

1 **Title: A conceptualisation and psychometric**
2 **evaluation of positive psychological outcome**
3 **measures used in adolescents and young adults**
4 **living with HIV: a mixed scoping and systematic**
5 **review**

6

7 **Authors:** Jermaine M. Dambi ^{1, §}, Frances M. Cowan ^{2,3}, Faith Martin ⁴, Sharon Sibanda ², Victoria
8 Simms ⁵, Nicola Willis ⁶, Sarah Bernays ^{5,7}, Webster Mavhu ^{2,3}

9

10 **Affiliations:**

11 ¹ University of Zimbabwe: Rehabilitation Sciences Unit, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
12 Avondale, Harare, Zimbabwe

13 ² Centre for Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Research (CeSHHAR), Harare, Zimbabwe

14 ³ Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, United Kingdom

15 ⁴ Cardiff University, Park Place, United Kingdom

16 ⁵ London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom

17 ⁶ ZVANDIRI, Avondale, Harare, Zimbabwe

18 ⁷ University of Sydney, Camperdown, Australia

19

20 § Corresponding author

21 **Email addresses:** jermainedambi@gmail.com/jermainedambi@friendshipbench.io (JMD)

22

23

24

25 Abstract

26 **Introduction:** Sub-Saharan Africa bears the greatest burden of HIV/mental disorders combined. It is
27 important to evaluate the mental health of adolescents and young adults living with HIV (AYALHIV)
28 comprehensively by measuring both negative and positive psychological constructs. There has been a
29 proliferation of interest in positive psychological outcome measures, but the evidence of their
30 psychometric robustness is fragmented. This review sought to:

- 31 1) Identify positive psychological outcomes and corresponding outcome measures used in AYALHIV in
32 sub-Saharan Africa
- 33 2) Critically appraise the psychometrics of the identified outcome measures

34
35 **Methods and analysis:** Independent and blinded reviewers searched articles in PubMed, Scopus,
36 Africa-Wide Information, CINAHL, Psych INFO, and Google Scholar. Separate independent reviewers
37 screened the retrieved articles. We applied a narrative synthesis to map the key constructs. The risk of
38 bias across studies was evaluated using the COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health
39 Measurement INSTRUMENTS (COSMIN) checklist. The quality of the psychometric properties was rated
40 using the COSMIN checklist and qualitatively synthesised using the modified Grading of
41 Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation checklist.

42
43 **Results:** We identified 15 positive psychological constructs: body appreciation, confidence, coping,
44 flourishing, meaningfulness, personal control, positive outlook, resilience, self-management, self-
45 compassion, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-worth and transcendence that had been used
46 to assess ALHIV. Resilience, self-concept, self-esteem, coping and self-efficacy were the most
47 measured constructs. Construct validity and internal consistency were the properties most frequently
48 assessed, while content validity and structural validity were assessed less often.

49
50 **Conclusions:** Few studies performed complete validations; thus, evidence for psychometric
51 robustness was fragmented. However, this review shows the initial evidence of the feasibility of using
52 positive psychological outcomes in low-resource settings. Instead of creating new outcomes,
53 researchers are recommended to leverage the existing measures, adapt them for use, and, if
54 appropriate, strive to maintain the factorial structure to facilitate comparisons.

55 **Registration:** PROSPERO-CRD42022325172.

56
57 **Keywords:** Adolescents; Global Mental Health; HIV/AIDS; psychometrics; positive psychology;
58 systematic review: sub-Saharan Africa.

59
60
61
62

63 Introduction

64 The burden of HIV in young people in low-resource settings, particularly in the sub-Saharan Africa
65 (SSA) region, remains high [1,2]. Adolescence and early adulthood are challenging developmental
66 stages, with the burden of navigating life challenges often even greater for adolescents and young
67 adults living with HIV (AYALHIV) [2–4]. For instance, AYALHIV face multiple psychosocial and structural
68 challenges, including stigma, negotiating reproductive health, socioeconomic deprivation, violence,
69 grief, orphaning and other difficulties [1,2,4,5]. HIV has evolved into a long-term condition with a
70 concomitant surge in comorbid non-communicable diseases [3,6]. For example, common mental
71 disorders, including anxiety and depression, are highly prevalent in AYALHIV, with a pooled prevalence
72 of 26.1% (95% CI 18.9-34.8) [2]. However, there are few integrated programmes combining HIV and
73 mental health care [2–4]. Importantly, many mental health conditions that present in adulthood emerge
74 in late adolescence and young adulthood, and effective management earlier in the life course can
75 prevent long-term mental health difficulties [2,3]. Systematic reviews have demonstrated that access to
76 mental healthcare by AYALHIV is associated with positive outcomes across the treatment continuum,
77 including: increased treatment initiation, increased adherence to care, viral suppression, and reduced
78 morbidity and mortality [3,4,7,8].

79
80 Mental health endpoints within HIV care have been traditionally conceptualised as improvements in
81 negative psychiatric symptomatology [5,9]. For example, success in psychotherapies is invariably
82 benchmarked against declines in rates of depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorders, and
83 other negative psychological indices [5]. However, focusing on negative indices misses the opportunity
84 to capture mental health's multidimensionality [10]. A holistic mental health evaluation requires a
85 comprehensive focus on both negative and positive mental health constructs [5, 7], and recognition of
86 this has resulted in a shift towards positive psychology, a framework that emphasises increasing human
87 well-being and positive functioning [5,10–12]. Positive mental health interventions (PMHIs) are
88 anchored upon the need to optimise human strengths and capabilities to improve positive outcomes
89 such as self-esteem, resilience, hope, self-worth, social resources, and flourishing [5,9,13]. For
90 instance, studies have shown that people living with a chronic condition (e.g., HIV) develop resilience
91 with time [5,13]. The resilience developed in navigating the challenges of living with a chronic condition
92 is potentially transferable into everyday functioning [13]. Positive psychology interventions (e.g.,
93 resilience-building approaches) are central to prevention health promotion and act as an entry point to
94 stepped care for mental health problems in routine HIV care [5].

95
96 With the proliferation of PMHIs comes the need to routinely evaluate the clinical endpoints from both
97 the clients' and therapists' perspectives [14]. The patient's evaluation of their health, treatment
98 expectations and outcomes are contingent upon the availability of validated and reliable outcome
99 measures [9]. The last few decades have seen a proliferation of positive psychology outcome measures
100 [15]. However, there is limited understanding of the salient positive psychological constructs linked to

101 AYALHIV's improved well-being and health-related quality of life. Rigorous evaluation of PMHIs is
102 essential but limited by a lack of robust measures.

103

104 In their scoping review, Wayant et al. (2021) mapped 15 positive psychological constructs associated
105 with increased quality of life and survival in adolescents and young adults living with cancer [16]. Well-
106 being, personal growth, hope, meaning in life, self-esteem, vitality and optimism were the most cited
107 positive constructs [16]; these constructs are potentially relevant to AYALHIV. Conversely, etiological
108 differences between cancer and HIV could also lead to differences in lived experiences, resulting in
109 differential perceptions of positive psychological constructs [16]. For instance, HIV-related stigma (often
110 associated with issues related to HIV's potential infectiousness) may have a more significant impact on
111 mental health functioning in AYALHIV [12,22] when compared to the effects of cancer-related stigma
112 [13]. It is thus critical to contextualise the impacts of positive psychological outcomes in AYALHIV.

113

114 Elsewhere, Govindasamy et al. (2021) performed a mixed-methods systematic review to explore
115 correlates of well-being among AYALHIV in SSA to inform econometric evaluations [17]. The review
116 showed that social support, belonging, purpose in life, and self-acceptance optimise well-being in
117 AYALHIV [17]. Also, Orth, Moosajee and Van Wyk (2023) performed a systematic review to identify and
118 conceptualise mental wellness in adolescents [10]. The review identified 13 concepts: life satisfaction,
119 mental well-being, resilience, self-efficacy, self-esteem, connectedness, coping, self-control,
120 mindfulness/spirituality, hope, sense of coherence, happiness, and life purpose. However, no
121 psychometric evaluation of the analysed instruments was done [10,17]. Earlier work by Govindasamy
122 et al. (2021) and Orth, Moosajee and Van Wyk (2023) provides essential insights into the broad nature
123 of well-being conceptualisation in AYALHIV. However, the sole focus on mental well-being limits our
124 comprehensive understanding of the spectrum of positive psychological constructs in AYALHIV living
125 in SSA. There is need to build on earlier work and understand positive psychological constructs in HIV
126 care for AYALHIV: such work is potentially applicable to other chronic conditions, given the multi-level
127 impacts of HIV. Also, there is a paucity of collective evidence of the psychometric robustness of the
128 positive psychological outcome measures used in AYALHIV. Some of the available generic outcomes
129 may not comprehensively reflect the nuances of living with HIV [17]. Further, different investigators use
130 varying wording to refer to the same construct; a mapping of the constructs is vital. This mixed review,
131 therefore, sought to:

132 1) Identify positive psychological outcomes and corresponding outcome measures used in AYALHIV
133 in SSA.

134 2) Critically appraise the psychometric properties of the identified positive psychology outcomes used
135 in AYALHIV.

136

137 **Methods**

138 **Overview**

139 This mixed review was done in two sequential and complementary phases. First, a scoping review
140 identified positive psychological outcomes used in AYALHIV in SSA and mapped the constructs onto
141 the corresponding measures. The scoping review was performed per Preferred Reporting Items for
142 Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines - See
143 **S1 Table** [18]. The second phase systematically evaluated the psychometric properties of the outcomes
144 identified from the scoping review. Evaluation of outcome measures' psychometrics was performed and
145 reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
146 (PRISMA) guidelines [19] - See **S2 Table**. Where appropriate, we outlined specific methodological
147 considerations unique to each phase.

148 **Protocol/ registration**

149 The protocol was registered on the PROSPERO database - CRD42022325172 and was previously
150 published [12].

151 **Eligibility criteria**

152 The following criteria were applied in selecting articles:

153 **Construct(s)**

154 We included studies evaluating positive psychological constructs. We broadly defined positive
155 psychological outcomes as any construct focusing on "... *aspects of the human condition that promote*
156 *fulfilment, happiness, and flourishing...*" [20]. Positive psychology is a rapidly developing field;
157 consequently, there is variability in the definition and conceptualization of psychological constructs
158 [5,10–12,16,20]. We build upon operational definitions outlined by Wayant et al. in their mapping of
159 positive psychological constructs in paediatric and adolescent/young adult patients with cancer [16].
160 Wayant et al.'s scoping review yielded these 15 constructs: contentment, gratitude, happiness, hope,
161 life satisfaction, meaning in life, optimism, perseverance, personal growth, resilience, self-esteem, self-
162 acceptance, tranquillity, vitality and well-being.

163 **Study designs/interventions**

164 For the scoping review, we included all quantitative designs, mixed methods, qualitative studies
165 exploring the positive psychological phenomenon in AYALHIV in SSA, and grey literature (e.g., blogs
166 and websites). For the systematic review, only quantitative designs were included. Systematic reviews,
167 editorials, and study protocols were excluded from the scoping and systematic reviews.

168 **Participants/settings**

169 For both phases of the mixed review, we analysed all studies reporting on using and evaluating positive
170 psychological constructs in AYALHIV (10-24 years-old) in SSA across all settings. We focused on
171 AYALHIV as it is the group with the greatest burden of HIV globally [17]. We anticipated that some

172 studies contained data on AYALHIV and other age bands (e.g., children and middle-aged adults). In
173 such cases, an article was considered for review if the average age was within the 10-24 years range
174 or if over 50% of the participants were AYALHIV.

175 **Language**

176 We restricted the analysis to articles published in English for both phases of the mixed review. We did
177 not have the resources to analyse articles published in other languages.

178 **Information sources**

179 Peer-reviewed articles were searched/retrieved from these electronic databases: PubMed, Scopus,
180 Web of Science, Africa-Wide Information, CINAHL, PsychInfo, and Google Scholar. Databases were
181 searched from inception through February 28th, 2023. Where only an abstract was available online, and
182 information regarding psychometrics was neither clear nor available from the text, an attempt to contact
183 the lead author was made, requesting the full article to ensure literature saturation and a truthful rating.
184 The article was excluded from the review if there was no response in two weeks following three email
185 reminders. We also reviewed grey literature using the Google Scholar search engine to search potential
186 databases such as university databases, research reports, pre-prints, newsletters and bulletins, policy
187 briefs, guidelines, and conference proceedings for articles. For completeness, we also performed both
188 backwards and forward searches of the reference lists of identified articles and databases, respectively.
189 Finally, we also contacted experts implementing PMHIs to check for articles we may have missed during
190 the literature searches.

191 **Search strategy**

192 For the scoping review, as an illustration, articles in CINAHL were searched using the AND Boolean
193 logic operators, i.e., 1 AND 6 AND 9 AND 12 (**S3 Table**). The search strategy was amended for the
194 systematic review component to include additional constructs identified through the scoping review.

195 **Data management**

196 Retrieved articles were imported into a password-protected Mendeley reference manager. The articles
197 were also synchronised onto Mendeley and Dropbox cloud storage platforms and backed-up onto a
198 password-encrypted external hard drive. All collaborators had full access/administrative privileges to
199 the shared Dropbox folder for the present systematic review. A trail/history of the electronic searches
200 was also saved on users' PubMed, Scopus, and EBSCOhost accounts. We also printed summaries of
201 all the searches to enhance the data capturing of the search records.

202 **Data collection process**

203 The data collection process was conducted in three stages, i.e., article retrieval, screening, and data
204 extraction. These processes were invariably similar for the scoping and systematic review phases.
205 Here, we describe these processes and highlight, where appropriate, differences in the two phases of
206 the review.

207 **Article retrieving**

208 Two researchers (SS & JMD) independently searched articles using a pre-defined search strategy. The
209 lead author (JMD) then imported the searches into Mendeley and removed duplicates.

210 **Screening**

211 Upon completion of article retrieval, another set of independent researchers (SB & WM) screened the
212 articles by title and abstract using Rayyan software [21]. To increase methodological rigour, both
213 researchers independently reviewed all retrieved articles, including documenting reasons for exclusion.
214 Rayyan software automatically collates the number of hits assigned different ratings by reviewers.
215 Discrepancies were resolved through discussion, and where consensus was not reached, a more senior
216 researcher (WM) made the final decision. JMD and SS then perform backwards and forward citation
217 searches to identify other potential articles. Two senior researchers (FMC & WM) reviewed the list of
218 identified articles afterwards to check for the completeness of the searches.

219 **Data extraction**

220 Once searches were finalised, two researchers (FM and NW) retrieved the full articles and
221 independently extracted data from articles meeting the inclusion criteria. Data extraction was performed
222 in duplicate. Disagreements during data extraction were resolved through consensus, and more senior
223 researchers (FMC & WM) made the final decisions if any impasses occurred. For both phases of the
224 review, we extracted the following information per study: research setting and design, study sample and
225 participants' demographics. For the systematic review component, we extracted information on the
226 mode of administration, the number of items, descriptions of domains, scoring and interpretation of
227 scores and whether measures were free to use or required a license fee or other payment.

228 **Charting/Outcomes and prioritisation**

229 Qualitative conceptualisation of positive psychological constructs and the appraisal of psychometric
230 properties of the identified outcome measures were the primary outcomes of the scoping and systematic
231 review phases, respectively. For the systematic review, the clinical utility of the identified outcome
232 measures was the secondary outcome. See **S4 Table** for operational definitions of psychometric
233 properties for the systematic review component [22,23].

234 **Risk of bias-individual studies**

235 The scoping review aimed to understand the conceptualisation of AYALHIV's positive psychological
236 constructs. Consequently, we did not perform any risk of bias (RoB) assessments. However, the
237 systematic review component aimed to synthesise the evidence of psychometric robustness,
238 necessitating RoB assessment. We used the revised COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of
239 health Measurement INstruments (COSMIN) checklist to assess the RoB across studies retrieved for
240 psychometric evaluation [22,23]. The COSMIN methodology consists of three steps. The checklist
241 consists of methodological benchmarks for ten (10) psychometric properties, which are categorised into
242 three major groups, i.e. content validity (e.g. patient-reported outcome measure development), internal
243 structure (e.g. structural validity), and other psychometrical properties (e.g. criterion validity) [22,23].
244 Each psychometric property is rated using a pre-set criterion, and using the principle of "worse score

245 counts", the lowest rating is ascribed as the overall methodological quality rating [23]. Methodological
246 quality is rated on a four-point Likert scale, i.e. "inadequate", "doubtful", "adequate", and "very good";
247 the higher the rating, the lower the risk of bias [22,23]. We anticipated that not all details might be
248 recorded for the retrieved articles, especially for studies whose primary aim was not psychometric
249 evaluation. We, therefore, contacted the corresponding author to achieve the most truthful rating of the
250 psychometric property to decrease bias during analysis.

251 **Quality of psychometric properties and data extraction**

252 The quality of psychometrical properties was evaluated using an updated, hybrid checklist based on
253 previous work by Terwee et al. [24] and Prinsen et al. [25] (**See S5 Table**). Each psychometric property
254 was rated as; sufficient (+), insufficient (-), or indeterminate (?) [22]. Positive ratings represent high-
255 quality psychometrics [22].

256 **Best evidence synthesis**

257 We applied a narrative synthesis to map the key "themes/constructs" emerging from the scoping review.
258 We mapped the constructs to corresponding outcome measures; this mapping exercise subsequently
259 guided the psychometric evaluation. The collective evidence per psychometric property per outcome
260 was synthesised using the modified Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and
261 Evaluation (GRADE) checklist [26]. The modified GRADE checklist was then used to collate the RoB
262 results and the quality of psychometric ratings to qualitatively synthesise/summarise the quality of
263 evidence per psychometric property across studies. A meta-analysis was not possible given the
264 heterogeneity of outcome measures retrieved. The quality of evidence per psychometrical property was
265 classified as very low, low, moderate or high [26] - **See S6 Table**.

266 **Patient and Public Involvement statement**

267 We worked collaboratively with AYALHIV during data collection and dissemination. AYALHIV
268 representatives previously trained and involved in systematic reviews assisted with article screening.
269 This review is attached to ongoing work in which AYALHIV are collaboratively engaged. It is part of a
270 larger study to explore various constructs to understand how they improve AYALHIV's health outcomes.
271 We have recruited AYALHIV to serve as a Youth Expert Panel (YEP). The YEP functions as both a
272 guide to the study/research process and an additional group of analysts and discussants to examine
273 the emerging analysis and findings. We also co-created the dissemination plans; for instance,
274 adolescents and young adults with lived experiences were involved in co-developing output animation
275 and contributing to the project blogs, amongst other dissemination activities.

276 **Ethics and dissemination**

277 No ethical approvals were needed as this is a literature review. The mixed review maps and appraise
278 the collective evidence of the psychometric robustness of positive psychological outcomes used in
279 AYALHIV. The review builds on recommendations of systematic reviews on objectively measuring
280 positive psychological constructs across diverse populations. This is important given the need to use
281 valid and reliable outcomes in understanding the positive effects of living with HIV. The review also
282 assisted in identifying psychometrically robust outcomes to inform an item bank to adapt a context-

283 specific outcome measure for AYALHIV in low-resource settings. For example, we consolidated all self-
 284 esteem outcome measures and categorised items from multiple outcomes into common
 285 factors/“themes”. The outputs collectively informed the development, implementation, and evaluation of
 286 a bespoke positive mental health intervention for AYALHIV, hence a need for a multimodal
 287 dissemination plan to reach multiple stakeholders. In addition to publishing the outcomes in a peer-
 288 reviewed journal, we disseminated the outcomes through social media, policy briefs and blogs.

289

290 Results

291 The results are presented in two parts. First, we present the mapping of constructs identified from the
 292 analysed studies from the scoping review component. The second part presents the qualitative
 293 synthesis of standardized outcome measures analysed in the systematic review.

294 Study selection

295 We retrieved 6437 studies, of which 1 679 were duplicates. After de-duplication, 4748 articles were
 296 screened by title and abstract; of these, 4050 were assessed for eligibility. Six (60) articles met the full
 297 criteria and were analysed in this review. See **S7 Figure** for the PRISMA flowchart.

298 Description of study participants and settings

299 Slightly over half of the outcomes were developed in high-income settings (15/29), with 19 studies
 300 conducted in urban areas, six (6) in rural settings and four (4) in both urban and rural localities. 13/29
 301 (45%) of the studies were cross-sectional, with 20/29 (69%) of the studies published between 2018 and
 302 2023 - **See Error! Reference source not found..**

303 **Table 1: Description of study participants and settings**

Construct	Name of tool	Country; setting	Design	Participants, Sample size	Age (years)
Body Appreciation	Body appreciation scale 2 (BAS-2)	South Africa; Urban Primary care clinics	Cross-sectional.	YPLHIV (N=76)	Range:15–24; Mean (SD): 19.4 (2.6)
Confidence	Ad hoc	Zimbabwe; rural primary healthcare clinics	RCT	ALHIV, (N=94)	Range: 10-15
Coping	Psychological Adjustment to Illness Scale Self Report (PAIS-SR)	Nigeria; urban	Quasi-experimental	Non-Disclosed YPLHIV, (N=19)	Range: 15–29
Coping	Acceptance of illness scale (AIS)	Nigeria; Rural and Urban HIV treatment centres	Mixed methods	Pregnant women living with HIV (N=840)	Range: 22-46

Coping	Ad hoc	South Africa; primary care clinics	RCT	Women living with IV (N=143)	Range: 18-50: Mean (SD) control: 28.4 (6.3) : Mean (SD) intervention: 30.6 (5.8)
Flourishing	Flourishing Well Being Scale (FWBS)	South Africa; households; households	Cross-sectional	AGYW living with HIV (N=568)	Range: 10–24
Meaningfulness	HIV meaningfulness scale (HIVMS)	Nigeria; Rural and Urban HIV treatment centres	Mixed methods	Pregnant women living with HIV (N=840)	Range: 22-46 years
Personal Control	Mastery Scale (MS)	Ghana; Urban-Hospital-based clinic	Cross-sectional	PLHIV in Ghana & USA (N=55 Ghana)	Range 15-49
Positive Outlook	Positive Outlook-Individual Protective Factors Index (PIPFI)	Uganda; Urban-Community clinic	Retrospective cohort study	Children living with HIV, exposed and unexposed to HIV (N=165)	Range: 6-18: Mean (SD): 10.8 (3.5)
Resilience	Child Youth Resilience Measure-12 (CYRM-12)	South Africa; Urban-public health ART clinics	Cross-sectional	ALHIV, (N=385)	Range 13-18: Median (IQR): 15 (14-16)
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-25)	South Africa: Rural-Community-based	Cross-sectional survey	YPLHIV (N=334)	Range: 12-24 : Median (IQR): 21 (16 to 23)
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-25)	South Africa; Rural-public healthcare facilities	Cross-sectional survey	YPLHIV (N=359)	Range: 12-24: Median (IQR): 21 (16- 23)
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10)	South Africa; Households	Cross-sectional	AGYW living with HIV (N = 568)	Range 10–24
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	Lesotho; Urban – hospital and Youth centre	Cross-sectional survey	AYLWH (N = 183)	Range: 15–25: Median (IQR): 22 (4)
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	South Africa; Urban – healthcare facilities	cross-sectional	ALHIV (N=385)	Range: 13–18 Median (IQR): 15 (14-16)
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	South; Africa; Urban – healthcare facilities	mixed method	ALHIV (N=385)	Range: 13-18: Median (IQR): 15 (14 – 16)
Self-compassion	Self-compassion scale (SCS)	Nigeria; Rural and Urban HIV treatment centres	Mixed methods	Pregnant women living with HIV (N=840)	Range 22-4

Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)	South Africa; Urban-HIV clinics	Cohort	YLP HIV (N=203), HIV-U (N=44)	Range 9–11: Median (IQR) YLP HIV: 10.7 (9.9 – 11.4) Median (IQR): HIV-U: 10.3 (9.7-11.1)
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)	South Africa; Urban-Public sector healthcare service	prospective cohort study baseline data	PHIV+ adolescents (N=204), Control (N=44)	Range 9-11: HIV+ mean = 10.4 SD 0.9; controls Mean = 10.4 SD = 1.1
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)	South Africa; Urban – Research Centre	Cohort study	ALHIV (N=122)	Range 12–15 PHIV+ (Mean SD): 13.5 (1.0); Controls (Mean SD):13.8 (1.2)
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)	Uganda; Rural – Public schools	longitudinal study	AIDS orphaned adolescents (N=268)	Range 11-17: Mean (SD): 13.7 (1.3)
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)	South Africa; Urban-HIV clinics	Longitudinal study	Perinatally infected YLHIV (N=37)	Range: 9-14; Mean (SD): 11.6 (1.7)
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)	South Africa; Urban – Paediatric HIV clinics and public hospitals	RCT baseline data	PHIV (N=177)	Range: 9-14; Mean (SD): 11.68 (1.42)
Self-Efficacy	Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children	Tanzania; Urban – weekly paediatric clinic	Pilot randomized waitlist-controlled trial	ALHIV (N=48)	Range: 14-18; Mean (SD): 15.7 (1.4)
Self-Efficacy	Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-Item Scale (SE-6-Xhosa)	South Africa; Urban-Community Health Centre	Cross-sectional	Xhosa women with HIV (N = 229)	Range 18-40; Mean (SD): 30.7 (4.8)
Self-Efficacy	HIV-Adherence self-efficacy assessment survey (HIV-ASES)	Kenya; Urban- HIV care and treatment outpatient clinic	Cross-sectional	ALHIV (N=82)	Range 16-19; Median (IQR): 17 (16 – 18)
Self-Efficacy	Ad hoc	South Africa; Urban – primary schools	Mixed Methods	Female adolescents (N=382)	Range: 11-16
Self-Efficacy	Ad hoc	South Africa; Urban-Primary care clinics	Pilot Interventional study	Women living with HIV (N=120)	Range: 18-50; Mean (SD) Control: 28.4 (6.3) ;Mean (SD) Intervention: 30.6 (5.8)

Self-Efficacy	Ad hoc	Eswatini; Rural and Urban HIV care and treatment facilities	Cross- sectional	ALHIV (N=40)	Mean (SD): 15.5 (1.6)
Self-Efficacy	Ad hoc	Uganda; and Kenya; Facility-based	Cross- sectional	ALHIV (N=582)	Mean (SD): 14.6 (1.4)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Nigeria; Urban-HIV support care centre	Cross- sectional	HIV positive adults	Range: 18-62 ;Mean (SD): 30.9 (11.4)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Ghana; Urban- Hospital- based clinic	Cross- sectional	PLHIV in Ghana & USA (N= 55 Ghana)	Range 15-49
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	South Africa; Urban – primary schools	Mixed Methods	Female adolescents (N = 382)	Range: 11-16
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	South Africa: Rural- Community based	Cross sectional survey	YPLHIV (N=334)	Range: 12-24; Median (IQR): 21 (16-23)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Namibia; Rural – Health Centre	Exploratory design	PLWHA (N=124)	Range: 13-74; Mean (SD): 31.8 (10.9)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	South Africa; Rural-public healthcare facilities	Cross sectional survey	YPLHIV (N=359)	Range: 12-24 Median (IQR): 21 (16-23)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	South Africa; urban	Cross- sectional.	YPLHIV (N=76)	Range:15-24; Mean (SD): 19.4 (2.6)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Tanzania; Urban – weekly paediatric clinic	pilot randomized waitlist- controlled trial	ALHIV (N=48)	Range: 14- 18 Mean (SD): 15.7 (1.4)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	<i>Ghana</i> ; Urban- hospital	Cross- sectional study	ALHIV (N=139)	Range: 13-19; Mean (SD):16.6 (1.8)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Kenya; Urban- HIV care and treatment outpatient clinic	Cross- sectional	ALHIV (N = 82)	Range 16-19; Median (IQR): 17 (16-18)
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self- esteem Measure (RSEM-10)	Uganda and Kenya; Facility- based	Cross- sectional	ALHIV (N=582)	Mean (SD): 14.6 (1.4)
Self-esteem	Modified Rosenberg Self-	South Africa; Urban –	Mixed Methods	Female Adolescents (N = 382)	Range: 11-16

	esteem Measure (RSEM-8)	primary schools			
Self-esteem	Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)	Uganda; Rural – Public schools	Longitudinal study	AIDS orphaned adolescents (N=268)	Range 11-17; Mean (SD): 13.7 (1.3)
Self-esteem	Self-esteem-Hare Area-specific self-esteem scale	Uganda; Urban-Community clinic	Retrospective cohort study	children with and without perinatal HIV Infection/exposure (N=165)	Range: 6-18; Mean (SD): 10.8 (3.5)
Self-esteem	Ad hoc	South Africa, Primary care clinics	RCT	Women living with HIV (N=143)	Range: 18-50
Self-esteem	Ad hoc	Uganda and South Africa-Facility-based	Cross-sectional	Adults receiving palliative services (N=285)	mean (SD): 40.1 (12.8)
Self-worth	Ad hoc	Zimbabwe; Rural – Primary Healthcare Clinics	RCT	ALHIV (N=94)	Range: 10-15
Transcendence	Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index (MVQOLI) Transcendent Subscale	Uganda and South Africa; Rural to urban non-profit and state service, palliative care services and voluntary sector hospice service	Cross-sectional	Adults receiving palliative services (N=285)	mean (SD): 40.1 (12.8)

304

305 **Qualitative mapping of positive constructs - scoping review**

306 **results**

307 **<Insert Figure 1 here>**

308 ***Figure 1: Qualitative mapping of positive psychological constructs***

309 From the qualitative studies, six positive psychological constructs emerged, i.e., courage, self-reliance,
 310 self-esteem, self-acceptance, resilience, and coping. Self-concept was conceptualised as an interaction
 311 of self-esteem, self-reliance, self-acceptance, and self-reflection. Self-concept is central to positive
 312 functioning; for example, high self-esteem is essential for living with HIV. The studies also suggested
 313 that resilience was crucial to coping with the demands of living with a chronic condition. Sociocultural
 314 belief systems shape resilience and are essential for treatment adherence. Social support optimised
 315 positive mental health function, with participants citing support from several sources (e.g., family and
 316 peers). Lastly, stigma and fear of disclosure were seen as the most significant barriers to positive
 317 psychological functioning - See **S8 Table** for further details.

318 **Quantitative mapping of positive constructs - systematic**
 319 **review results.**

320 **Description of outcome measure characteristics**

321 <Insert Figure 2 here>

322 **Figure 2: Constructs Map**

323 We retrieved 36 outcome measures spanning 15 positive psychological constructs. Resilience, self-
 324 concept, self-esteem, coping and self-efficacy were the most commonly reported constructs, as visually
 325 depicted in **Figure 2**. The item range for the outcomes was 5-45, with 19/36 (53%) scored on a 5-point
 326 Likert scale and most (29/36, 81%) available for free/without payment. However, a few outcome
 327 measures (11/36, 31%) had scoring instructions available - **See S9 Table**.

328 **Results of individual outcomes sorted by construct.**

329 A description of the different outcome measures is presented subsequently; results are arranged
 330 alphabetically per construct. In **Table 2** we present methodological quality/RoB assessment ratings ,
 331 with **Table 3** outlining the collation of quality of outcomes and best evidence synthesis.

332 **Table 2: Methodological ratings**

Construct	Outcome Measure	Structural validity	Internal consistency	Convergent validity - comparison with other outcome measurement instruments	Discriminative or known-groups validity	Construct validity (hypotheses testing approach) - comparison with other outcome measurement instruments.	Construct validity (hypotheses testing approach) - comparison between subgroups.	Responsiveness - hypotheses testing before and after intervention
Body Appreciation	Body Appreciation Scale- 2 (BAS-2)			Adequate [28] ●only internal consistency was reported for the outcome measure.				
Confidence	Ad hoc							Inadequate [29] ●No formal validation of outcomes despite pilot testing and adaptation
Coping	Psychological Adjustment to Illness Scale Self Report (PAIS-SR)			Inadequate [31] ●no translation and validation of outcomes for local use				Inadequate [31] ●sample too small for statistical tests
Coping	Acceptance of illness scale (AIS)			Doubtful [32] ●only the reliability coefficient reported				
Coping	Coping with HIV+ status						Inadequate [33] ●no psychometrics of	

							outcome measures were provided	
Flourishing	Flourishing Well Being Scale (FBWS)			Doubtful [35] ●only the reliability coefficient reported.				
Meaningfulness	HIV meaningfulness scale (HIVMS)			Doubtful [32] ●only the reliability coefficient reported.				
Personal Control	Mastery Scale (MS)				Inadequate [38] ●sample size determined based on parameters from a Ghanaian study only. ● Comparator outcomes not validated for local use			
Positive Outlook	Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI)		Inadequate [39] ●Too small sample size for the pilot study (N=15) to establish reliability indices ●No additional psychometrics were measured		Inadequate [39] ●Too small sample size for the pilot study (N=15) to establish reliability indices ●No additional psychometrics were measured			
Resilience	Child Youth Resilience Measure-12			Doubtful [41] ● Cut-off points not stated ●Outcome measure not validated in study population not stated	Doubtful [41] ● Cut-off points not stated ●Outcome measure not validated in study population not stated			
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10)			Very Good [43]				
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10)			Very Good [42]				
Resilience	Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10)			Very Good [35]				
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	Very good [45]		Doubtful [45] ● not all comparator instruments psychometrics are provided				
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)		Very good [46]	Adequate [46] ● not all comparator instruments psychometrics are provided				

Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	Very good [47]	Very good [47]	Adequate [47] ● not all comparator instruments psychometrics are provided				
Self-compassion	Self-compassion scale (SCS)			Doubtful [32] ● only the reliability coefficient reported				
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)				Inadequate [50] ● no psychometrics for local adaptation	Inadequate [50] ● no psychometrics for local adaptation		
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)				Inadequate [51] ● measurement properties not highlighted for all instruments. The cited papers do not have any psychometric data.	Inadequate [51] ● measurement properties not highlighted for all instruments. The cited papers do not have any psychometric data.		
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)				Inadequate [52] ● measurement properties not highlighted for all instruments. The cited papers do not have any psychometric data.	Inadequate [52] ● measurement properties not highlighted for all instruments. The cited papers do not have any psychometric data.		
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept (TSCS-2 20-item)			Doubtful [54] ● no psychometrics were provided, even in the referenced article			Doubtful [54] ● no psychometrics were provided, even in the referenced article	
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept (TSCS-2 20-item)			Doubtful [53] ● Only Cronbach alpha is reported.				
Self-Concept	Tennessee Self-concept (TSCS-2 20-item)			Inadequate [55] ● Outcome not adapted and validated for local use. ● Only Cronbach alpha is reported.				
Self-efficacy	Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQC)							Inadequate [57] ● tools were translated into the local language but were not validated.
Self-Efficacy	Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-Item Scale (SE-6-Xhosa)			Inadequate [58] ● psychometrics not reported				
Self-Efficacy	Self-efficacy to							Inadequate [59]

	protect oneself from unwanted sex							no details on validation of the adapted outcome measure.
Self-Efficacy	Self-efficacy against unwanted sex (SEPOUS)							Inadequate [33] ●no psychometrics of outcome measure
Self-Efficacy	Self-efficacy for negotiating condom use (SENCU)							Inadequate [33] ●no psychometrics of outcome measure
	Self-efficacy to disclose HIV Questionnaire (SEDHQ)						Doubtful [60] ●no details of the scale development and validation process were provided. ●only Cronbach's alpha indices were provided for comparator outcomes.	
Self-esteem	Ad hoc							Inadequate [33] ●no psychometrics of outcomes
Self-esteem	Ad hoc							Inadequate [29] ●No formal validation of outcomes despite pilot testing and adaptation.
Self esteem	Ad hoc						Inadequate [38] ●No psychometrics of outcomes	
Self-esteem	Self-esteem-Hare Area-specific self-esteem scale (HASSES)						Inadequate [39] ●Too small sample size for the pilot study (N=15) to establish reliability indices ●No additional psychometrics were measured	Inadequate [39] ●Too small sample size for the pilot study (N=15) to establish reliability indices ●No additional psychometrics were measured
Self-esteem	Modified Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-8)							Inadequate [59] ●No details of the validation of the adapted Rosenberg- 8 scale
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)							Inadequate [38] ●outcome measure not

					validated in local setting (Ghana)			
Self-Esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Inadequate [64] ●outcome measure not validated in the local setting	Doubtful [64] ● Tools not validated			
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)					Doubtful [60] ●no psychometrics for local adaptation		
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Very good [42]				
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)							Inadequate [57] Tools were translated and not formally validated for use in the study population.
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Inadequate [63] ●only Cronbach's alpha scores presented for psychometrics & tools not adapted for local use				
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Inadequate [65] ● no information on cross-cultural adaptation & psychometrics	Inadequate [65] ● no information on cross-cultural adaptation & psychometrics			
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Inadequate [62] ● no information on cross-cultural adaptation & psychometrics				
Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Very good [43]				
Self-Esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			Adequate [28] ●Only construct validity and internal consistency were reported for some of the comparator outcome measures.				
Self-worth	Ad hoc							Inadequate [29] ●No formal validation of outcomes despite pilot testing and adaptation
Transcendence	Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index (MVQOLI)				Moderate [88] ●No formal validation of translated			

	Transcendent Subscale				outcome measures			
--	-----------------------	--	--	--	------------------	--	--	--

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340 **Table 3: Quality of psychometrics/evidence synthesis**

Construct	Outcome Measure	Structural validity	Internal consistency	Convergent validity - comparison with other outcome measurement instruments	Discriminative or known-groups validity	Construct validity (hypotheses testing approach) - comparison with other outcome measurement instruments.	Construct validity (hypotheses testing approach) - comparison between subgroups.	Responsiveness - hypotheses testing before and after intervention
Body Appreciation	Body appreciation scale 2 (BAS-2)			Methodology quality: Adequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Moderate [28]				
Confidence	Ad hoc							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [29]
Coping	Psychological Adjustment to Illness Scale Self Report (PAIS-SR)			Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [31]				Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [31]
	Acceptance of illness scale (AIS)			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Low [32]				
	Coping with HIV+ status						Methodology quality: Inadequate	

							Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [33]	
Flourishing	Flourishing Well Being Scale (FBWS)			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Low [35]				
Meaningfulness	HIV meaningfulness scale (HIVMS)			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Low [32]				
Personal Control	Mastery Scale (MS)				Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: ? Quality of evidence: Very low [38]			
Positive Outlook	Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI)		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [39]		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [39]			
Resilience	Child Youth Resilience Measure-12			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Low [41]	Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Low [41]			
	CDRS-25			Study 1 [43]: Methodology quality: doubtful Psychometric quality: + Study 2 [42]: Methodology quality: very good Psychometric quality: - Overall Quality of evidence: Moderate				
	CDRS-10			Methodology quality: Doubtful				

				Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Low [35]				
Self-Management	Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)	study 3: [47] Methodology quality: Very good Psychometric quality: + Study 1: [45] Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low	Study 2 [46]: Methodology quality: Very good Psychometric quality: + Study 3 [47]: Methodology quality: Very good psychometric quality: +	Study 1: [45] Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Study 2: [46] Methodology quality: Adequate Psychometric quality:+ Study 3 [47]Methodology quality: Adequate Psychometric quality : + Quality of evidence: Low				
Self-compassion	Self-compassion scale (SCS)			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Low [32]				
Self-Concept	Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)			Study 1 [50]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Study 2 [51]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Study 3 [52]: Methodology quality: Moderate Psychometric quality: + Overall Quality of evidence: Very low	Study 1 [50]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Study 2 [51]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: ? Study 3 [52]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality:+ Overall Quality of Evidence: Very low			
	Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)			Study 1 [54]: Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: + Study 2 [53]: Methodology quality: Doubtful			Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [54]	

				Psychometric quality: + study 3 [55] Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: ? Quality of evidence: Very low				
Self-efficacy	Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQC)							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [57]
	Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-Item Scale (SE-6-Xhosa)			Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [58]				
	Self-efficacy against unwanted sex (SEPOUS)							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [59]
	Self-efficacy for correct condom use (SECCU)						Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [33]	
	Self-efficacy for negotiating condom use (SENCU)				Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low[33]		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [33]	
	Self-efficacy to disclose HIV Questionnaire (SEDHQ)					Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [60]		

Self-esteem	Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)			<p>Study 1 [38]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 2 [64]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 3 [63]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 4 [62]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 5[42]: Methodology quality: Very good Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 6[28]: Methodology quality: Adequate Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Study 7 [43] : Methodology quality: Very good Psychometric quality: +</p> <p>Overall Quality of evidence: Moderate</p>	Study 8 [65]: Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: ?	Study 9 [60]: Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: -	Study 10 [57]: Methodology quality: Doubtful Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low	
	Modified Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-8)							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [59]
	Self-esteem-Hare Area-specific self-esteem scale (HASSES)		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [39]		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: - Quality of evidence: Very low [39]			
	Ad hoc						Methodology quality:	

								Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [33]
	Ad hoc		Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [38]					
	Ad hoc							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [29]
Self-worth	Ad hoc							Methodology quality: Inadequate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Very low [29]
Transcendent	Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index (MVQOLI) Transcendent Subscale				Methodology quality: Moderate Psychometric quality: + Quality of evidence: Moderate [66]			

341

342 **Body Appreciation**

343 Body appreciation is defined as “accepting, holding favourable attitudes toward, and respecting the
344 body, while also rejecting media-promoted appearance ideals as the only form of beauty” [27].

345 **The Body Appreciation Scale-2 (BAS-2)**

346 The BAS-2 was cited in one study [28]. There was moderate evidence of construct validity. The study
347 was of moderate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator outcomes was reported.

348

349 **Confidence**

350 Confidence can be defined as the belief in one’s capability to meet the demands of any task [27].

351 **Ad-hoc confidence questionnaire**

352 An ad hoc questionnaire measured confidence in a study [29]. There was very low evidence of construct
353 validity; the study was of inadequate quality. Although the outcome was pilot tested and adapted for
354 local use with 10 participants, the outcome measure was not formally validated.

355 **Coping**

356 Coping is defined as “strategies, i.e., behaviours, skills, or ways of regulating thoughts and emotions
357 for dealing with stressors [30]. Coping was reported in three studies; all used different outcome
358 measures [31–33].

359 **Acceptance of Illness Scale (AIS)**

360 The AIS was cited in one study [32]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study was
361 of inadequate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator outcomes was reported, and the
362 outcome measures were not translated and validated for local use.

363 **Ad hoc coping questionnaire.**

364 An ad hoc questionnaire was used to measure coping with HIV in one study [33]. There was very low
365 evidence of construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality; no psychometrics of the comparator
366 outcomes were reported, and the outcome measures were not translated and validated for local use.

367 **Psychological Adjustment to Illness Scale Self Report (PAIS-SR)**

368 The PAIS-SR was cited in one study [31]. There was very low evidence of construct validity and
369 responsiveness. The study was of inadequate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator
370 outcomes was reported. Also, the outcome measures were not translated and validated for local use.
371 Lastly, inappropriate tests were used for analysis to measure responsiveness; t-tests were used for a
372 very small sample (N=19).

373 **Flourishing**

374 Flourishing can be defined as “a combination of feeling good and functioning effectively and is
375 synonymous with a high level of mental well-being” [34].

376 **The Flourishing Well Being Scale (FWBS)**

377 The FWBS was cited in one study [35]. There was moderate evidence of construct validity. The study
378 was of very good quality, and comparator outcome measures were translated and validated in the
379 research setting. However, the study produced null findings; flourishing was equitable for those on
380 Antiretroviral therapy (ART) and those not on ART.

381 **Meaningfulness**

382 Meaningfulness can be defined as “the cognizance of order, coherence, and purpose in one’s existence,
383 the pursuit and attainment of worthwhile goals and an accompanying sense of fulfilment” [36].

384 **The HIV Meaningfulness Scale (HIVMS)**

385 The HIVMS was cited in one study [32]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study
386 was of inadequate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator outcomes was reported.
387 Further, the outcome measures were not translated and validated for local use.

388 **Personal Control**

389 Personal control can be defined as "...a learned repertoire of goal-directed skills that enable humans
390 to act upon their aims, postpone gratification, and overcome difficulties relating to thoughts, emotions,
391 and behaviours" [37].

392 **Mastery Scale (MS)**

393 The MS was cited in one study to measure personal control [38]. There was very low evidence of
394 construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality; the outcome measures were not translated and
395 validated for local use. Also, the study sample size was determined based on parameters from a
396 Ghanaian target sample, yet the study compared outcomes across Ghanaian and US participants.

397 **Positive Outlook**

398 Positive outlook can be defined as optimism about a great future with or without experiencing adverse
399 events [37].

400 **Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI)**

401 The IPFI was cited in one study [39]. There was very low evidence of internal consistency and construct
402 validity. The study was of inadequate quality. Although the outcomes were translated and adapted for
403 use in Uganda, the investigators used too small a sample for the pilot study (N=15) to establish reliability
404 indices. Further, no additional psychometrics were measured for the adapted outcome measures.

405 **Resilience**

406 Resilience is the ability to bounce back from adverse circumstances and maintain optimal mental health
407 functioning [40]. Resilience was evaluated in four studies. One study used the Child Youth Resilience
408 Measure-12 [41], with three studies using the Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10) [35,42,43].

409 **Child Youth Resilience Measure-12 (CYRM-12)**

410 The CYRM-12 was cited in one study [41]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study
411 was of doubtful quality; the outcome measure was not translated and validated for local use.

412 **Connor-Davidson Resilience scale (CDRS-10)**

413 There was high evidence of construct validity of the CDRS-10. All three studies were of very good
414 quality [35,42,43], with the CDRS-10 previously translated and validated in South African adolescents
415 [44].

416 **Self-Management**

417 Self-management can be defined as the ability to take necessary steps, including adhering to treatment
418 regimens in managing a condition [45,46].

419 **The Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale (AdHIVSM)**

420 The AdHIVSM was cited in three studies [45–47]. There was high evidence of content validity [47],
421 structural validity [45,47] and internal consistency [46,47]; the studies were of very good quality. There
422 was moderate evidence of construct validity: not all the psychometrics of the comparator outcomes
423 were reported [45,46].

424 **Self-compassion**

425 Self-compassion can be defined as “*being open to and moved by one's own suffering, experiencing*
426 *feelings of caring and kindness toward oneself, taking an understanding, non-judgmental attitude*
427 *toward one's inadequacies and failures, and recognizing that one's experience is part of the common*
428 *human experience*” [48].

429 **The Self-Compassion Scale (SCS)**

430 The SCS was cited in one study [32]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study was
431 of inadequate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator outcomes was reported, and the
432 outcome measures were not translated and validated for local use.

433 **Self-Concept**

434 Self-concept can be defined as how someone perceives and evaluates themselves relative to peers
435 [49]. Six studies evaluated self-concept using the Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale [50–52] and the
436 Tennessee Self-Concept Scale [53–55].

437 **The Beck Youth Self-Concept Scale (BYSCS)**

438 The BYSCS was cited in three studies [50–52]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The
439 three studies were of inadequate quality. Although the secondary outcome measures were translated
440 into the local languages, they were not fully validated. Also, the cross-referenced articles did not contain
441 the validation data as cited by the authors, but rather generic statements on the translation of the
442 outcomes [52,56].

443 **Tennessee Self-concept Scale-2 (TSCS-2)**

444 The TSCS-2 was cited in three studies [53–55]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The
445 three studies were of inadequate quality. Although the secondary outcome measures were translated
446 tools into the local language, they were not validated. Also, the cross-referenced articles did not contain
447 the validation data as cited by the authors [54,55].

448 **Self-efficacy**

449 Self-efficacy is defined as self-belief in the capability to execute a specific task regardless of the
450 magnitude of potential obstacles [49]. We analysed six variants of self-efficacy outcome measures
451 reported across five studies [33,57–60].

452 **Self-efficacy for correct condom use (SECCU)**

453 An ad hoc questionnaire (SECCU) was used to measure self-efficacy for correct condom use in a single
454 study [33]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality; no
455 psychometrics of the comparator outcomes were reported, and the outcome measures were not
456 translated and validated for local use.

457 **Self-efficacy for negotiating condom use (SENCU)**

458 An ad hoc questionnaire (SENCU) was used to measure self-efficacy for negotiating condom use in a
459 study [33]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality. No
460 psychometrics of the comparator outcome measures were reported. Also, the outcome measures were
461 not translated and validated for local use.

462 **Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQC)**

463 The SEQC was cited in one study [57]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The study
464 was of inadequate quality. Although the outcomes were translated tools into the local language, they
465 were not formally validated.

466 **Self-Efficacy for Managing Chronic Disease 6-Item Scale (SE-6-Xhosa)**

467 The SE-6-Xhosa was cited in one study [58]. There was very low evidence of construct validity. The
468 study was of inadequate quality. There was no transcultural adaptation, and no psychometrics were
469 reported.

470 **Self-efficacy to protect oneself from unwanted sex (SEPOUS)**

471 The SEPOUS was cited in one study [59]. There was very low evidence of responsiveness. The study
472 was of inadequate quality; no psychometrics were reported, including the transcultural adaptation of
473 comparator outcome measures.

474 **Self-efficacy to disclose HIV Questionnaire (SEDHQ)**

475 The study purpose-built SEDHQ was used in one study [60]. There was very low evidence of
476 responsiveness. The study was of inadequate quality; no scale development and validation process
477 details were provided. Also, only Cronbach's alpha indices were provided for comparator outcomes.

478 **Self-esteem**

479 Self-esteem can be defined as "... as an attitude toward one's self-based on one's feelings of worth as
480 a person" [61]. Self-esteem was measured using six different outcome measures, i.e. three ad hoc
481 questionnaires [29,33,38], Hare Area-specific self-esteem scale (HASSES), Rosenberg Self-esteem

482 Measure (RSEM-10) [28,38,42,43,57,60,62–65] and the Modified Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure
483 (RSEM-8) [39].

484 **Ad hoc self-esteem measures**

485 Study purpose-built (ad-hoc) self-esteem questionnaires were used in three studies [29,33,38]. There
486 was very low evidence of construct validity. The studies were of inadequate quality; no details are
487 provided for developing and validating the ad hoc measures.

488 **Hare Area-specific self-esteem scale (HASSES)**

489 The HASSES was cited in one study [39]. There was very low evidence of internal consistency and
490 construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality. Although the outcomes were translated and
491 adapted for use in Uganda, the investigators used too small a sample for the pilot study (N=15) to be
492 able to establish reliability indices. Further, no additional psychometrics were measured for the adapted
493 outcome measures

494 **Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-10)**

495 The RSEM-10 was used in 10 studies of varying methodological quality. There was moderate evidence
496 for construct validity. The methodological rating ratings were: very good [42,43], adequate [28] doubtful
497 [60,62] and inadequate [38,57,63–65]. The methodological down gradings for the construct validity
498 evaluation studies were mainly due to the lack of reporting of psychometrics; cross-cultural adaptation
499 was not performed in most of the studies [38,57,63,64]. There was high evidence of known-group
500 validity from a single study of very good methodological quality [42].

501 **Modified Rosenberg Self-esteem Measure (RSEM-8)**

502 The RSEM-8 was cited in one study [59]. There was very low evidence of responsiveness. The study
503 was of inadequate quality. Two items were omitted from the original RSEM-10, but the transcultural
504 adaptation process details were not provided. Also, no psychometrics were reported, including those of
505 comparator outcome measures.

506 **Self-worth**

507 Self-worth can be defined as “...an individual’s evaluation of himself or herself as a valuable, capable
508 human being deserving of respect and consideration” [61].

509 **Ad hoc self-worth measure**

510 A study used an ad hoc questionnaire to measure self-worth [29]. There was very low evidence of
511 construct validity. The study was of inadequate quality. Although the outcome was pilot tested and
512 adapted for local use on 10 participants, the outcome measure was not formally validated.

513 **Transcendence**

514 Transcendence can be defined as “...a state of existence or perception that is not definable in terms of
515 normal understanding or experience” [66].

516 **Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index (MVQOLI) Transcendence Subscale**

517 The MVQOL was cited in one study [67]. There was moderate evidence of construct validity. The solitary
518 study was of moderate quality; only the internal consistency of the comparator outcomes was reported.

519 **Discussion**

520 **Overall synthesis**

521 This review sought to identify positive psychological outcomes used in AYALHIV in SSA, map the
522 constructs onto corresponding measures, and critically appraise the identified outcomes'
523 psychometrics. We gleaned 15 positive psychological constructs, namely: body appreciation,
524 confidence, coping, flourishing, meaningfulness, personal control, positive outlook, resilience, self-
525 management, self-compassion, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-worth and transcendent.
526 Resilience, self-efficacy, and self-esteem were the most measured constructs. Construct validity and
527 internal consistency were the most measured properties, with content and structural validity being the
528 least measured psychometrics. The implications of the individual measurement properties are
529 discussed subsequently.

530

531

532 **Qualitative mapping of positive psychological constructs**

533 Social support was used as an umbrella term to encompass the types of support that occurred at family,
534 peer and community levels. At the interpersonal level, family and peer support were instrumental in
535 assisting adolescents to cope with negative feelings and facilitating belongingness [66,68]. Peer social
536 support assisted ALHIV in achieving the goals of giving and receiving social support, gaining health and
537 relationship advice, adhering to healthcare regimens, learning practical skills and enjoying recreational
538 activities as a group [69]. Social support has also precipitated a positive outlook for life among ALHIV,
539 with adolescents believing that people living with HIV should be allowed to marry and have children if
540 they so desire. Adolescents reporting lack of social support and strained social and interpersonal
541 relations reported neglect, differential treatment, mistreatment [70] and a decreased sense of belonging
542 [17]. The intersection between social support and stigma becomes more obvious at the community
543 level. Adolescents fear disclosing their status because they fear stigmatisation, ridicule, gossip and
544 insult within the school and community [70,71].

545 Robust self-esteem among adolescents with HIV enabled them to overcome stigma, increase their self-
546 reliance and accept their HIV status [72]. Resilience is shaped by cultural and religious beliefs and the
547 capacity to self-reflect and face adverse conditions [72,73]. Resilient adolescents had greater life
548 satisfaction [73], and were acceptive of their live circumstances. Resilience was vital for young persons
549 to cope with their realities [72] and muster the courage to face possible stigma [70]. Among adolescents,
550 disclosure to others was not always based on choice; the process is emotional and complex, with
551 uncertain outcomes [74]. However, disclosure positively influenced adherence and retention to care
552 health improvement and enabled social participation [75].

553 **Structural validity**

554 Despite the wide use of positive psychological measures, the evidence for structural validity was limited.
555 Except for the Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale [32], all outcome measures analysed were
556 developed in high-income settings but were not properly translated and validated before use in different
557 contexts. Robust transcultural adaptations are essential for preserving structural validity, an essential
558 psychometric property [76–78]. Structural/factorial validity measures the extent to which items measure
559 the latent constructs purportedly measured by a specific outcome measure [76]. For example, the
560 Connor-Davidson Resilience scale was the most commonly used resilience outcome measure, applied
561 in three of the five studies of resilience [35,42,43], yet none of these studies evaluated structural validity.
562 Also, the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale, was used in ten studies evaluating self-esteem
563 [38,42,43,57,60,62–64] but no study evaluated its structural validity.

564

565 Further, an outcome measure may perform differently when applied to two different geographical
566 regions in the same country owing to sociocultural and linguistic differences. For instance, the
567 Flourishing Scale exhibited measurement invariance/differential item functioning in South African
568 university students [79]. Three of the eight items performed differently across the study's four

569 languages, i.e. English, Afrikaans, Sesotho and Setswana [79]. Robust transcultural translations and
570 adaptations, including structural validity assessment, are essential before using an outcome measure
571 with seemingly high psychometric robustness in another country. Psychometric performance in another
572 country can never be assumed.

573
574 During the analysis, we observed a trend of snowball citations, i.e. the tendency to cite previously
575 published studies to justify the validity of applied outcome measures [80]. Snowball referencing is
576 problematic as the actual measurement properties of most positive psychological outcomes remain
577 elusive. For example, a Kenyan study explored the construct validity of the Rosenberg Self-esteem
578 Scale by investigating the correlates of self-esteem to self-efficacy in HIV treatment adherence as
579 measured by the ART Adherence Self-efficacy (HIV-ASES) [64]. The study by Gitahi-Kamau et al.
580 (2022) cites a previous validation study performed in the US as evidence of the psychometric
581 robustness of the HIV-ASES [81]. However, the HIV-ASES did not undergo transcultural adaptation and
582 validation before use in Kenya; this may lead to measurement bias.

583

584 **Construct validity**

585 Construct validity is the extent to which scores on two outcomes correlate [76]. Sufficient evidence of
586 structural validity is a pre-requisite for construct validity [76]. In this review, construct validity was the
587 most measured psychometric, with most tools showing evidence of moderate to high collective
588 robustness. The high construct validity evidence across outcome measures may indeed imply that the
589 outcomes were measuring what they were supposed to measure. However, the lack of structural validity
590 may “invalidate” evidence of construct validity robustness [76]. This contradiction (lack of structural
591 validity) poses a measurement error dilemma, as most outcomes still performed satisfactorily. Most of
592 the outcomes had positive ratings regarding the quality of construct validity. The Pearson correlation
593 coefficient was the most applied bivariate correlation index. The robustness of the Pearson correlation
594 is a function of normality and sample size. None of the studies reported normality indices. However,
595 most studies recruited samples ≥ 100 ; with a larger sample size, weak correlations are likely to show
596 statistical significance. That said, the correlations were in the moderate ranges, with only two studies
597 yielding very strong correlations, i.e., $R \geq 0.8$; this may downgrade the overall evidence of construct
598 validity. Nevertheless, building on the strong construct validity evidence across outcomes, there is a
599 need for solid efforts for proper validation i.e. measuring both structural and construct validity to ensure
600 measurement equivalency to facilitate cross-cultural comparisons [76–78].

601

602 **Responsiveness**

603 Responsiveness is the ability of an outcome measure to detect change over time [76]. There was
604 insufficient evidence of responsiveness across the outcomes. Despite pilot testing and adaptation, none
605 of the studies evaluating responsiveness formally validated outcomes before use [29,57,59]. In some
606 instances, no psychometrics were provided [59]. For example, a randomised controlled trial evaluated
607 the effectiveness of a peer-led intervention in improving linkage to and retention in care, adherence to

608 ART and psychosocial well-being among adolescents living with HIV in rural Zimbabwe [29]. The study
609 applied an ad-hoc questionnaire measuring confidence, self-esteem, and self-worth as secondary
610 outcomes. Although the positive psychological outcome measures were translated into the native
611 language and pilot tested, the tools were not formally validated. The study demonstrated intervention
612 effectiveness on the primary outcome (viral load suppression) and positive psychological constructs. It
613 is reasonable to scale up the intervention at the clinical level. However, this may be problematic when
614 inferring the intervention effects on the measured positive psychological outcomes. Using unvalidated
615 outcomes may distort intervention effect sizes, which may lead to incorrect conclusions. More efforts
616 are required to ensure that positive outcomes are adequately validated, with norms or cut-off scores
617 identified before the measures are used for intervention(s) evaluation.

618

619 **Reliability**

620 Reliability measures the extent of stability and reproducibility of outcomes assuming constancy in
621 extraneous variables [76,82]. The Cronbach alpha was the most cited reliability index, with overall
622 evidence of reliability in the moderate to high range. As observed in previous reviews, the Cronbach
623 Alpha was inappropriately used in most studies as an indicator of psychometric robustness [80,83,84].
624 There were instances where outcome measures were adapted and translated, with the Cronbach alpha
625 cited as evidence of reliability and validity. The Cronbach alpha measures the degree of connectedness
626 of items; it is neither a true indicator of internal consistency, a form of reliability, nor validity [76,82,85].
627 Evaluation of Cronbach alpha is not a substitute for full validation. Compared to other forms of reliability,
628 such as test-retest reliability, and split-half reliability indexes, the Cronbach alpha is the “least
629 desired/robust” reliability indicator [82,85]. Although most outcomes yielded high Cronbach alphas,
630 there is a need for properly designed and fully-powered psychometric evaluation studies. For instance,
631 structural validity must be established before evaluating internal consistency and construct validity [76].

632

633 **Clinical and research utility**

634 All but three outcome measures were available free of charge; this increases the utility of the identified
635 positive psychological outcome measures. Most of the outcomes were rated on 4- or 5-point Likert
636 scales, with some using 7-point Likert scales. Consideration needs to be made during transcultural
637 adaptations to ensure age- and developmental-appropriate adaptations. For example, it essential to
638 decrease the number of response options to increase the feasibility of use in AYALHIV. For instance,
639 HIV-related neurological impairment can decrease AYALHIV cognitive capabilities. In Africa, more
640 common lower levels of education, and HIV itself, can impede school attendance and learning in this
641 context. A previous validation study in Uganda had to collapse seven response options to five in addition
642 to using visual cues as participants had difficulties understanding the original scoring instructions [86].
643 Cultural and linguistic differences must be accounted for to ensure equivalency between the original
644 and source languages [77]. Robust transcultural translations and adaptations are critical, given that
645 most of the outcomes gleaned were from high-income countries. Most of the outcome measures were
646 brief; this decreases respondent burden and increases the feasibility of research and routine use for

647 evidence-based care. Also, most of the outcomes were generic; this allows comparisons across
648 conditions and settings and could be applicable for use in other chronic conditions. However, very few
649 tools had established cut-off points; this makes comparisons across studies and contexts difficult.
650 Overall, most of the tools had a high utility for routine use, given that most were generic, brief, had fewer
651 response options and were available at low or no cost [25].

652

653 **Limitations**

654 A significant limitation of the current review is that most of the studies analysed were not primarily
655 psychometric evaluation studies. As such, the odds of high risk of bias (RoB) ratings were great given
656 that the COSMIN checklist, which we utilised to evaluate methodological quality, was primarily designed
657 to appraise psychometrics evaluation studies. For example, there was poor evidence of responsiveness
658 across the outcome measures analysed. None of the analysed studies were primarily designed to
659 evaluate responsiveness, rather, we analysed results from interventional studies to evaluate
660 responsiveness. The COSMIN checklist is considered a “gold standard” for RoB evaluations but has
661 limitations; it overtly gravitates to the stringent spectrum of psychometric RoB checklists [87]. However,
662 we utilised multiple methods to ensure fair judgements per study. For instance, we contacted authors
663 to get information essential for RoB ratings, which may not have been published to avoid reporting bias.
664 Also, we had consensus meetings to synthesise all findings, as the first round of RoB ratings had yielded
665 poor ratings for most outcomes. Due to resource limitations, we only analysed peer-reviewed articles
666 published in English; this may have introduced language bias. Nevertheless, applying the PRISMA
667 guidelines throughout increases the robustness of the review findings despite the inevitable
668 methodological pitfalls.

669

670 **Conclusion**

671 We identified 15 positive psychological constructs applied in AYALHIV in SSA: body appreciation,
672 confidence, coping, flourishing, meaningfulness, personal control, positive outlook, resilience, self-
673 management, self-compassion, self-concept, self-efficacy, self-esteem, self-worth and transcendent.
674 Of the identified outcome measures, the RSEM-10, Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index Transcendent
675 Subscale, the Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale, Connor-Davidson Resilience scale, Flourishing
676 Well-Being Scale, and the Body Appreciation Scale-2 had moderate to high evidence of psychometric
677 robustness. Few studies performed complete validations; thus, evidence for psychometric robustness
678 was fragmented. However, this review demonstrates the initial evidence of the feasibility of positive
679 psychological outcomes for use in AYALHIV in low-resource settings. Instead of creating new
680 outcomes, authors are advised to leverage the existing outcomes, adapt them for use, and, if
681 appropriate, strive to maintain the factorial structure to facilitate comparisons. Lastly, validating
682 composite positive psychological outcomes should be considered for transcultural adaptations, given
683 the variable psychometric performance across constructs and measurement properties.

684 .

685

686 Abbreviations

687	AdHIVSM – Adolescent HIV Self-Management Scale	723	PRISMA-P-Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocol
688		724	
689	AIDS – Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome	725	
690	AIS – Acceptance of Illness Scale	726	PRISMA-ScR- Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews
691	ALHIV – Adolescents Living With HIV	727	
692	ART – Anti Retroviral Therapy	728	
693	AYALHIV- Adolescents and Young Adults Living With HIV	729	PROSPERO – Prospectively Registered Systematic Reviews with a health related Outcome
694		730	
695	BAS-2 – Body Appreciation Scale	731	
696	BYSCS – Beck Youth Self Concept Scale	732	RoB – Risk of Bias
697	CDRS – Connor Davidson Resilience Scale	733	RSEM – Rosenberg Self Esteem Measure
698	CINAHL- Cumulative Index of Nursing and Allied Health Literature	734	SCS – Self Compassion Scale
699		735	SECCU – Self Efficacy for Correct Condom Use
700	COSMIN-COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement Instruments	736	SEDHQ – Self Efficacy to Disclose HIV Questionnaire
701		737	
702	CYRM-12 – Child Youth Resilience Measure	738	SENCU – Self Efficacy for Negotiating Condom Use
703	FWBS – Flourishing Wellbeing Scale	739	
704	GRADE- Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation	740	SEPOUS – Self Efficacy to Protect Oneself from Unwanted Sex
705		741	
706	HASSES – Hare Area Specific Self Esteem Scale	742	SEQC – Self Efficacy Questionnaire for Children
707		743	
708	HIV – Human Immunodeficiency Virus	744	SE-6-Xhosa – Self Efficacy for managing chronic disease 6 item scale – Xhosa Version
709	HIV-ASES – HIV ART Adherence Self Efficacy Scale	745	
710		746	SSA – Sub Saharan Africa
711	HIVMS – HIV Meaningfulness Scale	747	TSCS-2 – Tennessee Self-Concept Scale
712	HRQoL-Health-Related Quality of Life	748	TWCF – Templeton World Charity Foundation
713	IPFI – Individual Protective Factors Index	749	YEP – Youth Expert Panel
714	MeSH – Medical Subject Headings		
715	MS – Mastery Scale		
716	MVQOLI – Missoula Vitas Quality of Life Index – Transcendence Subscale		
717			
718	PAIS-SR – Psychological Adjustment to Illness Scale – Self Report		
719			
720	PMHI – Positive Mental Health Interventions		
721	PRISMA- Preferred Reporting Items of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses		
722			

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate.

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable as we reviewed published studies. However, all relevant data/materials, including data collection tools, were submitted as supplementary files.

Competing interests

All the authors declare no competing interests.

References

- 1 Dow DE, Mmbaga BT, Turner EL, *et al.* Building resilience: a mental health intervention for Tanzanian youth living with HIV. *AIDS Care* 2018;**30**:12–20. doi:10.1080/09540121.2018.1527008
- 2 Ayano G, Demelash S, Abraha M, *et al.* The prevalence of depression among adolescent with HIV/AIDS: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *AIDS Res Ther* 2021;**18**:1–10. doi:10.1186/s12981-021-00351-1
- 3 Bhana A, Kreniske P, Pather A, *et al.* Interventions to address the mental health of adolescents and young adults living with or affected by HIV: state of the evidence. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2021;**24**:87–99. doi:10.1002/jia2.25713
- 4 Bhana A, Abas MA, Kelly J, *et al.* Mental health interventions for adolescents living with HIV or affected by HIV in low- and middle-income countries: systematic review. *BJPsych Open* 2020;**6**:1–15. doi:10.1192/bjo.2020.67
- 5 Bolier L, Haverman M, Westerhof GJ, *et al.* Positive psychology interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled studies. *BMC Public Health* 2013;**13**. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-13-119
- 6 Adeyemi O, Lyons M, Njim T, *et al.* Integration of non-communicable disease and HIV/AIDS management: A review of healthcare policies and plans in East Africa. *BMJ Glob Heal* 2021;**6**:1–9. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004669
- 7 Laurenzi CA, Melendez-Torres GJ, Page DT, *et al.* How do psychosocial interventions for adolescents and young people living with HIV improve adherence and viral load? A realist review. *J Adolesc Heal* 2022;**71**:254–69. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2022.03.020
- 8 Cluver LD, Sherr L, Toska E, *et al.* From surviving to thriving: integrating mental health care into HIV, community, and family services for adolescents living with HIV. *Lancet Child Adolesc Heal* 2022;**6**:582–92. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(22)00101-8
- 9 Bristowe K, Murtagh FEM, Clift P, *et al.* The development and cognitive testing of the positive outcomes HIV PROM: A brief novel patient-reported outcome measure for adults living with HIV. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2020;**18**:1–10. doi:10.1186/s12955-020-01462-5
- 10 Orth Z, Moosajee F, Van Wyk B. Measuring Mental Wellness of Adolescents: A Systematic Review of Instruments. *Front Psychol* 2022;**13**:1–14. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.835601
- 11 Orth Z, van Wyk B. Discourses of Mental Wellness Among Adolescents Living with HIV in Cape Town, South Africa. *Psychol Res Behav Manag* 2022;**15**:1435–50. <http://10.0.8.99/PRBM.S360145>
- 12 Dambi JM, Cowan FM, Martin F, *et al.* Conceptualisation and psychometric evaluation of positive psychological outcome measures used in adolescents and young adults living with HIV: a mixed scoping and systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e066129. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-066129
- 13 Dulin AJ, Dale SK, Earnshaw VA, *et al.* Resilience and HIV: a review of the definition and study of resilience. *AIDS Care - Psychol Socio-Medical Asp AIDS/HIV* 2018;**30**:S6–17. doi:10.1080/09540121.2018.1515470
- 14 Kall M, Marcellin F, Harding R, *et al.* Patient-reported outcomes to enhance person-centred HIV care. *Lancet HIV* 2020;**7**:e59–68. doi:10.1016/S2352-3018(19)30345-5
- 15 Stoner CR, Stansfeld J, Orrell M, *et al.* The development of positive psychology outcome measures and their uses in dementia research: A systematic review. *Dementia* 2017;**18**:2085–106. doi:10.1177/1471301217740288
- 16 Wayant C, Manquen J, Wendelbo H, *et al.* Identification of Evidence for Key Positive Psychological

- Constructs in Pediatric and Adolescent/Young Adult Patients with Cancer: A Scoping Review. *J Adolesc Young Adult Oncol* 2021;**10**:247–59. doi:10.1089/jayao.2020.0184
- 17 Govindasamy D, Seeley J, Oлару ID, *et al.* Informing the measurement of wellbeing among young people living with HIV in sub-Saharan Africa for policy evaluations: A mixed-methods systematic review. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2020;**18**. doi:10.1186/s12955-020-01352-w
- 18 Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, *et al.* PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;**169**:467–73. doi:10.7326/M18-0850
- 19 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses. *BMJ* 2021;**372**. doi:10.1136/bmj.n71
- 20 Neuhaus M, Young T, Ferris LJ, *et al.* A Narrative Review of Peer-Led Positive Psychology Interventions: Current Evidence, Potential, and Future Directions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;**19**. doi:10.3390/ijerph19138065
- 21 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al.* Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;**5**:1–10. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4
- 22 Vet LBMHCW De, Patrick CACPD, Bouter JALM, *et al.* COSMIN Risk of Bias checklist for systematic reviews of Patient- Reported Outcome Measures. *Qual Life Res* 2018;**27**:1171–9. doi:10.1007/s11136-017-1765-4
- 23 Terwee CB, Prinsen CAC, Chiarotto A, *et al.* COSMIN methodology for evaluating the content validity of patient-reported outcome measures: a Delphi study. *Qual Life Res* 2018;**27**:1159–70. doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1829-0
- 24 Terwee CB, Bot SDM, de Boer MR, *et al.* Quality criteria were proposed for measurement properties of health status questionnaires. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2007;**60**:34–42. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.03.012
- 25 Prinsen CAC, Vohra S, Rose MR, *et al.* How to select outcome measurement instruments for outcomes included in a “ Core Outcome Set ” – a practical guideline. *Trials* 2016;**17**:1–10. doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1555-2
- 26 Zhang Y, Alonso-Coello P, Guyatt GH, *et al.* GRADE Guidelines: 19. Assessing the certainty of evidence in the importance of outcomes or values and preferences—Risk of bias and indirectness. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;**111**:94–104. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.01.013
- 27 Linardon J, McClure Z, Tylka TL, *et al.* Body appreciation and its psychological correlates: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Body Image* 2022;**42**:287–96. doi:10.1016/j.bodyim.2022.07.003
- 28 Nyamaruze P, Govender K, Cowden RG. Self-esteem and antiretroviral therapy adherence among young people living with HIV: An exploratory serial mediation analysis. *S Afr J Sci* 2021;**117**:124–30. <http://10.0.67.7/sajs.2021/8354>
- 29 Willis N, Milanzi A, Mawodzeke M, *et al.* Effectiveness of community adolescent treatment supporters (CATS) interventions in improving linkage and retention in care, adherence to ART and psychosocial well-being: a randomised trial among adolescents living with HIV in rural Zimbabwe. *BMC Public Health* 2019;**19**:117. <http://ezproxy.uct.ac.za/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=awn&AN=30691425&site=ehost-live>
- 30 Nota PM Di, Anderson GS, Kasurak E, *et al.* Coping among public safety personnel: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Stress Heal* 2021;**37**:613–30. doi:10.1002/smi.3039
- 31 John ME, Samson-Akpan PE, Etowa JB, *et al.* Enhancing self-care, adjustment and engagement through mobile phones in youth with HIV. *Int Nurs Rev* 2016;**63**:555–61. doi:10.1111/inr.12313
- 32 Ogueji IA. Experiences and predictors of psychological distress in pregnant women living with HIV. *Br J Health Psychol* 2021;**26**:882–901. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12510
- 33 Saleh-Onoya D, Reddy PS, Ruiter RAC, *et al.* Condom use promotion among isiXhosa speaking women living with HIV in the Western Cape Province, South Africa: a pilot study. *AIDS Care* 2009;**21**:817–25. doi:10.1080/09540120802537823
- 34 Witten H, Savahl S, Adams S. Adolescent flourishing: A systematic review. *Cogent Psychol* 2019;**6**. doi:10.1080/23311908.2019.1640341
- 35 Dietrich JJ, Jonas K, Cheyip M, *et al.* Examining the Relationship Between Psychosocial Factors with Knowledge of HIV-Positive Status and Antiretroviral Therapy Exposure Among Adolescent Girls and Young Women Living with HIV in South Africa. *AIDS Behav* 2023;**27**:231–44. doi:10.1007/s10461-022-03759-6
- 36 Brandstätter M, Baumann U, Borasio GD, *et al.* Systematic review of meaning in life assessment instruments. *Psychooncology* 2012;**21**:1034–52. doi:10.1002/pon.2113
- 37 Bukchin-Peles S, Ronen T. Linking Self-Control, Hope, Positivity Ratio, Anxiety and Handwashing Habits during the Coronavirus Outbreak. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;**19**. doi:10.3390/ijerph19148859
- 38 Poku KA, Linn JG, Fife BL, *et al.* A comparative analysis of perceived stigma among HIV-positive Ghanaian and African American males. *SAHARA J J Soc Asp HIV/AIDS Res Alliance* 2005;**2**:344–51. doi:10.1080/17290376.2005.9724859
- 39 Zalwango SK, Kizza FN, Nkwata AK, *et al.* Psychosocial adjustment in perinatally human immunodeficiency virus infected or exposed children - a Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2016;**19**:20694. doi:10.7448/IAS.19.1.20694
- 40 Lasota A, Mróz J. Positive psychology in times of pandemic—time perspective as a moderator of the relationship between resilience and meaning in life. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**. doi:10.3390/ijerph182413340
- 41 Crowley T, van der Merwe AS, Esterhuizen T, *et al.* Resilience of adolescents living with HIV in the Cape Metropole of the Western Cape. *AIDS Care* 2022;**34**:1103–10. doi:10.1080/09540121.2021.1961115

- 42 Filiatreau LM, Pettifor A, Edwards JK, *et al.* Associations Between Key Psychosocial Stressors and Viral Suppression and Retention in Care Among Youth with HIV in Rural South Africa. *AIDS Behav* 2021;**25**:2358–68. doi:10.1007/s10461-021-03198-9
- 43 Filiatreau LM, Giovenco D, Twine R, *et al.* Examining the relationship between physical and sexual violence and psychosocial health in young people living with HIV in rural South Africa. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2020;**23**:e25654. doi:10.1002/jia2.25654
- 44 Jørgensen IE, Seedat S. Factor structure of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale in South African adolescents. *Int J Adolesc Med Health* 2008;**20**:23–32. doi:10.1515/IJAMH.2008.20.1.23
- 45 Nagenda MC, Crowley T. Contextual Factors Influencing Self-Management of Adolescents and Youth Living with HIV: A Cross-Sectional Survey in Lesotho. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2022;**20**. doi:10.3390/ijerph20010238
- 46 Crowley T, van der Merwe A, Kidd M, *et al.* Adolescent human immunodeficiency virus self-management: Associations with treatment adherence, viral suppression, sexual risk behaviours and health-related quality of life. *South Afr J HIV Med* 2020;**21**:1–11. doi:10.4102/SAJHIVMED.V21I1.1054
- 47 Crowley T, Van der Merwe A, Kidd M, *et al.* Measuring Adolescent HIV Self-management: An Instrument Development Study. *AIDS Behav* 2020;**24**:592–606. doi:10.1007/s10461-019-02490-z
- 48 NEFF K. Self-Compassion: An Alternative Conceptualization of a Healthy Attitude Toward Oneself. *Self Identity* 2003;**2**:85–101. doi:10.1080/15298860309032
- 49 Chen X, Lake J, Padilla AM. Self-Views and Positive Psychology Constructs Among Second Language Learners in Japan, Taiwan, and the United States. *Front Psychol* 2020;**11**:1–11. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02176
- 50 Mahtab S, Jao J, Myer L, *et al.* The association between mental health and metabolic outcomes in youth living with perinatally acquired HIV in the Cape Town Adolescent Antiretroviral Cohort. *AIDS Care* 2022;**34**:1151–8. doi:10.1080/09540121.2021.1950605
- 51 Sevenoaks T, Fouche J-P, Phillips N, *et al.* Childhood Trauma and Mental Health in the Cape Town Adolescent Antiretroviral Cohort. *J Child Adolesc Trauma* 2022;**15**:353–63. <http://10.0.3.239/s40653-021-00362-0>
- 52 Hoare J, Phillips N, Brittain K, *et al.* Mental Health and Functional Competence in the Cape Town Adolescent Antiretroviral Cohort. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2019;**81**:e109–16. doi:10.1097/QAI.0000000000002068
- 53 Small LA, Huynh AK, Parchment TM. The association between self-Esteem, stigma, and mental health among South African youth living with HIV: the need for integrated HIV care services. *AIDS Care* 2022;**34**:86–94. doi:10.1080/09540121.2021.2002253
- 54 Ssewamala FM, Han C-K, Neilands TB. Asset ownership and health and mental health functioning among AIDS-orphaned adolescents: findings from a randomized clinical trial in rural Uganda. *Soc Sci Med* 2009;**69**:191–8. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.05.019
- 55 Bhana A, Mellins CA, Small L, *et al.* Resilience in perinatal HIV+ adolescents in South Africa. *AIDS Care - Psychol Socio-Medical Asp AIDS/HIV* 2016;**28**:49–59. doi:10.1080/09540121.2016.1176676
- 56 Hoare J, Phillips N, Joska JA, *et al.* Applying the HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder diagnostic criteria to HIV-infected youth. *Neurology* 2016;**87**:86 LP – 93. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000002669
- 57 Harding R, Wei G, Gwyther L, *et al.* Improving psychological outcomes for orphans living with HIV in Tanzania through a novel intervention to improve resilience: findings from a pilot RCT. *AIDS Care - Psychol Socio-Medical Asp AIDS/HIV* 2019;**31**:340–8. doi:10.1080/09540121.2018.1533630
- 58 Parker R, Jelsma J, Stein DJ. Pain in amaXhosa women living with HIV/AIDS: a cross-sectional study of ambulant outpatients. *BMC Womens Health* 2017;**17**:1–11. doi:10.1186/s12905-017-0388-9
- 59 Merrill KG, Merrill JC, Hershov RB, *et al.* Linking at-risk South African girls to sexual violence and reproductive health services: A mixed-methods assessment of a soccer-based HIV prevention program and pilot SMS campaign. *Eval Program Plann* 2018;**70**:12–24. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2018.04.010
- 60 Nöstlinger C, Bakeera-Kitaka S, Buyze J, *et al.* Factors influencing social self-disclosure among adolescents living with HIV in Eastern Africa. *AIDS Care* 2015;**27**:36–46. doi:10.1080/09540121.2015.1051501
- 61 Park JY, Park EY. The Rasch Analysis of Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale in Individuals With Intellectual Disabilities. *Front Psychol* 2019;**10**:1–10. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01992
- 62 Adewuya AO, Afolabi MO, Ola BA, *et al.* The effect of psychological distress on medication adherence in persons with HIV infection in Nigeria. *Psychosomatics* 2010;**51**:68–73. doi:10.1176/appi.psy.51.1.68
- 63 Kalomo EN. Associations between HIV-related stigma, self-esteem, social support, and depressive symptoms in Namibia. *Aging Ment Heal* 2018;**22**:1570–6. doi:10.1080/13607863.2017.1387763
- 64 Gitahi-kamau N, Wahome S, Memiah P, *et al.* Adolescents in Transition to Adult Care in Kenya. 2023;**17**:308–19. doi:10.1080/17450128.2021.1954736
- 65 Agyemang EO, Dapaah JM, Osei FA, *et al.* Self-Esteem Assessment among Adolescents Living with HIV and Seeking Healthcare at Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital-Kumasi, Ghana. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care* 2020;**19**:1–9. doi:10.1177/2325958220976828
- 66 Petersen I, Bhana A, Myeza N, *et al.* Psychosocial challenges and protective influences for socio-emotional coping of HIV+ adolescents in South Africa: a qualitative investigation. *AIDS Care* 2010;**22**:970–8. doi:10.1080/09540121003623693
- 67 Selman LE, Higginson IJ, Agupio G, *et al.* Quality of life among patients receiving palliative care in South Africa and Uganda: a multi-centred study. *Heal Qual Life Outcomes* 2011;**9**:21. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-9

- 21
- 68 Govindasamy D, Ferrari G, Maruping K, *et al.* A qualitative enquiry into the meaning and experiences of wellbeing among young people living with and without HIV in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Soc Sci Med* 2020;**258**:N.PAG-N.PAG. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113103
- 69 Wolf H, Chelliah S, Ong'wen P, *et al.* Forming a Kanyakla: A qualitative study to develop a novel social support intervention for adolescents living with HIV. *J Adolesc* 2018;**69**:203–11. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.10.006
- 70 Kimera E, Vindevogel S, Kintu MJ, *et al.* Experiences and perceptions of youth living with HIV in Western Uganda on school attendance: barriers and facilitators. *BMC Public Health* 2020;**20**:1–12. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-8198-7
- 71 Mutumba M, Bauermeister JA, Musiime V, *et al.* Psychosocial Challenges and Strategies for Coping with HIV Among Adolescents in Uganda: A Qualitative Study. *AIDS Patient Care STDs* 2015;**29**:86–94. doi:10.1089/apc.2014.0222
- 72 Woollett N, Cluver L, Hatcher AM, *et al.* “To be HIV positive is not the end of the world”: Resilience among perinatally infected HIV positive adolescents in Johannesburg. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2016;**70**:269–75. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.09.039
- 73 Adegoke CO, Steyn MG. Yoruba culture and the resilience of HIV-positive adolescent girls in Nigeria. *Cult Health Sex* 2018;**20**:1287–98. doi:10.1080/13691058.2017.1422806
- 74 Mlilo P, Dziva C, Moyo VP, *et al.* ‘Growing up and growing old with HIV’: HIV+ adolescents’ experiences of disclosing statuses to romantic partners in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe. *African J AIDS Res* 2020;**19**:312–22. doi:10.2989/16085906.2020.1841011
- 75 Nixon SA, Bond V, Solomon P, *et al.* Optimism alongside new challenges: using a rehabilitation framework to explore experiences of a qualitative longitudinal cohort of people living with HIV on antiretroviral treatment in Lusaka, Zambia. *AIDS Care* 2018;**30**:312–7. doi:10.1080/09540121.2017.1363365
- 76 Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, *et al.* COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews of patient-reported outcome measures. *Qual Life Res* 2018;**0**:1–11. doi:10.1007/s11136-018-1798-3
- 77 Wild D, Grove A, Martin M, *et al.* Principles of Good Practice for the Translation and Cultural Adaptation Process for Patient-Reported Outcomes (PRO) Measures: report of the ISPOR Task Force for Translation and Cultural Adaptation. *Value Health* 2005;**8**:94–104. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4733.2005.04054.x
- 78 Song H, Cai H, Brown JD, *et al.* Differential item functioning of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale in the US and China: Measurement bias matters. *Asian J Soc Psychol* 2011;**14**:176–88. doi:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2011.01347.x
- 79 Mostert K, Beer LT De. Psychometric properties of the Flourishing Scale for South African first-year students. *African J Psychol Assess* 2023;**5**:1–10.
- 80 Dambi J, Corten L, Chiwaridzo M, *et al.* A systematic review of the psychometric properties of the cross-cultural translations and adaptations of the Multidimensional Perceived Social Support Scale (MSPSS). *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2018;**16**:1–19. doi:10.1186/s12955-018-0912-0
- 81 Johnson MO, Neilands TB, Dilworth SE, *et al.* The role of self-efficacy in HIV treatment adherence: Validation of the HIV Treatment Adherence Self-Efficacy Scale (HIV-ASES). *J Behav Med* 2007;**30**:359–70. doi:10.1007/s10865-007-9118-3
- 82 Sijtsma K. On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of cronbach’s alpha. *Psychometrika* 2009;**74**:107–20. doi:10.1007/s11336-008-9101-0
- 83 Stoner CR, Stansfeld J, Orrell M, *et al.* The development of positive psychology outcome measures and their uses in dementia research: A systematic review. *Dementia* 2019;**18**:2085–106. doi:10.1177/1471301217740288
- 84 Windle G, MacLeod C, Algar-Skaife K, *et al.* A systematic review and psychometric evaluation of resilience measurement scales for people living with dementia and their carers. *BioMed Central* 2022. doi:10.1186/s12874-022-01747-x
- 85 Linacre JM. KR-20 / Cronbach alpha or Rasch person reliability: Which tells the truth? *Rasch Meas Trans* 1997;**11**:580–1. <http://www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt113l.htm>
- 86 Nakigudde J, Musisi S, Ehnvall A, *et al.* Adaptation of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support in a Ugandan setting. *Afr Health Sci* 2009;**9 Suppl 1**:S35–41.
- 87 McKenna SP, Heaney A. Setting and maintaining standards for patient-reported outcome measures: can we rely on the COSMIN checklists? *J Med Econ* 2021;**24**:502–11. doi:10.1080/13696998.2021.1907092
- 88 Selman LE, Higginson IJ, Agupio G, *et al.* Quality of life among patients receiving palliative care in South Africa and Uganda: a multi-centred study. *Heal Qual Life Outcomes* 2011;**9**:21. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-9-21

Supporting information

S1 Table : Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

S2 Table: PRISMA Checklist

S3 Table : CINAL search strategy

S4 Table : Operational definitions of psychometric properties

S5 Table: Updated criteria for good measurement properties

S6 Table : GRADE checklist- best evidence synthesis

S7 Table : Study selection

S8 Table : Qualitative mapping of psychological constructs

S9 Table : Outcomes utility




Figure 1

