

1 **Risk screening tools could potentially miss out HIV positive individuals who seek testing**
2 **services: A secondary program data analysis on the performance characteristics of an**
3 **adolescent and adult HIV risk screening tool in Uganda.**

4
5 Marvin Lubega^{1¶}, Katherine Guerra^{1&}, Megan Ginivan^{¶2}, Yewande Kamuntu^{¶1}, George
6 Senyama^{1&}, Andrew Musoke^{1&}, Taasi Geoffrey^{3&}, Sylvia Nalubega^{4¶}, Shaukat Khan^{1&}, John
7 Bosco Junior Matovu^{3¶*}

8
9 ¹ Clinton Health Access Initiative, Kampala, Uganda

10 ² Clinton Health Access Initiative, Boston, USA

11 ³AIDS Control Program - Ministry of Health, Kampala, Uganda

12 ⁴Institute of Applied Technology, Fatima College of Health Sciences, UAE

13
14 *Corresponding author

15 Email address: mtvbosco@gmail.com

16
17 ¶These authors have contributed equally to the work.

18 &These authors also contributed equally to this work

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24

25 **Introduction:** Improving HIV testing efficiency has been documented to save financial and
26 material resources for health. In October 2019, the Ministry of health Uganda deployed an HIV
27 risk screening tool for use in 24 health facilities targeting clients aged 15 years and above in both
28 outpatient and Voluntary Counselling and Testing departments.

29

30 **Methods:** We conducted a retrospective secondary data analysis of routinely collected HIV risk
31 screening program data in Uganda, collected from October to November 2019, to determine the
32 performance characteristics of the adolescent and adult HIV risk screening tool in public health
33 facility settings. Statistical measures for the risk screening tool performance included sensitivity,
34 specificity, positive and negative predictive values, and a cost analysis.

35 **Results:** A total of 19,854 clients were screened for HIV testing eligibility; we excluded 150
36 records with incomplete testing information. The overall positivity rate (cluster weighted
37 prevalence of HIV) among those screened was 4.5% (95% CI: 4.1%-4.8%) versus 3.71% (95%
38 CI: 3.06-4.50) among those not screened. The sensitivity and specificity of the risk screening tool
39 were found to be 90.7% (95% CI: 88.4%, 92.7%) and 75.8%, (75.2-76.4) respectively. With
40 screening, the number needed to test to identify one PLHIV reduced from 27 to 22. Although risk
41 screening would have led to 24.5% (4,825/19,704) reduction in testing volume, 9.3% (68/732) of
42 PLHIV would have been missed as they were misclassified as not eligible for testing. The cost per
43 PLHIV identified fell by 3% from \$69 without screening to \$66.9 with implementation of the
44 screening tool.

45 **Conclusions:** The use of HIV risk screening tool in OPD settings in Uganda demonstrated
46 improved HIV testing efficiency by reducing testing volumes but resulted in screening out of

47 a significant number of people living with HIV. The team recommends that scientifically
48 validated HIV risk screening tools be considered for use by countries.

49

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Globally, human immune-deficiency virus (HIV) testing programs have contributed to enormous
53 progress in identifying people living with HIV (PLHIV) and increased coverage of anti-retroviral
54 therapy (ART) (1). By 2020, Uganda was nearing the first of the United Nation's 95-95-95 targets
55 of identifying 95% of PLHIV with approximately 91% of the 1.4 million PLHIV already
56 identified, 94% on treatment but with a slightly lower viral suppression rate (85%)(2). Despite
57 remarkable progress in HIV case identification in Uganda, there were approximately 126,000
58 PLHIV not yet on treatment with an estimated 38,000 new HIV infections by the year 2020,
59 indicating a need to sustain innovative HIV case identification approaches and linkage to
60 treatment.

61

62 As Uganda gets closer to reaching identification and treatment targets, it will become increasingly
63 difficult and resource-intensive to identify the remaining PLHIV. At the same time, resources for
64 HIV testing services (HTS) are declining and countries are facing pressure to reduce testing
65 volumes in order to improve efficiency by focusing on increasing HIV testing yield at different
66 community and facility-based entry points (3). In 2017, for example, the President's Emergency
67 Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) had a target of conducting approximately 7.2 million HIV tests
68 in Uganda but this target dropped to just over 1.7 million in 2020, with targets for provider-initiated
69 testing and counselling (PITC) virtually eliminated (4).

70 Despite introducing more targeted HIV testing approaches such partner testing services in Uganda,
71 the overall HTS yield remained relatively constant from 3.1% in 2017, peaking at 3.8% in 2018
72 and regressing to 3.1% in 2019. Whereas index testing (including partner testing services) provided
73 significant yield (20%) in 2019, the overall contribution to case identification by this HTS modality

74 was only 15.4%, with provider-initiated counselling and testing other (PITC-other) modality
75 contributing 53% of all HIV-positive cases identified in 2019 (5). Large facility-based entry points
76 like PITC, however, reach large numbers of clients and identify more PLHIV in absolute numbers
77 than targeted strategies, even if they are of lower yield. As a result, in recent years, the vast
78 majority of newly identified PLHIV have been identified through facility-based testing (6). For
79 example in 2018, PITC at outpatient departments (OPD) and facility-based voluntary counselling
80 and testing (VCT) accounted for approximately 68% of all newly diagnosed PLHIV (7).

81 Given resource constraints, ministries of health are looking for opportunities to improve HIV
82 testing efficiency through reducing the total number of people tested for HIV while targeting to
83 identify the same or higher numbers of PLHIV hence increasing the positivity rates. To achieve
84 this, many countries are institutionalized HIV risk screening tools to identify high risk populations.
85 These tools use a combination of clinical and behavior-based criteria to identify individuals with
86 a higher risk of HIV infection who are then prioritized for testing. Screening tools have been used
87 successfully for pediatric and adolescent clients to identify children/adolescents living with HIV
88 and are used to screen-in children and adolescents for testing using socio-demographic and clinical
89 variables (8). However, evidence around use of screening tools in adults is limited (9). Evaluations
90 of behavior-based risk algorithms in the United States and Malawi, to identify sexually transmitted
91 infection (STI) indicate the tools have varying sensitivities and specificities (10). Many countries
92 have adopted the use of risk-based screening tools among adult populations, which screen out
93 significant numbers of people and only test those defined as eligible. The underlying hypothesis is
94 to reduce the total number of tests while increasing the positivity rate.

95 The HTS program at the Ministry of Health (MOH) in Uganda introduced an HIV risk screening
96 tool to determine eligibility for HIV testing among clients attending OPD clinics. Beginning in

97 October 2019, the MOH deployed this tool for use in 24 health facilities, targeting clients aged 15
98 years and above in both OPD and VCT departments.

99 The screening tool included following questions:

- 100 • Does patient have co-morbidities or an exposure risk?
 - 101 ○ Presumptive TB
 - 102 ○ New perpetrators and survivors of SGBV
 - 103 ○ A reactive HIV self-test
 - 104 ○ Elicited through index testing
 - 105 ○ Accidentally exposed to HIV
 - 106 ○ Diagnostic HTS (unconscious, critically ill, mentally impaired)
- 107 • Has the client had an HIV test in the last 12 months?
- 108 • Has the client tested within the last 3 months? If No does the client meet any of the
109 following criteria:
 - 110 ○ Client has had unprotected sex with partner(s) of unknown HIV status or known
111 HIV positive status since the last negative HIV test?
 - 112 ○ HIV negative partner(s) in a discordant relationship and has not had an HIV test
113 within the past 3 months
 - 114 ○ Client has diagnosis of sexually transmitted infection (including Hepatitis B)
115 after previous negative HIV test
 - 116 ○ Client with TB, STI, Hepatitis B, symptomatic of HIV, or is on PEP and Tested
117 HIV Negative at least 1 month ago

118 A client was eligible for HIV testing if any of the responses was “Yes” and ineligible for testing
119 if all the responses were “No”.

120

121 We aimed at determining the operational performance of the screening tool in public health facility
122 settings, by assessing the diagnostic characteristics of the tool in terms of sensitivity, specificity,
123 predictive values, and number needed to test to identify an individual with HIV. We also aimed to
124 determine the cost implication of using or not using the screening tool by analyzing the estimated
125 comparative costs of testing with and without screening as a secondary outcome.

126 **Materials and methods**

127 **Design**

128 We conducted a retrospective secondary data analysis of de-identified and anonymized HIV
129 testing program data, collected and reported by 24 health facilities in Uganda. The de-identified
130 data was requested from the MOH for secondary analysis and upon approval, was extracted from
131 the DHIS2 by district biostatisticians. Data analysis was performed between March and April 2020
132 on all HIV risk screening data collected and reported between October and November 2019. The
133 primary outcome was to compare the sensitivity and specificity of the screening tool with the
134 standard of care (testing without screening), and the secondary outcome was to estimate the cost
135 savings on using the screening tool compared to the standard of care.

136

137 **Settings**

138 Ministry of health Uganda deployed the adolescent and adult HIV risk screening tool to determine
139 eligibility for HIV testing among clients attending OPD clinics in 24 health facilities in October
140 2019. The screening tool was deployed at various levels of the health care system, including
141 primary, secondary, and tertiary health facilities. The use of the screening tool was integrated into
142 routine care, and all clients who sought HTS in the OPD and VCT clinics were consented and
143 screened by health care providers. Health workers used the risk screening tool to determine clients'

144 eligibility for HIV testing. Because clients who attended HIV testing points in the OPD and VCT
145 had turned up for HIV testing, the use of the screening did not exclude anyone from testing, hence
146 both clients who were categorized as eligible or ineligible upon screening were offered HIV testing
147 services including testing and linkage to posttest services. In line with national guidelines, the
148 screening tool was only administered to clients over the age of 15 years. Screening and testing
149 information was recorded using the national health management information system using primary
150 data collection registers. The information was decoded, anonymized, and reported by the health
151 facilities in the district health information system (DHIS2).

152 **Study participants**

153 The data analysis included entries of all clients aged 15 years and above, who were screened for
154 HIV testing eligibility at the 24 health facilities in the months of October and November 2019.

155 **Study variables**

156 The predictor for the primary outcome was binary, “eligible for screening”, or “Not eligible for
157 screening”. And the outcome was the HIV test result “Tested HIV Positive”, or “Tested HIV
158 Negative”. These were stratified by social demographic characteristics including age, gender, and
159 marital status. From the eligibility and the HIV testing results variables, we computed the
160 predictive values Sensitivity, specificity, and number needed to test (NNT) to identify one HIV
161 positive person with or without screening. For the secondary outcome, we estimated the unit cost
162 needed to identify one HIV positive client with or without risk screening from which we
163 determined the cost difference.

164

165 **Sample size and data sources**

166 We included all (census) data submitted into the DHIS2 for clients screened for HIV eligibility at
167 the 24 health facilities in the two months' period (October and November 2019). The data source
168 was DHIS2 (secondary data) from districts where the health facilities belonged. By considering all
169 the data submitted for all facilities, we excluded selection bias which would result from using a
170 small sample. The choice of the 24 health facilities was because, these were the first facilities to
171 use the screening tool and data from these facilities would inform further scale up.

172 **Data analysis**

173 Data was abstracted from the DHIS2 by district biostatisticians and shared with the authors for
174 analysis. The data was checked for consistency and accuracy, was cleaned using excel software,
175 and exported into STATE/SE 15 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas) software for analysis. We
176 included a record which reported both the screening eligibility and a documented HIV test result.
177 We excluded entries with missing screening eligibility, missing HIV test results, and those
178 reporting an age below 15 years. HIV positivity rates (also computed statistically as PPV) with
179 and without screening were calculated allowing for clustering by facility. Sensitivity, specificity,
180 and number needed to test (NNT) were also calculated. Logistic regression with random effects
181 was used to estimate the odds ratio (OR) associated with HIV status for each variable.

182 Cost estimates were calculated based on commodity and human resource (HR) required to conduct
183 HIV testing for clients who were categorized as eligible. Commodity costs were based on public
184 procurement cost of HIV rapid diagnostic tests in Uganda at the time of screening. Human resource
185 costs were calculated using the average salary for counselors in public health facilities. Time
186 requirements for standard of care (no screening in HTS) assumed the time for counseling and
187 testing as was outlined in national guidelines while screening time assumptions were based on

188 implementing partner reports. Estimated costs did not include operational costs, such as training
189 and printing of risk screening tools.


190 **Ethical considerations**

191 The authors analyzed anonymized retrospective secondary program data which did not include
192 client identification information. Neither the authors nor the district biostatisticians interacted with
193 any primary client records before, during or after the data analysis. The analyzed data had been
194 decoded at the time of reporting into the DHIS2 hence access to this data did not pose breach of
195 confidentiality or would not potentially lead to identification of clients. For this reason, the authors
196 did not seek IRB approval but sought clearance from the Ministry of Health to access the secondary
197 data from district DHIS2 systems through district biostatisticians.

198 **Results**

199 A total of 19,854 clients were screened for HIV testing eligibility, we excluded 137 records due to
200 missing HIV testing information, and an additional 13 records were excluded because the
201 documented age was below <15 years (Figure 1).

202 **Figure 1: Study flow chart**



203

204

205 Of the remaining 19,704 (99.2%) clients, 12,971 (66%) were female, with a median age of 27 years

206 (IQR: 21-35). (Table 1).

207 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics stratified by HIV status**

Characteristics	All N=19,704	HIV Status		Univariate OR (95% CI)
		Positive n= 732 (% _{col})	Negative n= 18,972(% _{col})	
Age (years)				
15-19	3,379 (17%)	42 (6%)	3,337 (17%)	1
20-35	11,469 (58%)	457 (62%)	11,012 (58%)	3.10 (2.08-4.63)
36-50	3,310 (17%)	171 (24%)	3,139 (17%)	4.21 (2.78-6.35)
50+	1,546 (8%)	62 (9%)	1,484 (8%)	3.33 (2.00-5.56)

Median age (IQR)	27 (21-35)	30 (25-39)	26 (21-35)	
Gender				
Female	12,971 (66%)	475 (65%)	12,496 (66%)	1
Male	6,733 (34%)	257 (35%)	6,476 (34%)	1.01 (0.83-1.24)
Marital Status				
Married	12,071 (61%)	464 (63%)	11,607 (61%)	1
Divorce/ Separated	1,544 (8%)	115 (16%)	1,429 (8%)	2.11 (1.59-2.81)
Single	5,628 (29%)	128 (18%)	5,500 (29%)	0.60 (0.43-0.85)
Widowed	461 (2%)	25 (3%)	436 (2%)	1.60 (0.88-2.88)
Screening tool (Yes, to any eligibility criteria)	14,879 (76%)	664 (91%)	14,215 (75%)	3.60 (2.30-5.62)

208

209 The overall positivity rate (cluster weighted prevalence of HIV) was estimated at 3.71% (95% CI:
 210 3.06-4.50), which would be the yield without screening. Among those screened, the positivity rate
 211 was 4.5% (95% CI: 4.1%-4.8%). The sensitivity of the tool was 90.7% (95% CI: 88.4%, 92.7%)
 212 while the specificity was 98.6% (95% CI: 98.2%-98.9%). With screening, the number needed to
 213 test (NTT) to identify one PLHIV reduced from 27 to 22. See Table 2.

214 Table 2: Diagnostic characteristics of the adult HIV risk screening tool

Variable	Tested (N)	Positive (n)	Positivity Rate (n/N%, 95% Ci)
Positivity rate			
Without risk screening	19,704	732	3.7%
With risk screening (screened in)	14,879	664	4.5%
With risk screening (screened out)	4,825	68	1.4%
Diagnostic characteristics of the tool			
Sensitivity	732	68	90.7%, (88.4-92.7)
Specificity	19,636	14,879	75.8%, (75.2-76.4)
Positive Predictive Value			12.3%, (11.9-12.6)

Negative predictive value			99.6% (99.4-99.6)
Number needed to test			
Number needed to test without screening	3.7	1	27
Number needed to test with screening	4.5	1	22
Positive Likelihood Ratio	24.2	90.7	3.74, (3.6-3.9)
Negative Likelihood Ratio	75.8	9.3	0.12, (0.10-0.15)

215
 216 Overall screening for HIV testing eligibility using the screening tool would have led to 24.5%
 217 (4,825/19,704) reduction in testing volume but 9.3% (68/732) of PLHIV would have been missed
 218 as they were misclassified as not eligible for testing. The cost per PLHIV identified fell by 3%
 219 from \$69 without screening to \$66.9 with implementation of the screening tool (Table 3).

220 **Table 3: Cost analysis for implementing HIV screening using a risk screening tool at an**
 221 **outpatient department (OPD) in Uganda**

HR and commodity costs for current standard of care compared with screening in OPD			
	Standard of Care	Screening in OPD	Screening tool savings
Total number of tests (A1)	19,704	16,764	2,951
Total cost	\$44,357	\$40,222	\$4,138
Commodities	\$25,825	\$22,036	\$3,790
Human resources	\$18,532	\$18,184	\$348
Cost per PLHIV identified	\$69.05	\$66.91	\$2.14
Commodity cost per PLHIV identified	\$40.2	\$34.4	\$5.9
Human resources per PLHIV identified	\$28.85	\$28.31	\$0.54

222

223 **Discussion**

224 Over the past years, there has been a strong narrative supporting the use of risk screening tools to
225 improve testing efficiency with very limited evidence on their impact. This program data analysis
226 identifies operational gaps in HIV case identification among clients who seek health services at
227 outpatient departments and highlights how HIV risk screening tools may misclassify HIV positive
228 clients as “not at risk” of being HIV positive. These findings relate to those of Antelman and
229 colleagues (11), where a risk screening tool for children and adolescents in Tanzania was reported
230 to miss an unacceptably high proportion (36%) of HIV-positive children. Such missed
231 opportunities may propagate HIV transmission resulting from being unaware of the positive HIV
232 status and may lead to delayed diagnosis and linkage to treatment resulting into AIDS related
233 deaths.

234 Whereas secondary analysis of routine programmatic data from Uganda shows the screening tool
235 could reduce testing volumes by 24% hence apparently saving on the cost per HIV positive case
236 identified, screening resulted in a marginal increase in positivity rate from 3.71% to 4.5%. Of more
237 concern is the number of clients who were misclassified as ineligible for HIV testing, yet they
238 were HIV positive. Health workers in Uganda routinely provide HIV testing demand generation
239 health talks (information giving) at the OPD and VCT waiting areas, which include information
240 on how to opt in for HIV testing. By opting to test for HIV, it means these clients have a perceived
241 risk of being HIV positive and would not need to undergo another layer of screening; thus, without
242 screening, all clients who choose to test for HIV would be tested.

243 Considering the risk screening tool’s inefficiency on a national scale, the number of PLHIV that
244 would be missed through screening at a 90.7% sensitivity is significant. In 2021 for example,

245 Uganda conducted approximately 4,608,652 HIV tests of which 1,753,704 (38%) tests were in
246 OPD. Applying the screening tool to that population would result in missing 5,002 PLHIV, hence
247 it is essential for Ministry to weigh this impact as it scales up implementation.

248 From a cost perspective, screening did slightly reduce the cost per PLHIV identified by about 3%
249 and did result in overall program savings from the lower commodity requirements for reduced
250 testing volumes. However, these savings only accounted for human resource and commodity costs
251 and do not reflect the full costs of implementing screening tools which would include training,
252 printing, dissemination of tools, monitoring, and evaluation among others. In addition, these
253 savings were at the expense of missed PLHIV and would be offset by the cost to reach these missed
254 PLHIV through alternative strategies such as index testing. Facility-based testing is generally less
255 expensive compared to community testing strategies such as outreach, and mobile testing hence
256 all opportunities need to be maximized to identify HIV positive clients who present at the health
257 facilities. If clients living with HIV are screened out at facilities, ministries need to consider if they
258 will ultimately be able to identify these clients through alternative, more expensive testing models.
259 Moreover, it is of ethical concern that HIV positive clients are classified as HIV negative.

260 Routine use of risk screening tools would require training and supervision of HIV testers to
261 minimize user errors that lead to misclassification of clients. During monitoring and supervision
262 visits by ministry of health, it was established that some healthcare workers did not follow the
263 screening standard operating procedure leading to misclassification of clients. Although training
264 and ongoing mentorship would improve healthcare worker capacity to screen, this would probably
265 only address the misclassification bias to a limited extent; for example, if clients do not feel
266 comfortable answering the screening questions truthfully, the risk screening tool would not detect
267 the misclassification. Improving sensitivity of the tool would require formulation of less

268 stigmatizing questions and more private spaces for responses. This is an area for further study to
269 determine the extent to which misclassification bias can be reduced.

270 The costs and implications of failing to identify PLHIV within health facilities where they could
271 be identified and linked to care, may quickly outweigh savings in testing commodities and calls
272 for strategic reforms by countries to consider alternatives to risk screening tools. Of recent, there
273 is growing advocacy for countries to adopt HIV self-testing (HIVST) as a screening approach for
274 clients seeking HIV testing at both facility and community (test for triage). Scaling up HIVST
275 would require formulation or adoption of HIVST policies and a considerable financial investment
276 to roll out these policies, plus commodity management. Recent research in Malawi has shown the
277 potential of HIVST to expand testing coverage, while reducing HR time and limiting the risk of
278 screening PLHIV out, given the much higher sensitivity of antibody screening platforms compared
279 to risk-based screening tools (12).

280 Much as countries are exploring use of HIV risk screening tools to identify PLHIV more efficiently
281 and make better use of available resources, the evidence presented above clearly illustrates the
282 tradeoffs involved in implementing these tools. Lowering HIV testing volumes comes at the
283 expense of screening out PLHIV who have presented for testing in facilities. Furthermore, any
284 overall savings made through use of risk screening tools are significantly offset by the added
285 human resource costs during program implementation. Given that majority of PLHIV have been
286 identified globally and narrowing this to individual countries, the reliance on risk screening tools
287 to classify who is likely to be HIV positive may be counterproductive especially in low HIV
288 prevalence countries or in high prevalence countries but with a low HIV treatment adjusted
289 prevalence. For such countries, an antibody/antigen screening test would be most ideal.

290

291 **Limitations**

292 This was a secondary analysis of routine program data from 24 health facilities that were not
293 randomly selected and may not represent over 3,000 health facilities that offer HTS in the country.
294 Costing included commodity and human resource costs, as these are primary cost drivers for HTS,
295 but was not exhaustive and did not include operational costs. HR time requirements were estimated
296 based on guidelines and implementing partner reports, rather than time-in-motion studies.

297 **Conclusion**

298 The use of HIV risk screening tool in OPD settings in Uganda demonstrated improved HIV
299 testing efficiency by reducing testing volumes but resulted in screening out of a significant
300 number of people living with HIV. There was minimal cost savings earned through testing
301 fewer people, but these would be offset by the cost to reach the missed PLHIV through alternative
302 and more expensive HIV testing strategies such as index testing.

303 **Recommendations**

304 The team recommends use of scientifically validated HIV risk screening tools by countries;
305 ministries should provide regular support supervision and mentorship to all HIV testers to ensure
306 adherence to the risk screening SOPs, and to limit misclassification of clients seeking HTS, facility
307 based HIVST (HIV antibody test) should be adopted. Scientific validation of risk screening tool
308 using a statistically representative sample is recommended to generate generalizable results.

309

310 **Acknowledgements**

311 Special thanks to the staff of Uganda Ministry of Health, STD/AIDS Control program, Health
312 workers at the 24 health facilities where secondary data was abstracted, PEPFAR-CDC Uganda
313 and CHAI Uganda.

314 **Funding**

315 Authors did not receive any grant to support the data analysis, however, the Clinton Health Access
316 Initiative (CHAI) was providing technical assistance to the Ministry of Health to scale up the
317 quality of HIV testing services in Uganda.

318

319 **References**

320

- 321 1. Muttai H, Guyah B, Achia T, Musingila P, Nakhumwa J, Oyoo R, et al. Mapping
322 geographic clusters of new HIV diagnoses to inform granular-level interventions for HIV
323 epidemic control in western Kenya. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21.
- 324 2. UNAIDS. UNAIDS DATA 2021. UNAIDS 2021 REFERENCE2021.
- 325 3. De Cock KM, Barker JL, Baggaley R, El Sadr WM. Where are the positives? HIV testing
326 in sub-Saharan Africa in the era of test and treat. *AIDS*. 2019;33(2).
- 327 4. PEPFAR. PEPFAR 2020 Country Operational Plan Guidance for all PEPFAR Countries.
328 2020.
- 329 5. Uganda AIDS Commission. Empowering Young People to Champion the End of New
330 HIV Infections. In: Health, editor. Uganda2020.
- 331 6. Martelli G, Van Duffel L, Kwezi EC, Cavallin F, Salehe IA, Torelli GF, et al.
332 Community- and facility-based HIV testing interventions in northern Tanzania: Midterm results
333 of Test & Treat Project. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(4):e0266870.

- 334 7. PEPFAR. PEPFAR Uganda Country Operational Plan (COP) 2019-Strategic Direction
335 Summary. In: Health, editor.: PEPFAR; 2019.
- 336 8. Bandason T, Dauya E, Dakshina S, McHugh G, Chonzi P, Munyati S, et al. Screening
337 tool to identify adolescents living with HIV in a community setting in Zimbabwe: A validation
338 study. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(10):e0204891.
- 339 9. Muttai H, Guyah B, Musingila P, Achia T, Miruka F, Wanjohi S, et al. Development and
340 Validation of a Sociodemographic and Behavioral Characteristics-Based Risk-Score Algorithm
341 for Targeting HIV Testing Among Adults in Kenya. *AIDS Behav*. 2021;25(2):297-310.
- 342 10. Powers KA, Miller WC, Pilcher CD, Mapanje C, Martinson FE, Fiscus SA, et al.
343 Improved detection of acute HIV-1 infection in sub-Saharan Africa: development of a risk score
344 algorithm. *Aids*. 2007;21(16):2237-42.
- 345 11. Antelman G, Gill MM, Jahanpour O, van de Ven R, Kahabuka C, Barankana A, et al.
346 Balancing HIV testing efficiency with HIV case-identification among children and adolescents
347 (2-19 years) using an HIV risk screening approach in Tanzania. *PLoS One*.
348 2021;16(5):e0251247.
- 349 12. Nichols BE, de Nooy A, Benade M, Balakasi K, Mphande M, Rao G, et al. Facility-based
350 HIV self-testing strategies may substantially and cost-effectively increase the number of men and
351 youth tested for HIV in Malawi: results from an individual-based mathematical model. *J Int*
352 *AIDS Soc*. 2022;25(10):e26020.

353