available  
289 from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/human-papillomavirus-\(hpv\)-and-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/human-papillomavirus-(hpv)-and-cervical-cancer)  
290 [cervical-cancer](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/human-papillomavirus-(hpv)-and-cervical-cancer)
- 291 2. Parkin DM, Bray F, Ferlay J, Pisani P. Global Cancer Statistics, 2002. *CA Cancer J Clin.*  
292 2005 Mar 1;55(2):74–108.
- 293 3. Katahoire RA, Jitta J, Kivumbi G, Murokora D, Arube WJ, Siu G, et al. An assessment of the  
294 readiness for introduction of the HPV vaccine in Uganda. *Afr J Reprod Health.* 2008  
295 Dec;12(3):159–72.
- 296 4. Vu M, Yu J, Awolude OA, Chuang L. Cervical cancer worldwide. *Curr Probl Cancer.* 2018  
297 Sep;42(5):457–65.
- 298 5. WHO Global strategy to accelerate the elimination of cervical cancer as a public health  
299 problem [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2023 Mar 4]. Available from:  
300 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240014107>
- 301 6. Hull R, Mbele M, Makhafola T, Hicks C, Wang S, Reis R, et al. Cervical cancer in low and  
302 middle-income countries (Review). *Oncol Lett.* 2020 Jun 19;20(3):2058–74.
- 303 7. Senapathy JG, Umadevi P, Kannika PS. The present scenario of cervical cancer control and  
304 HPV epidemiology in India: an outline. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev APJCP.* 2011;12(5):1107–  
305 15.
- 306 8. Mishra GA, Pimple SA, Shastri SS. Prevention of Cervix Cancer in India. *Oncology.*  
307 2016;91(Suppl. 1):1–7.
- 308 9. Ndayisaba G, Verwijs MC, van Eeckhoudt S, Gasarabwe A, Hardy L, Borgdorff H, et al.  
309 Feasibility and Acceptability of a Novel Cervicovaginal Lavage Self-Sampling Device Among  
310 Women in Kigali, Rwanda. *Sex Transm Dis.* 2013 Jul;40(7):552–5.
- 311 10. Verwijs MC, Agaba S, Umulisa MM, van de Wijgert JHHM. Feasibility and acceptability of  
312 frequent vaginal self-sampling at home by Rwandan women at high risk of urogenital tract  
313 infections. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2022 Feb;98(1):58–61.
- 314 11. Rawat A, Sanders C, Mithani N, Amuge C, Pedersen H, Namugosa R, et al. Acceptability  
315 and preferences for self-collected screening for cervical cancer within health systems in  
316 rural Uganda: A mixed-methods approach. *Int J Gynecol Obstet.* 2021 Jan;152(1):103–11.
- 317 12. Mitchell SM, Pedersen HN, Eng Stime E, Sekikubo M, Moses E, Mwesigwa D, et al. Self-  
318 collection based HPV testing for cervical cancer screening among women living with HIV in  
319 Uganda: a descriptive analysis of knowledge, intentions to screen and factors associated  
320 with HPV positivity. *BMC Womens Health.* 2017 Dec;17(1):4.
- 321 13. Mitchell S, Ogilvie G, Steinberg M, Sekikubo M, Biryabarema C, Money D. Assessing  
322 women’s willingness to collect their own cervical samples for HPV testing as part of the

- 323 ASPIRE cervical cancer screening project in Uganda. *Int J Gynecol Obstet.* 2011  
324 Aug;114(2):111–5.
- 325 14. Lofters A, Vahabi M. Self-sampling for HPV to enhance uptake of cervical cancer screening:  
326 Has the time come in Canada? *Can Med Assoc J.* 2016 Sep 6;188(12):853–4.
- 327 15. Nishimura H, Yeh PT, Oguntade H, Kennedy CE, Narasimhan M. HPV self-sampling for  
328 cervical cancer screening: a systematic review of values and preferences. *BMJ Glob Health.*  
329 2021 May;6(5):e003743.
- 330 16. Nakisige C, Trawin J, Mitchell-Foster S, Payne BA, Rawat A, Mithani N, et al. Integrated  
331 cervical cancer screening in Mayuge District Uganda (ASPIRE Mayuge): a pragmatic  
332 sequential cluster randomized trial protocol. *BMC Public Health.* 2020 Dec;20(1):142.
- 333 17. Esber A. Feasibility, validity and acceptability of self-collected samples for human  
334 papillomavirus (HPV) testing in rural Malawi. *Malawi Med J.* 2018 Jun 30;30(2):61.
- 335 18. Broquet C, Triboullier D, Untiet S, Schafer S, Petignat P, Vassilakos P. Acceptability of self-  
336 collected vaginal samples for HPV testing in an urban and rural population of Madagascar.  
337 *Afr Health Sci.* 2015 Sep 9;15(3):755.
- 338 19. Murchland AR, Gottschlich A, Bevilacqua K, Pineda A, Sandoval-Ramírez BA, Alvarez CS,  
339 et al. HPV self-sampling acceptability in rural and indigenous communities in Guatemala: a  
340 cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open.* 2019 Oct;9(10):e029158.
- 341 20. Recommendations and key considerations [Internet]. WHO guideline on self-care  
342 interventions for health and well-being, 2022 revision. World Health Organization; 2022  
343 [cited 2023 Apr 8]. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK582350/>
- 344 21. Munoru F, Gitonga L, Muraya M. Integration of Cervical Cancer Screening Services in the  
345 Routine Examinations Offered in the Kenyan Health Facilities: A Systematic Review. *Open J*  
346 *Obstet Gynecol.* 2019;09(05):656–68.
- 347 22. Makuza JD, Nsanzimana S, Muhimpundu MA, Pace LE, Ntaganira J, Riedel DJ. Prevalence  
348 and risk factors for cervical cancer and pre-cancerous lesions in Rwanda. *Pan Afr Med J*  
349 [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2023 Mar 7];22. Available from: [http://www.panafrican-med-](http://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/22/26/full/)  
350 [journal.com/content/article/22/26/full/](http://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/22/26/full/)
- 351 23. Niyonsenga G, Gishoma D, Sego R, Uwayezu MG, Nikuze B, Fitch M, et al. Knowledge,  
352 utilization and barriers of cervical cancer screening among women attending selected  
353 district hospitals in Kigali - Rwanda. *Can Oncol Nurs J.* 2021 Jul 22;31(3):266–74.
- 354 24. Patridge EF, Bardyn TP. Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap). *J Med Libr Assoc*  
355 [Internet]. 2018 Jan 12 [cited 2023 Mar 7];106(1). Available from:  
356 <http://jmla.pitt.edu/ojs/jmla/article/view/319>
- 357 25. World Health Organization. Improving data for decision-making: a toolkit for cervical cancer  
358 prevention and control programmes [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018  
359 [cited 2023 Mar 7]. 289 p. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/279420>

- 360 26. Infanger D, Schmidt-Trucksäss A. *P* value functions: An underused method to present  
361 research results and to promote quantitative reasoning. *Stat Med*. 2019 Sep  
362 20;38(21):4189–97.
- 363 27. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna,  
364 Austria; 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 365 28. Bansil P, Wittet S, Lim JL, Winkler JL, Paul P, Jeronimo J. Acceptability of self-collection  
366 sampling for HPV-DNA testing in low-resource settings: a mixed methods approach. *BMC*  
367 *Public Health*. 2014 Dec;14(1):596.
- 368 29. Gottschlich A, Nuntadusit T, Zarins KR, Hada M, Chooson N, Bilheem S, et al. Barriers to  
369 cervical cancer screening and acceptability of HPV self-testing: a cross-sectional  
370 comparison between ethnic groups in Southern Thailand. *BMJ Open*. 2019  
371 Nov;9(11):e031957.
- 372 30. Swanson M, Ibrahim S, Blat C, Oketch S, Olwanda E, Maloba M, et al. Evaluating a  
373 community-based cervical cancer screening strategy in Western Kenya: a descriptive study.  
374 *BMC Womens Health*. 2018 Dec;18(1):116.
- 375 31. Gottschlich A, Rivera-Andrade A, Grajeda E, Alvarez C, Mendoza Montano C, Meza R.  
376 Acceptability of Human Papillomavirus Self-Sampling for Cervical Cancer Screening in an  
377 Indigenous Community in Guatemala. *J Glob Oncol*. 2017 Oct;3(5):444–54.
- 378 32. Mremi A, Linde DS, Mchome B, Mlay J, Schledermann D, Blaakær J, et al. Acceptability and  
379 feasibility of self-sampling and follow-up attendance after text message delivery of human  
380 papillomavirus results: A cross-sectional study nested in a cohort in rural Tanzania. *Acta*  
381 *Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2021 Apr;100(4):802–10.
- 382 33. Arrossi S, Paolino M, Thouyaret L, Laudi R, Campanera A. Evaluation of scaling-up of HPV  
383 self-collection offered by community health workers at home visits to increase screening  
384 among socially vulnerable under-screened women in Jujuy Province, Argentina. *Implement*  
385 *Sci*. 2017 Dec;12(1):17.
- 386 34. Ogilvie GS, Mitchell S, Sekikubo M, Biryabarema C, Byamugisha J, Jeronimo J, et al.  
387 Results of a community-based cervical cancer screening pilot project using human  
388 papillomavirus self-sampling in Kampala, Uganda. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 2013  
389 Aug;122(2):118–23.
- 390 35. Lee F, Bula A, Chapola J, Mapanje C, Phiri B, Kamtuwange N, et al. Women’s experiences  
391 in a community-based screen-and-treat cervical cancer prevention program in rural Malawi:  
392 a qualitative study. *BMC Cancer*. 2021 Dec;21(1):428.
- 393 36. Moucheraud C, Kawale P, Kafwafwa S, Bastani R, Hoffman RM. “It is big because it’s  
394 ruining the lives of many people in Malawi”: Women’s attitudes and beliefs about cervical  
395 cancer. *Prev Med Rep*. 2020 Jun;18:101093.
- 396 37. Binka C, Doku DT, Nyarko SH, Awusabo-Asare K. Male support for cervical cancer  
397 screening and treatment in rural Ghana. Withers MH, editor. *PLOS ONE*. 2019 Nov  
398 18;14(11):e0224692.

- 399 38. Buchanan Lunsford N, Ragan K, Lee Smith J, Saraiya M, Aketch M. Environmental and  
400 Psychosocial Barriers to and Benefits of Cervical Cancer Screening in Kenya. *The*  
401 *Oncologist*. 2017 Feb 1;22(2):173–81.
- 402 39. Adewumi K, Oketch SY, Choi Y, Huchko MJ. Female perspectives on male involvement in a  
403 human-papillomavirus-based cervical cancer-screening program in western Kenya. *BMC*  
404 *Womens Health*. 2019 Dec;19(1):107.
- 405 40. Emerson RW. Convenience Sampling, Random Sampling, and Snowball Sampling: How  
406 Does Sampling Affect the Validity of Research? *J Vis Impair Blind*. 2015 Mar;109(2):164–8.
- 407 41. Rosenman R, Tennekoon V, Hill LG. Measuring bias in self-reported data. *Int J Behav*  
408 *Healthc Res*. 2011;2(4):320.
- 409