

# Understanding Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance of home-based comprehensive sexual health care: a Realist Review

Cornelia J.D. Goense<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>, Thuan-Huong P. Doan<sup>4</sup>, Eneyi E. Kpokiri<sup>5</sup>, Ymke J. Evers<sup>1,2</sup>, Claudia S. Estcourt<sup>6</sup>, Rik Crutzen<sup>3</sup>, Jeffrey D. Klausner<sup>4</sup>, Weiming Tang<sup>7</sup>, Paula Baraitser<sup>8</sup>, Christian J.P.A. Hoebe<sup>1,2,9</sup>, Nicole H.T.M. Dukers-Muijers<sup>2,3</sup>

1. Department of Social Medicine, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University, Maastricht
2. Department of Sexual Health, Infectious Diseases and Environmental Health, Living Lab Public Health, Public Health Service South Limburg, Heerlen
3. Department of Health Promotion, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University Medical Centre (MUMC+), Maastricht
4. University of Southern California, Los Angeles
5. Clinical Research Department, Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London
6. School of Health and Life Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow
7. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Project-China, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
8. Department of Sexual Health, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London
9. Department of Medical Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Infection Prevention, Care and Public Health Research Institute (CAPHRI), Maastricht University Medical Centre+ (MUMC+), Maastricht

\*Corresponding author

Full name: Cornelia Johanna Dorothy (Hanneke) Goense

ORCID: 0000-0001-6108-0209

Postal Address: P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD, Maastricht, the Netherlands

E-mail: [c.goense@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:c.goense@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

Telephone number: 0031 088 880 5722

## ABSTRACT

**Background.** Testing for *human immunodeficiency virus* (HIV) and sexually transmitted infections (STI) is increasingly offered outside a clinic-based setting. Among key populations barriers to accessing testing and sexual health care may could be lowered due to home-based testing and care services. This review identifies which elements of home-based comprehensive sexual health care (home-based CSH) impacted which key populations, under which circumstances.

**Methods.** A realist review of studies focused on home-based CSH with at least self-sampling or self-testing HIV and additional sexual health care (e.g., treatment, counselling). PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials, and PsycINFO databases were searched. Peer-reviewed quantitative and qualitative literature published between February 2012 and February 2023 was examined. The RE-AIM framework was used to systematically assess the (R) reach of key populations, (E) effectiveness of the intervention, and (AIM) effects on the adoption, implementation, and maintenance within routine sexual health care.

**Results.** Of 730 uniquely identified records, 92 were selected for extraction. Of these studies, 59% (54/92) reported actual interventions and 41% (38/92) described the acceptability and feasibility. Studies were mainly based in Europe or North America and were mostly targeted to MSM (59%; 55/92) (R). Overall, self-sampling or self-testing was highly acceptable across key populations. The effectiveness (E) of most studies was (expected) increased HIV testing. Adoption (A) of the home-based CSH was acceptable for care providers if linkage to care was available, even though a minority of studies reported adoption by care providers and implementation fidelity (I) of the intervention. In terms of maintenance (M), home-based CSH should be institutionalised and complementary to clinic-based sexual health care.

**Conclusions.** Five key findings were identified which may enhance implementation of home-based CSH. When providing the individual with a choice of testing, clear instructions, and tailored dissemination successful uptake of HIV testing may increase. For implementers perceived care and treatment benefits for clients may increase their willingness to implement home-based CSH. Therefore,

home-based CSH may determine more accessible sexual health care and increased uptake of HIV testing among key populations.

**Keywords:** Home care services; STI testing; HIV testing; comprehensive care; sexual health care; realist review; intervention; key populations

## BACKGROUND

Sexually transmitted infections (STI) such as *Chlamydia trachomatis* (CT), *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* (NG), Hepatitis B (HBV), Hepatitis C (HCV), syphilis and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) constitute a public health concern among key populations world-wide [1]. Key populations include populations vulnerable to HIV transmission such as men who have sex with men (MSM), sex workers, and transgender people. If STI or HIV are left undiagnosed and untreated, this could lead to serious adverse health consequences including acute illness, infertility and, long-term disability [2]. Regular testing followed by timely treatment is an effective strategy to improve clinical outcomes. Barriers to regular testing include social barriers such as expected HIV-related stigma and structural barriers such as costs or distance to the clinic [3, 4]. Home-based interventions, including self-(sampling) testing for HIV and STI, have gained urgency and popularity, especially during the last years of the COVID-19 pandemic [5]. Home-based interventions may lower commonly reported barriers and enhance personal autonomy thereby increasing accessibility and uptake of testing in key populations [6–8].

Home-based comprehensive sexual health care (hereafter: home-based CSH) includes either self-sampling or self-testing STI/HIV and additional sexual health care such as treatment or counselling. Self-sampling is when a person collects samples and sends them to a laboratory for testing, self-testing is when a person samples and interprets the test results themselves [9]. Self-sampled and clinician-collected samples provide comparable results for CT and NG testing, similar to the performances and usability of several HIV self-tests[10]. Therefore, the World Health Organisation (WHO) has recommended making self-sampling or self-testing STI and HIV available in addition to clinic-based sexual health services [8].

Earlier reviews about home-based CSH have mostly focused on its outcomes in terms of effectiveness and patient experiences of the care offered, with less attention to the implementation process in real-world settings [11–13]. The realist approach is especially relevant for understanding


complex interventions, such as home-based and sexual health care [14]. Where systematic reviews usually aim to answer whether an intervention provides desired results, a realist review is particularly concerned with understanding why and how an intervention may or may not work, under which circumstances, and for which populations [15].

This realist review aimed to provide an overview of the mechanisms and contextual factors that determine what elements within home-based CSH impact which key populations under what circumstances. The reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation and maintenance framework (RE-AIM) was used as structural guidance, which is a widely used framework to assess the impact of public health interventions [16]. This realist review used existing literature to identify working mechanisms and outcomes, which are influenced by contextual factors such as different settings and populations, thereby providing valuable information for key populations, care providers and policymakers.

## **METHODS**

We conducted a realist review, which required the construction and refinement of an initial programme theory. Figure 1 shows the initial programme theory that assessed context, mechanisms and outcomes. Outcomes were determined by reach(R), effectiveness(E), adoption(A), and implementation fidelity(I) elements of home-based CSH and how it affect the maintenance(M) of interventions [16]. We conducted the following iterative steps: 1) clarified research scope, 2) searched for relevant evidence, 3) appraised and extracted data, 4) synthesised evidence and 5) evaluated findings [14]. This review is reported following the publication standards realist and meta-narrative evidence Syntheses (RAMESES) guidelines for realist synthesis [17]. This study is pre-registered in PROSPERO (CRD42023397383).

Figure 1. Initial programme theory: Theoretical framework of context, mechanisms and outcomes



## Inclusion criteria

Eligible interventions had a self-testing or self-sampling testing component. The intervention of home-based comprehensive sexual health care must consist of HIV testing alone or combined with other STI tests performed by the individual outside of a clinic location. In addition, the interventions should have other care components, such as sexual health counselling, partner notification or, linkage to treatment. Interventions could target any key population at elevated risk for HIV infection, such as men who have sex with men, sex workers or transgender people.

## Evidence identification


PubMed, Embase, PsycINFO and Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) were searched [18]. The initial search aimed to explore initial key theories in the several interventions and refine inclusion criteria. The initial search was conducted in February 2022, and analysis and selection

of articles was completed in June 2022 and covered literature from the past 10 years [see Additional file 1]. We adjusted the search strategy according to different terminology used to refer to home-based CSH in studies (i.e., telehealth, self-managed testing, home-testing). The first author conducted the initial search and together with the second and third authors performed independent title, abstract and full-text screening. Literature was selected based on pre-specified inclusion and exclusion criteria [see Additional file 2]. The first three authors independently reviewed and analysed a random selection of approximately 200 to 300 unique records each, all authors approved of the final selection.

## Data extraction

Figure 2 shows that from a total of 730 unique records identified, and after exclusion of 620 records, 106 studies (17%) had been initially selected for review. The main reasons for exclusion were ‘intervention did not include HIV testing’ or ‘HIV testing is not self-sampling or self-testing’. Two reports were added to the selection using snowballing (i.e., referenced by included articles but not yet included in the search). An iterative selection excluded another 25 studies, mostly because they were systematic reviews or did not fit the research purpose. The final search added 11 studies from February 2022 to February 2023.

Figure 2. Flowchart of study search strategy through an iterative search process



## Quality appraisal

The quality of the literature was determined by judging to what extent the selected literature contributes to the outcome of the study questions. The selection was appraised by following the mixed methods appraisal tool (MMAT) and additional questions were assessed such as a) did the study describe constructs of the initial programme theory (Figure 2) b) were intervention components described, d) was the context of the intervention described and e) did the study describe the way the intervention affects outcomes (of RE-AIM) [19]. Studies were considered sufficient quality if clear research questions were reported, and the data allowed to address the research question. The first author conducted the quality appraisal which was randomly checked by the second and third author, inconsistencies were decided upon among the first three authors [see Additional file 3]. All authors agreed with the overall selection procedure. The data extraction process is mainly conducted by the first author, other authors verified the process and provided feedback. Results were presented using the RE-AIM framework. In addition, enhancing process factors were formulated based on evidence from all included studies and each included context (C), mechanisms (M) and outcomes (O) components.

## RESULTS

A total of 92 studies were included that examined interventions of home-based CSH with STI and HIV self-sampling or self-testing and additional sexual health care [see Additional file 4]. Most studies (59%; 54/92) described research with intervention components in randomized, non-randomized, quasi-experimental (qualitative and quantitative) evaluation studies. The other studies (41%; 38/92) solely described the acceptability or intention of key populations to potentially use an intervention (hereafter: acceptability studies). Overall, most studies were from Europe (n=30) or North America (n=28) and focused on the key populations MSM (n=55), sex workers (n=7) and transgender people (n=6). Based on the evidence from all 54 evaluation studies with intervention components tested in real-life settings, five statements were described. Results were enriched with information from 38 acceptability studies. Table 1 shows a summary of enhancing process factors. Process factors on the level of both the intervention and the implementation contribute to successfully implementing home-based CSH in practice and maintenance of its value for sexual health care of key populations in the long term.

*Table 1. Key findings that enhance implementation of home-based comprehensive sexual health care*

<b>Reach</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Mechanisms</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
	Individuals have a choice between types and methods of self-sampling or self-testing HIV and additional care	Increased fit of home-based comprehensive sexual health care to individual needs	Increased uptake of HIV testing and access to sexual health among key populations
	Provision of clear and understandable test instructions	Increased self-efficacy to perform testing	Successful use of self-sampling or self-testing HIV in individuals and thus uptake of HIV testing in the key population
	Dissemination strategies of home-based comprehensive sexual health care are tailored to fit key populations	Increased accessibility to use home-based comprehensive sexual health care	Increased uptake of HIV testing and access to sexual health among key populations
<b>Effectiveness</b>	Home-based comprehensive sexual health care offer fits key populations	Increased HIV risk perception, self-control, and general HIV knowledge	Increased uptake of HIV testing and access to sexual health among key populations
<b>Adoption</b>	Home-based comprehensive is perceived to be beneficial to improving clients' HIV testing uptake and feelings of confidentiality and privacy, contributing to their sexual health	Increased willingness among implementers to adopt the intervention	Increased availability of home-based comprehensive sexual health care
<b>Implementation*</b>	Implementation fidelity may be considered when implementing an innovation	Increased willingness among implementers to adopt the intervention	Increased availability of home-based comprehensive sexual health care

\* Only two included studies reported implementation fidelity



## Reach

The type of self-sampling or self-testing is an important factor for the acceptance and use of home-based CSH. Most included studies assessed HIV self-testing (54%; 30/54) or self-sampling HIV testing (33%; 18/54) interventions, and 16 (11%) intervention studies were combined with self-sampling STI testing. In a study among the general population of the United Kingdom, self-testing was mostly preferred, and self-sampling testing when the ability to complete the test within the laboratory [20]. Samples required for HIV testing were either blood or saliva. Blood-based samples were more accurate for syphilis, HBV, HCV and HIV testing [21–23]. Blood was collected via finger-prick for dried-blood spot (DBS) or capillary collection (in a tube) or by a lancet in a vacuum system. The use of a finger-prick was acceptable to people in key populations across most interventions. It was feasible and could be done successfully [24, 25]. Reported challenges were mainly a result of insufficient knowledge of correct performance [26–28]. Blood collection with a vacuum system was highly acceptable and feasible for sampling among PrEP-using MSM. They were confident of performing this without supervision at home [29]. Saliva-based sampling was also experienced as acceptable and mostly easy to perform [27, 30–34]. In addition, saliva-based samples had a higher return rate than blood samples [23]. Most studies were restricted to results of a single type of testing, either blood-based or saliva-based. However, interventions that assessed both, recommended that both self-testing and self-sampling HIV testing should be available [24, 35].

Instructions to use the test kit were available before the actual testing and demonstrated by a care provider or study staff, or instructions were provided during testing with a video or written instructions. Several interventions did not specify the form in which instructions were provided. Clear instructions were reported to increase the usability of self-(sampling) testing [26, 34, 36, 37]. Complementary (photo or animated) images of the puncture site could support correct performance [24]. Studies among African populations highlighted the importance of instructions in local languages [34, 38, 39]. Interventions in younger key populations reported high acceptability of online or mobile application instructions [40–42]

Various dissemination strategies were used to offer home-based CSH to key populations, and several venues were targeted. These include community venues, sex-on-premises, online services or

existing (location-based) sexual health care. Only a few studies elaborated on the method to design dissemination methods. An example is the use of an intervention mapping framework to fit the communication messages, channels, and strategies to the needs of the key population [31, 43]. Other interventions only mentioned the communication modes (online or offline) [42, 44–46]. Online dissemination was mostly preferred by key populations when privacy concerns were related to clinic-based care [27, 35, 47, 48]. For key populations with inadequate access to digital technology, additional offline options (i.e., locations visited by key populations) should be available [49, 50]. Several studies demonstrated that online or peer-to-peer dissemination might be a promising strategy for reaching first-time testers [42, 46, 51–55]. For sex workers, self-tests were reportedly distributed through their workplaces (i.e., sex on premises, saunas, brothels), mobile units, and via online personal messages [41, 56, 57]. To recruit vulnerable key populations such as transgender people, online geotargeting was used. In addition, the costs of HIV self-(sampling) testing are mentioned as a barrier to testing uptake, and this is important to consider [58, 59].

## **Effectiveness**

The main reason organizations implement home-based CSH is to increase HIV testing in the people who need it [6–8]. The effectiveness of an accessible care offer could thus be identified by the numbers of test uptake, HIV diagnosis, linkage to sexual health care and prevention measures. Most studies demonstrated the identification of new HIV diagnoses. Overall, though HIV positivity rate varied between different contexts and populations, from 0.2% in a British study to 14.3% in a Chinese study among MSM [32, 60]. A substantial number of studies did not identify any new positive HIV results [20, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 40, 53, 61, 62]. Those studies were mainly based in Western continents (Europe, North America) and are focused on MSM. In studies that did not report positivity rates, the effectiveness of home-based care was attributed to the uptake of testing among at-risk and previously untested people and the return rate of test kits [51, 63–65]. Several interventions demonstrated high intention among populations to use home-based CSH again [33, 37, 40, 46, 66]. Home-based CSH may also affect other aspects of behavioural change of the individual, such as increased self-control, increased risk perception, and increased general knowledge of STI and HIV [33, 56, 62, 67]. Of 21 intervention studies that

identified new HIV diagnoses, most of them also reported linkage to care such as confirmatory testing, linkage to treatment, post-test counselling, PrEP care, and partner notification. A few studies linked all new HIV infections successfully to care [59, 68]. Some studies reported referral, although it remained unknown whether clients had acted upon the referral to health care services [57, 69]. Other studies described loss to follow-up after positive HIV tests [45, 49, 60, 69]. Linkage to care in standard care is > 95%, and the linkage to care proportions of home-based care are comparable to outreach standards, i.e., within 75%-100% [42]. There were 13 studies that did not describe which additional sexual health options were offered (e.g., linkage to treatment, counselling, partner notification).

### **Adoption**

Here, seven studies are described that examined adoption by implementers and conditions for potential implementation in practice. Implementers are considered the individuals (i.e., care providers or counsellors) who enable access to home-based CSH or handle the patient management of people who are using the intervention. Implementation of home-based CSH is needed for the availability and, thereby the accessibility of the offer. Most studies described experienced or perceived facilitators and barriers to adopting home-based CSH [25, 31, 33, 43, 47, 70]. Overall, adoption was acceptable according to implementers as a result of facilitators such as increased access for clients to testing and increased confidentiality and privacy for clients. Implementers also mentioned the expected extended reach of vulnerable key populations and justification of clinical time (i.e., reduced or reallocated workload) [43, 70]. One of the concerns of adopting home-based CSH was expected missed opportunities for appropriate sexual health prevention information and interventions (e.g., vaccinations), that could have been given when consultations take place in person [27, 28, 31, 70]. Other concerns were regarding following up on people with positive results when testing outside a clinic [33, 71]. Expected pragmatic challenges were in data collection and reporting. Tailored programmes may be required for implementing home-based care, although that could result in complex data management [25, 72]. Implementing a secured digital platform for data may improve access. A few studies described their challenges with digital applications such as missing links between test kits and participants, or survey errors [25, 40]. Digital applications for home-based CSH were mainly created for use in high-income countries and may be less applicable to lower-income countries [72].

## **Implementation**

Implementation fidelity indicates the extent to which designed elements were used by implementers, as intended. Implementers, such as care providers, may have limited role tasks in carrying out the intervention since home-based CSH is designed for use by clients outside the clinic setting. Little information is available on the implementation fidelity of home-based interventions. One study demonstrated fidelity in the performance of the intervention. In one study, the performance fidelity of oral HIV self-testing was lower than expected since more than half of the participants had observed errors in their tests [73]. Another study described on an organisational level that a standardised script was recommended (i.e., a written version of all relevant elements) when introducing home-based CSH among care providers and their clients. Although the intervention was designed with these standardised elements, in practice tailoring was applied, which contributed to increasing the speed of processes [31]. Lastly, one study suggests simplification of intervention processes should contribute to implementation of home-based CSH, but without specifying the process simplification [59].

## **Maintenance**

The maintenance CSH assessed to what extent home-based CSH becomes part of routine sexual health care. Most studies suggested that home-based CSH may be offered complimentary to existing health care initiatives. For instance, a North American study evaluated the implementation of several oral HIV self-test interventions between 2018 and 2020, however, it did not examine its potential institutionalisation within existing sexual health care [25]. One study demonstrated that a self-sampling service among MSM increased awareness and intention to test, two years after implementation [74]. In most cases, the long-term impact of most home-based CSH has not yet been examined, since it has been implemented in recent years.

## **DISCUSSION**

Key populations are disproportionately affected by human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and sexually transmitted infections (STI). Home-based comprehensive sexual health care (home-based CSH) can overcome barriers to accessing testing and care. This realist review assessed which elements of home-based CSH works for which key populations, and under which circumstances. A realist approach

allowed for comparing key elements in a real-life context following the reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance (RE-AIM) framework.

From a user perspective, enhancing elements were identified, such as the choice of either home-based or clinic-based HIV testing, clear instructions, and tailoring of dissemination, which may contribute to the uptake of HIV testing. Choice in the type of HIV testing should increase the fit of the offer to individual needs. A recent systematic review of randomised controlled trials demonstrated a contribution to the uptake of HIV testing when offering self-testing instead of standard-of-care testing [75]. Several studies indicated a higher uptake of HIV testing as a result of implementing home-based CSH [46, 61]. However, another systematic review demonstrated growing inequality, with vulnerable groups less represented among home-based CSH users. Home-based CSH may not be suitable when people need further clinical evaluation in case of poor sexual health and or digital literacy or for vulnerable people [23]. Therefore, home-based CSH should be offered in addition to clinic-based sexual health care in order for people to have a choice in the type of HIV testing and care they prefer [50]. Furthermore, an understandable and clear provision of test instructions could increase the self-efficacy of users. Previous studies identified that self-collected swabs and urine samples could be an alternative to swabs collected by a clinician [76]. Therefore, it is essential to offer clear instructions (i.e., written, illustrated or video) to ensure correctly taken samples [77]. A recent study among MSM and transgender people found users preferred video instructions when using an HIV self-test. In addition, inaccuracies in the interpretation of HIV testing results were reduced, when using visualized instructions[78]. Moreover, previous studies suggested that if dissemination strategies are tailored, home-based CSH will be more accessible to key populations [39]. Qualitative evaluation of a self-collection program assessed that the use of multiple communication channels is preferred [79]. In addition, a previous literature review of oral HIV self-testing emphasizes making the offer fitting and accessible for the needs of the key population in terms of language, sexual health literacy and culture [80].

From the implementers' perspective, few insights on home-based CSH were demonstrated. Even though adoption by implementers may be essential to successfully implement and maintain an intervention. In a previous study, care providers found the distribution of home-based CSH highly

acceptable. However, there was concern about which care provider or health care organisation should be responsible for managing clients when testing at home [81]. On an organisational level, the cost-effectiveness for finding new HIV infections is a facilitator to adopt home-based solutions [31, 41, 57]. However, at first, home-based CSH may have higher costs due to starting up processes required for implementation (e.g., collaboration with stakeholders, monitoring) [82]. Another concern is the capability of proper performance of HIV self-testing by clients [81, 83]. A complete care package with self-testing and additional web-based information or counselling may improve the acceptability of home-based CSH by care providers [84]. In addition, simplification of tests should contribute to the ability of clients to perform their home-based testing accurately. Further, self-sampling testing (i.e., when clients send their samples to a laboratory) might offer care providers more control over clients' tests results and follow-up if necessary [20].

### **Scientific implications**

Terms such as telehealth, eHealth, and self-managed care, among other terminology, are used interchangeably to refer to different elements within home-based CSH. The WHO has called for clear and transparent definitions of digital health and self-care [85]. Earlier, the nomenclature was determined for self-testing and self-sampling testing [9]. To unravel universal success factors of home-based CSH, more comparative research and the reporting of processes in more detail, are warranted. Additionally, universal nomenclature in scientific articles may contribute to increased comparability and transparency of studies.

### **Strengths and limitations**

To our knowledge, this is the first realist review that aimed to examine enhancing elements of global home-based CSH. In addition, the realist approach seemed appropriate for assessing this complex intervention. However, a high number of studies had different definitions for home-based CSH and could therefore not be compared properly in such syntheses. Furthermore, a limited number of studies were included from implementation and maintenance perspectives. This could result in missing important conditions for implementation in the realist setting and the long-term impact of home-based CSH. As most included studies focused on MSM, information is lacking for other key populations, a

common occurrence [75, 86, 87]. Therefore, future research should consider sampling key populations such as migrants, transgender people and sex workers.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Home-based comprehensive sexual health care (home-based CSH) interventions have been implemented globally in recent years. This realist review aimed to identify which elements within home-based CSH works for which key populations under which circumstances. Five key elements for enhancing the reach, effectiveness, adoption and implementation of interventions were identified; choice of testing to fit individual needs, provision of clear instructions, tailored dissemination, increased individual determinants for successful uptake and, perceived care and treatment benefits for clients. Considering these elements within home-based CSH may result in more accessible sexual health care for key populations and increased uptake of HIV testing and care among these populations.

## **Abbreviations**

CT – *Chlamydia Trachomatis*, CSH – comprehensive sexual health care, DBS – dried blood spot, HBV – Hepatitis B, HCV – Hepatitis C, HIV – Human immunodeficiency virus, MSM – men who have sex with men, NG – *Neisseria Gonorrhoea*, RCT – randomized controlled trial, RE-AIM – reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation and maintenance framework, STI – sexually transmitted infections, WHO – World Health Organisation

## **Acknowledgements**

First, we would like to thank Lucie Zeches for her cooperation in setting up this study and initiating the search strategy. We also want to thank Rianne de Wit for her contributions to the quality appraisal of the review.

## **Availability of data and material**

Data sharing is not applicable since no datasets were generated or analysed during this study.

## **Funding**

This study is part of the project “Limburg4Zero: An integrated approach to reduce the number of HIV and sexually transmitted diseases in Limburg”. Previously funded by Aidsfonds Nederland; P-49903 and currently by Maastricht University Medical Centre+ within ‘the Next Step’ grant.

### **Authors contributions**

All authors decided upon an initial research design. CG, T-HD, and EK searched and selected relevant literature. CG performed a synthesis of literature data, supervised by YE and ND. CG wrote the first draft of the paper; all authors approved the final draft before submission.

### **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

Not applicable.

### **Consent for publication**

Not applicable

### **Competing interests**

The authors declare no competing interests.



## REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Report on Global Sexually Transmitted Infection Surveillance. 2018. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/277258>. Accessed 16 Dec 2022.
2. World Health Organization. Global prevalence and incidence of selected curable sexually transmitted infections overview and estimates. 2001. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-\(stis\)](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/sexually-transmitted-infections-(stis)). Accessed 16 Dec 2022.
3. Deblonde J, De Koker P, Hamers FF, Fontaine J, Luchters S, Temmerman M. Barriers to HIV testing in Europe: A systematic review. *Eur J Public Health*. 2010;20:422–32.
4. Denison HJ, Bromhead C, Grainger R, Dennison EM, Jutel A. Barriers to sexually transmitted infection testing in New Zealand: a qualitative study. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2017;41:432–7.
5. Kersh EN, Shukla M, Raphael BH, Habel M, Park I. At-Home Specimen Self-Collection and Self-Testing for Sexually Transmitted Infection Screening Demand Accelerated by the COVID-19 Pandemic: a Review of Laboratory Implementation Issues. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2021;59:11.
6. Spence T, Kander I, Walsh J, Griffiths F, Ross J. Perceptions and experiences of internet-based testing for sexually transmitted infections: Systematic review and synthesis of qualitative research. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22.
7. Paudyal P, Llewellyn C, Lau J, Mahmud M, Smith H. Obtaining self-samples to diagnose curable sexually transmitted infections: A systematic review of patients' experiences. *PLoS One*. 2015;10.
8. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on self-care interventions. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-SRH-23.1>. Accessed 20 Dec 2022.
9. Harding-Esch EM, Hollis E, Mohammed H, Saunders JM. Self-sampling and self-testing for STIs and HIV: the case for consistent nomenclature. *Sex Transm Infect Month*. 2015;5:10.
10. Majam M, Fischer AE, Rhagnath N, Msolomba V, Venter WDF, Mazzola L, et al. Performance assessment of four HIV self-test devices in South Africa: A cross-sectional study. *S Afr J Sci*. 2021;117.
11. Kpokiri EE, Marley G, Tang W, Fongwen N, Wu D, Berendes S, et al. Diagnostic infectious diseases testing outside clinics: A global systematic review and meta-analysis. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2020;7:1–9.
12. Figueroa C, Johnson C, Verster A, Baggaley R. Attitudes and Acceptability on HIV Self-testing Among Key Populations: A Literature Review. *AIDS Behav*. 2015;19:1949–65.
13. Zhang C, Li X, Brecht ML, Koniak-Griffin D. Can self-testing increase HIV testing among men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2017;12.
14. Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, Walshe K. Realist review - A new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2005;10:21–34.
15. Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Westhrop G, Pawson R. Protocol-realist and meta-narrative evidence synthesis: Evolving Standards (RAMESES). *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2011;11:115.
16. Glasgow RE, Vogt TM, Boles SM, Glasgow E. Evaluating the Public Health Impact of Health Promotion Interventions: The RE-AIM Framework. *Am J Public Health*. 1999; 89(9):1322-7.

17. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards: Realist syntheses. *BMC Med.* 2013;11.
18. Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: A prospective exploratory study. *Syst Rev.* 2017;6.
19. Nha Hong Q, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) User guide. 2018. <http://mixedmethodsappraisaltoolpublic.pbworks.com/>. Accessed 16 Sept 2022.
20. Baraitser P, Black A, Amos-Gibbs S, Holdsworth G, Ardines E, Courtenay M, et al. User preference for HIV self-testing or self-sampling within a free online sexual health service: a service evaluation. *Int J STD AIDS.* 2019;30.
21. Bristow CC, Shannon C, Herbst De Cortina S, Klausner JD. Use of Oral Fluid with a Rapid Treponemal Test for Syphilis Evaluation. *Sex Transm Dis.* 2018;45.
22. Pai P, Nitika D, Pai NP, Balram B, Shivkumar S, Luis Martinez-Cajas J, et al. Head-to-head comparison of accuracy of a rapid point-of-care HIV test with oral versus whole-blood specimens: a systematic review and meta-analysis. [www.thelancet.com/infection](http://www.thelancet.com/infection). 2012;12:373–80.
23. Sumray K, Lloyd KC, Estcourt CS, Burns F, Gibbs J. Access to, usage and clinical outcomes of, online postal sexually transmitted infection services: a scoping review. *Sex Transm Infect.* 2022;98:528–35.
24. MacGowan RJ, Chavez PR, Gravens L, Wesolowski LG, Sharma A, McNaghten AD, et al. Pilot Evaluation of the Ability of Men Who Have Sex with Men to Self-Administer Rapid HIV Tests, Prepare Dried Blood Spot Cards, and Interpret Test Results, Atlanta, Georgia, 2013. *AIDS Behav.* 2018;22.
25. Norelli J, Zlotorzynska M, Sanchez T, Sullivan PS. Scaling Up CareKit: Lessons Learned from Expansion of a Centralized Home HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infection Testing Program. *Sex Transm Dis.* 2021;48.
26. Sharma A, Gandhi M, Sallabank G, Merrill L, Stephenson R. Perceptions and Experiences of Returning Self-collected Specimens for HIV, Bacterial STI and Potential PrEP Adherence Testing among Sexual Minority Men in the United States. *AIDS Behav.* 2023; 27(4):1091-1105.
27. Chasco EE, Hoth AB, Cho H, Shafer C, Siegler AJ, Ohl ME. Mixed-Methods Evaluation of the Incorporation of Home Specimen Self-Collection Kits for Laboratory Testing in a Telehealth Program for HIV Pre-exposure Prophylaxis. *AIDS Behav.* 2021;25.
28. Leenen J, Hoebe CJP, Ackens RP, Posthouwer D, van Loo IHM, Wolffs PFG, et al. Pilot implementation of a home-care programme with chlamydia, gonorrhoea, hepatitis B, and syphilis self-sampling in HIV-positive men who have sex with men. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2020;20.
29. Cannon CA, Ramchandani MS, Golden MR. Feasibility of a novel self-collection method for blood samples and its acceptability for future home-based PrEP monitoring. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2022;22.
30. Sharma A, Gandhi M, Sallabank G, Merrill L, Stephenson R. Study Evaluating Self-Collected Specimen Return for HIV, Bacterial STI, and Potential Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis Adherence Testing Among Sexual Minority Men in the United States. *Am J Mens Health.* 2022;16.
31. Seguin M, Dodds C, Mugweni E, McDaid L, Flowers P, Wayal S, et al. Self-sampling kits to increase HIV testing among black Africans in the UK: the HAUS mixed-methods study. *Health Technol Assess.* 2018;22:1–158.

32. Ahmed-Little Y, Bothra V, Cordwell D, Freeman Powell D, Ellis D, Klapper P, et al. Attitudes towards HIV testing via home-sampling kits ordered online (RUClear pilots 2011-12). *J Public Health (Oxf)*. 2016;38:585–90.
33. Driver G, Debattista J, Gu Z, Lemoire J, Hooper J. HIV testing within the African community using home-based self collection of oral samples. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2017;41:446.
34. Pierre G, Umutoni A, Dzinamarira T. A qualitative study on oral-fluid-based HIV self-testing experiences among men in Kigali, Rwanda. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2020;37:1–10.
35. Lippman SA, Périssé ARS, Veloso VG, Sullivan PS, Buchbinder S, Sineath RC, et al. Acceptability of self-conducted home-based HIV testing among men who have sex with men in Brazil: data from an on-line survey. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2014;30:724–34.
36. Rahib D, Bercot B, Delagreverie H, Gabassi A, Delaugerre C, Salord H, et al. Online self-sampling kits for human immunodeficiency virus and other sexually transmitted infections: Feasibility, positivity rates, and factors associated with infections in France. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2022;33.
37. John SA, Cain D, Bradford-Rogers J, Rendina HJ, Grov C. Gay and Bisexual Men’s Experiences Using Self-Testing Kits for HIV and Rectal and Urethral Bacterial Sexually Transmitted Infections: Lessons Learned from a Study With Home-Based Testing. *Int J Sex Health*. 2019;31:308–18.
38. Mbopi-Kéou F-X, Kalla GCM, Anakeu P, Pondi J-E. Launching HIV self-testing in a multicultural setting in Cameroon. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020;20:286–7.
39. Tonen-Wolyec S, Batina-Agasa S, Muwonga J, Bouassa RSM, Tshilumba CK, Bélec L. Acceptability, feasibility, and individual preferences of blood-based HIV self-testing in a population-based sample of adolescents in Kisangani, Democratic Republic of the Congo. *PLoS One*. 2019;14.
40. Biello KB, Horvitz C, Mullin S, Mayer KH, Scott H, Coleman K, et al. HIV self-testing and STI self-collection via mobile apps: experiences from two pilot randomized controlled trials of young men who have sex with men. *Mhealth*. 2021;7:26–26.
41. Lebina L, Seatlholo N, Taruberekera N, Radebe M, Kinghorn A, Meyer T, et al. Feasibility of community-based HIV self-screening in South Africa: A demonstration project. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19.
42. Elliot E, Rossi M, McCormack S, Mcowan A. Identifying undiagnosed HIV in men who have sex with men (MSM) by offering HIV home sampling via online gay social media: A service evaluation. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2016;92:470–3.
43. Leenen J, Hoebe CJP, Bos AER, Wolffs PFG, van Loo IHM, de Wit JBF, et al. Systematic Development of an Intervention to Promote Self-Sampling for HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infections for Men Who Have Sex With Men: An Intervention Mapping Approach. *Front Reprod Health*. 2021;3.
44. Grov C, Westmoreland DA, Carneiro PB, Stief M, MacCrate C, Mirzayi C, et al. Recruiting vulnerable populations to participate in HIV prevention research: findings from the Together 5000 cohort study. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2019;35.
45. Loos J, Manirankunda L, Platteau T, Albers L, Franssen K, Vermoesen T, et al. Acceptability of a community-based outreach HIV-testing intervention using oral fluid collection devices and web-based HIV test result collection among sub-saharan african migrants: A mixed-method study. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2016;2.

46. Platteau T, Franssen K, Apers L, Kenyon C, Albers L, Vermoesen T, et al. Swab2know: An HIV-testing strategy using oral fluid samples and online communication of test results for men who have sex with men in Belgium. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17.
47. Phanuphak N, Anand T, Jantarapakde J, Nitpolprasert C, Himmad K, Sungsing T, et al. What would you choose: Online or Offline or Mixed services? Feasibility of online HIV counselling and testing among Thai men who have sex with men and transgender women and factors associated with service uptake. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2018;21.
48. Radebe O, Lippman SA, Lane T, Gilmore H, Agnew E, Manyuchi A, et al. HIV self-screening distribution preferences and experiences among men who have sex with men in Mpumalanga province: informing policy for South Africa. *S Afr Med J*. 2019;109:227–31.
49. Wulandari LPL, Kaldor J, Guy R. Uptake and acceptability of assisted and unassisted HIV self-testing among men who purchase sex in brothels in Indonesia: A pilot intervention study. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20.
50. Phanuphak N, Jantarapakde J, Himmad L, Sungsing T, Meksen R, Phomthong S, et al. Linkages to HIV confirmatory testing and antiretroviral therapy after online, supervised, HIV self-testing among Thai men who have sex with men and transgender women. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2020;23(1)
51. Giguere R, Lopez-Rios J, Frasca T, Lentz C, Balán IC, Dolezal C, et al. Use of HIV Self-Testing Kits to Screen Clients Among Transgender Female Sex Workers in New York and Puerto Rico. *AIDS Behav*. 2020;24:506–15.
52. Pintye J, Drake AL, Begnel E, Kinuthia J, Abuna F, Lagat H, et al. Acceptability and outcomes of distributing HIV self-Tests for male partner testing in Kenyan maternal and child health and family planning clinics. *AIDS*. 2019;33:1369–78.
53. Maksut JL, Eaton LA, Siembida EJ, Driffin DD, Baldwin R. A Test of Concept Study of At-Home, Self-Administered HIV Testing With Web-Based Peer Counseling Via Video Chat for Men Who Have Sex With Men. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2016;2.
54. Xiao W, Yan L, Chen L, Fu G, Yang H, Yang C, et al. Sexual network distribution of HIV self-testing kits: Findings from the process evaluation of an intervention for men who have sex with men in China. *PLoS One*. 2020;15.
55. Chiu CCJ, Young SD. Correlates of requesting home HIV self-testing kits on online social networks among African-American and Latino men who have sex with men. *AIDS Care*. 2016;28:289–93.
56. Belza MJ, Figueroa C, Rosales-Statkus ME, Ruiz M, Vallejo F, de la Fuente L. Low knowledge and anecdotal use of unauthorized online HIV self-test kits among attendees at a street-based HIV rapid testing programme in Spain. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2014;25:196–200.
57. Agustí C, Muñoz R, González V, Villegas L, Fibla J, Meroño M, et al. Outreach HIV testing using oral fluid and online consultation of the results: Pilot intervention in Catalonia. *Enferm Infecc Microbiol Clin*. 2021;39.
58. d'Elbee M, Indravudh PP, Mwenge L, Kumwenda MM, Simwanga M, Choko AT, et al. Preferences for linkage to HIV care services following a reactive self-Test: Discrete choice experiments in Malawi and Zambia. *AIDS*. 2018;32.
59. Zhong F, Tang W, Cheng W, Lin P, Wu Q, Cai Y, et al. Acceptability and feasibility of a social entrepreneurship testing model to promote HIV self-testing and linkage to care among men who have sex with men. *HIV Med*. 2017;18:376–82.

60. Jin X, Xu J, Smith MK, Xiao D, Rapheal ER, Xiu X, et al. An internet-based self-testing model (easy test): Cross-sectional survey targeting men who have sex with men who never tested for HIV in 14 provinces of China. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21.
61. Fisher M, Wayal S, Smith H, Llewellyn C, Alexander S, Ison C, et al. Home sampling for sexually transmitted infections and HIV in men who have sex with men: A prospective observational study. *PLoS One*. 2015;10.
62. Wong NS, Ho Kwan T, Chan DPC, Lui GCY, Shan Lee S. Regular Testing of HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infections With Self-Collected Samples From Multiple Anatomic Sites to Monitor Sexual Health in Men Who Have Sex With Men: Longitudinal Study. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022;6.
63. Rahib D, Delagreverie H, Gabassi A, Le Thi T, Vassel E, Vodossin P, et al. Online self-sampling kits to screen multipartner MSM for HIV and other STIs: Participant characteristics and factors associated with kit use in the first three months of the MemoDepistages program, France, 2018. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2021;97:134-140.
64. Manavi K, Hodson J. Observational study of factors associated with return of home sampling kits for sexually transmitted infections requested online in the UK. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7.
65. Hoyos J, Fernández-Balbuena S, De La Fuente L, Sordo L, Ruiz M, Barrio G, et al. Never tested for HIV in Latin-American migrants and Spaniards: Prevalence and perceived barriers. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2013;16.
66. Knight RE, Chabot C, Carson A, Thomson K, Haag D, Gilbert M, et al. Qualitative analysis of the experiences of gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men who use GetCheckedOnline.com: A comprehensive internet-based diagnostic service for HIV and other STIs. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2019;95.
67. Frasca T, Balan I, Ibitoye M, Valladares J, Dolezal C, Carballo-Diéguez A. Attitude and behavior changes among gay and bisexual men after use of rapid home HIV tests to screen sexual partners. *AIDS Behav*. 2014;18:950-7.
68. Asimwe S, Oloya J, Song X, Whalen CC. Accuracy of Un-supervised Versus Provider-Supervised Self-administered HIV Testing in Uganda: A Randomized Implementation Trial. *AIDS Behav*. 2014;18:2477-84.
69. Xia DY, Feng X, He XX, Liu GW, Lyu Y, Cheng H, et al. Feasibility of an internet-based HIV testing service: anonymous urine collection from men who have sex with men. *AIDS Care*. 2018;30:1228-30.
70. Flowers P, Riddell J, Park C, Ahmed B, Young I, Frankis J, et al. Preparedness for use of the rapid result HIV self-test by gay men and other men who have sex with men (MSM): a mixed methods exploratory study among MSM and those involved in HIV prevention and care. *HIV Med*. 2017;18:245-55.
71. Ricca A V., Hall EW, Khosropour CM, Sullivan PS. Factors Associated with Returning At-Home Specimen Collection Kits for HIV Testing among Internet-Using Men Who Have Sex with Men. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care*. 2016;15:463-9.
72. Shrestha R, Maviglia F, Altice FL, DiDomizio E, Khati A, Mistler C, et al. Mobile Health Technology Use and the Acceptability of an mHealth Platform for HIV Prevention Among Men Who Have Sex With Men in Malaysia: Cross-sectional Respondent-Driven Sampling Survey. *J Med Internet Res*. 2022;24.
73. Catania JA, Dolcini MM, Harper G, Fortenberry D, Singh RR, Jamil O, et al. Oral HIV Self-Implemented Testing: Performance Fidelity Among African American MSM. *AIDS Behav*. 2020;24.

74. Dulai J, Salway T, Thomson K, Haag D, Lachowsky N, Grace D, et al. Awareness of and intention to use an online sexually transmitted and blood-borne infection testing service among gay and bisexual men in British Columbia, two years after implementation. *Can J Public Health*. 2021;112:78–88.
75. Witzel TC, Eshun-Wilson I, Jamil MS, Tilouche N, Figueroa C, Johnson CC, et al. Comparing the effects of HIV self-testing to standard HIV testing for key populations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med*. 2020;18.
76. Lunny C, Taylor D, Hoang L, Wong T, Gilbert M, Lester R, et al. Self-collected versus clinician-collected sampling for chlamydia and gonorrhea screening: A systemic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2015;10.
77. Chow EPF, Bradshaw CS, Williamson DA, Hall S, Chen MY, Phillips TR, et al. Changing from clinician-collected to self-collected throat swabs for oropharyngeal gonorrhea and chlamydia screening among men who have sex with men. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020;58.
78. Rosadiño JDT, Pagtakhan RG, Briñes MT, Dinglasan JLG, Cruz DP, Corciega JOL, et al. Implementation of unassisted and community-based HIV Self-Testing (HIVST) during the COVID-19 pandemic among Men-who-have-sex-with-Men (MSM) and Transgender Women (TGW): A demonstration study in Metro Manila, Philippines. *PLoS One*. 2023;18.
79. Sallabank G, Stephenson R, Gandhi M, Sullivan S, Merrill L, Sharma A. Acceptability and feasibility of self-collecting biological specimens for HIV, sexually transmitted infection, and adherence testing among high-risk populations (project caboodle!): Protocol for an exploratory mixed-methods study. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2019;8.
80. Estem KS, Catania J, Klausner JD. HIV Self-Testing: a Review of Current Implementation and Fidelity. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2016;13:107–15.
81. Tat S, Dhanireddy S, Marrazzo JM, Barbee LA. Health Care Provider Perceptions of a Sexually Transmitted Infection Self-testing Program in an HIV Care Clinic. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2018;45:417–21.
82. Blake DR, Spielberg F, Levy V, Lensing S, Wolff PA, Venkatasubramanian L, et al. Could home sexually transmitted infection specimen collection with e-prescription be a cost-effective strategy for clinical trials and clinical care? *Sex Transm Dis*. 2015;42:13–9.
83. Jordão T, Magno L, Pereira M, Rossi TRA, de Almeida Silva P, Figueiredo MAA, et al. Willingness of health care providers to offer HIV self-testing from specialized HIV care services in the northeast of Brazil. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22.
84. McGuire M, de Waal A, Karellis A, Janssen R, Engel N, Sampath R, et al. HIV self-testing with digital supports as the new paradigm: A systematic review of global evidence (2010–2021). *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;39.
85. World Health Organization. WHO Consolidated Guideline on Self-Care Interventions for Health Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights. 2019. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240052192>. Accessed 20 July 2023.
86. Brandelli Costa A, Henriques Viscardi L, Feijo M, Martha A, Fontanari V. HIV Voluntary Counseling and Testing (VCT-HIV) effectiveness for sexual risk-reduction among key populations: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2022;52.
87. Yeh PT, Kennedy CE, Minamitani A, Baggaley R, Shah P, Verster A, et al. Web-Based Service Provision of HIV, Viral Hepatitis, and Sexually Transmitted Infection Prevention, Testing, Linkage, and Treatment for Key Populations: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2022;24.

## **Additional files**

### **Additional file 1 - search strategy.pdf**

PDF

*Additional file 1. Initial search strategy and search strings*

The initial search strategy by database and search engine, with associated search strings

### **Additional file 2 - inclusion.pdf**

PDF

*Additional file 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria*

Inclusion and exclusion criteria which were used for the selection of studies.

### **Additional file 3 - quality appraisal.xlsx**

XLSX

*Additional file 3. List of included studies and their quality appraisal*

Quality appraisal of all included studies by using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) and additional criteria.

### **Additional file 4 – includedstudies.pdf**

PDF

*Additional file 4. Included studies that assessed home-based comprehensive sexual health care (n=92)*

All included studies with their study type, design, first author, year of publication, full title, study population and size (N) and continent of publication.