

Factors influencing uptake of COVID-19 diagnostics in Sub-Saharan Africa: a rapid scoping review

Short title: COVID-19 diagnostics uptake in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mackwellings Maganizo Phiri^{1,2*},

Yasmin Dunkley⁶

Elizabeth Di Giacomo⁵

Wezzie Lora^{1,2}

Moses Kumwenda¹

Itai Kabonga³

Elvis Isere⁷

John Bimba⁷

Euphemia Sibanda^{3,4}

Augustine Choko^{1,2}

Karin Hatzold⁸

Liz Corbett⁶

Nicola Desmond^{1,2}

Affiliations

1. Malawi Liverpool Wellcome Programme

2. Kamuzu University of Health Sciences

3. Centre for Sexual Health and HIV/AIDS Research Zimbabwe

4. Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine

5. Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario

6. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

7. Zankli Research Centre, Bingham University

8. Population Services International, Washington DC

*Corresponding author

Email: mmphiri@mlw.mw/mackwellingsphiri@gmail.com

Abstract

Background

Diagnostics are critical for preventing COVID-19 transmission, enabling disease management and engagement with care. However, COVID-19 testing uptake remained low in low- and middle- income countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) during the recent pandemic, due to issues of supply, access and acceptability. Early studies conducted outside of the region provide insight into uptake of COVID-19 testing, however there has been no systematic research within the region. The aim of this scoping review is to investigate factors influencing uptake of COVID-19 testing in different settings across SSA.

Methods

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

45 Inclusion criteria was any study employing qualitative or mixed methodologies,
46 addressing uptake of COVID-19 testing conducted in SSA. MEDLINE, PubMed,
47 Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Africa-Wide Information were searched.
48 Thematic content analysis was conducted across all included articles until saturation
49 was attained.
50

51 **Results**

52 In total 2994 articles were identified and fourteen reviewed. Structural, social,
53 epidemiological, informational, and political elements affected how publics interacted
54 with COVID-19 testing. Coverage was limited by insufficient diagnostic capabilities
55 caused by a shortage of laboratory resources and trained personnel. False information
56 spread through social media led to testing misperceptions and apprehension. Testing
57 hesitancy was ascribed to fear of restrictive measures and the possibility of social
58 harms if positive. Facility-based testing was physically inaccessible and perceived as
59 lacking privacy, whereas self-testing distributed by the community removed lengthy
60 distances and prevented stigma. Perceptions that COVID-19 was not severe and low
61 numbers of confirmed cases in comparison to other settings undermined public
62 urgency for testing. Low testing frequency led to low-rate assumptions, which in turn
63 generated denial and othering narratives. Politicians' acceptance or denial of COVID-
64 19 affected the mobilization of the health system, and their model actions—such as
65 testing openly—promoted public confidence and involvement in interventions.
66

67 **Conclusions**

68 This review emphasizes the necessity of strong political commitments to enhancing
69 health systems for future pandemic preparedness. Response plans should consider
70 contextual elements that affect how people react to interventions and perceive health
71 emergencies. Community-driven self-testing distribution could enhance the uptake of
72 diagnostics through addressing socio-economic constraints impacting facility-
73 delivered testing.
74

75 **Introduction**

76 Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) was declared a Public Health Emergency of
77 International Concern by the World Health Organization (WHO) on January 30, 2020
78 [1,2]. Increased availability of diagnostic interventions for COVID-19 (C-19) was
79 identified as a research priority, including delivering point-of-care (POC) testing
80 within communities [2]. The WHO recommended integrating C-19 testing within
81 routine diagnostics for other respiratory illnesses including influenza and tuberculosis
82 to increase access [3]. Following these recommendations, different diagnostic
83 techniques, including rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs), were produced and implemented
84 [3]. These included genome sequencing, antigen or antibody detection, and molecular
85 testing using nucleic acids [4]. Antigen/antibody tests were recommended for
86 pandemic monitoring since they allowed rapid, regular, and expanded testing with on-
87 site detection and immediate management [4]. Despite this potential, C-19 testing was
88 not widely adopted by the public, particularly in low- and middle-income countries
89 (LMIC) in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) [5].
90

91 Identification of infected individuals through diagnostics is essential for disease
92 prevention and control but testing-related challenges have been reported worldwide
93 [5–8]. As C-19 spread, demand for diagnostic tests outstripped global supply,
94 resulting in an inequitable access [5,6]. Although high-income countries had the
95 means to produce or purchase technologies, access was limited in the LMIC [5,6].
96 This has been due to political and supply-side issues, including issues of global
97 governance and health system-related factors such as resource limitations and
98 logistics, as well as social and community-level factors such as communication and
99 trust in delivery agents. The spread of misinformation undermined public confidence
100 and restricted testing uptake globally [2]. Effective political leadership was
101 demonstrated to impact engagement in preventive measures such as a sharp increase
102 in people's trust and willingness to test for C-19 when the president of Ghana tested
103 publicly [9]. Likewise, where the political leadership was unwilling to test and
104 dismissive of C-19 threat the desire to test among the general public was also
105 correspondingly low.

106
107 Although studies have shed light on factors influencing public testing uptake, there
108 has been little research in SSA specifically. User focus in SSA has been on general
109 knowledge, attitudes, perceptions, and practices towards C-19 and vaccination
110 responses, whilst supply-side research has investigated healthcare system conditions
111 necessary for deploying testing instruments such as RDTs [10,11].

112
113 This study formed part of the “STAR Africa, Asia, Americas COVID-19 Preparedness
114 Project (3ACP)” funded through UNITAID, investigating COVID-19 professional use
115 and self-testing rapid diagnostics in Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and Malawi. As part of this
116 work, we conducted a scoping of the contextual factors influencing people’s decisions
117 regarding COVID-19 testing in various settings throughout SSA. This information
118 would support the implementation of the main project.

119 **Methods**

120 **Review scope**

121 We conducted the review between July and August 2023. The review methodology is
122 available at <https://osf.io> and has been registered with the Open Science Framework
123 (OSF). Arksey and O'Malley's methodological approach was used to formulate the
124 research question, find relevant studies, choose studies, chart the data, and compile,
125 summarize, and present findings [12]. Papers were selected following the Preferred
126 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework
127 [13].

128
129 Inclusion criteria were any peer-reviewed study investigating factors influencing self-
130 and provider-delivered COVID-19 testing uptake in sub-Saharan Africa with
131 qualitative research methods described (i.e., focus groups, interviews, ethnography,
132 and case studies), as well as mixed-methods studies including qualitative research
133 conducted in conjunction with clinical trials. The types of diagnostic tests being used
134 were another area of focus for data extraction. Quantitative research, literature
135 reviews, and duplicates were removed from analysis after title screening. The search
136

137 focused only on research from SSA from the onset of the C-19 pandemic (January
138 2020) to July 2023, when the review was conducted (**Table 1**).

139

140 **Table 1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

	Exclude	Include
Publication type	Non-peer reviewed content	Peer reviewed studies
Study design	Quantitative surveys, clinical studies with no qualitative element.	Qualitative research (results from focus groups / interviews), mixed-methods studies involving qualitative methodology.
Report types	Reviews, opinion pieces, letters to the editor	Primary research
Language	Non-English language	English language
Geographic area	Non-SSA countries	SSA countries
Topic	Non-COVID-19 testing, vaccine, vaccination	COVID-19 testing, COVID-19 diagnostics, and factors affecting their acceptability
Date range	Exclude studies before 2020	Studies from January 2020 to present date

141

142 We conducted the search through Google Scholar, PubMed, Web of Science, Medline,
143 and Africa-Wide Information. Search terms including COVID-19, COVID 19,
144 coronavirus, testing, screening, RDTs, diagnostics, diagnose, enablers, facilitators, motivation,
145 influence, behaviour, attitude, perception, beliefs, cultural, political, sociocultural, economic,
146 social science, qualitative, and mixed methods were used. We used them separately as well as
147 in combination (using the Boolean operators "AND" and "OR") (Table 2). Filters were
148 used to narrow the search to primary research abstracts and titles (**Table 2**).

149

150 **Table 2: Search terms**

Query	Filters
(COVID-19 OR COVID 19 OR coronavirus) AND (test* OR screen* OR RDT OR diagnos*) AND (enabl* OR facilitat* OR motiv* OR influenc *) AND (behav* OR attitude* OR perce* OR belie*) AND (cultur* OR politic* OR sociocult* OR econom*) AND (“social science” OR qualitative OR mixed methods)	Free full text, Journal Article, English, SSA, 2020 to present day

151

152 Studies were initially included for consideration based on the title and abstract. If the
153 abstract did not contain relevant information, we searched the article for the keywords
154 described above. We evaluated the quality and relevance of eligible studies using a
155 research appraisal tool developed by Hawker et al., 2002, and colleagues [14] (**S2**).
156 We developed a data charting form including details on the author, publication year,
157 location, study design, sample size, and conclusions (**S3**).

158

159 **Data analysis**

160 NVivo version 12 was used to import all the studies that satisfied the inclusion
161 criteria. Codes and concepts were explored inductively and deductively. A preliminary

162 coding framework was created and modified inductively to incorporate emerging
163 themes. The initial codes and concepts were later reclassified, summarised, and
164 integrated into two broad thematic areas: COVID-19 testing facilitators; and COVID-
165 19 testing barriers. We present the data under these thematic categories, and **Fig 2**
166 summarises the main and sub-themes under each category.

167

168 **Fig 2:** Graphical display of COVID-19 testing facilitators and barriers in sub-Saharan
169 Africa.

170

171 **Results**

172 A total of 2994 studies were identified through the initial search across all databases.
173 2870 studies were eliminated. We screened the abstracts of 124 articles: 104 were
174 excluded, covering topics related to COVID-19 but not directly associated with testing
175 uptake, for example, COVID-19 vaccination, knowledge, and beliefs. Other reasons
176 for exclusion included not focusing on the relevant disease area (HIV or tuberculosis
177 diagnostics), while others were not conducted within SSA. We remained with 20
178 articles for full-text screening. Of these two were systematic reviews, three did not
179 include qualitative approaches, and one was not conducted in SSA. A total of 14
180 articles remained for quality evaluation and data extraction (**Fig 1**).

181

182 **Fig 1.** Process flow diagram for the research selection using PRISMA methodology.

183

184 Six studies analysed patient and stakeholder perceptions and experiences with C-19
185 testing and screening procedures [10, 16-20]. The remaining eight studies explored C-
186 19 responses generally as well as testing-related topics. Four studies reported COVID-
187 19 self-testing [9,15–17], five used facility-based RDTs [9,18–21], two used
188 molecular tests [22,23], one used PCR tests [17], one used imaging [24], and two did
189 not explicitly specify the diagnostic test used [25,26]. The studies had a total of 953
190 participants, aged 17 to 77 (**Table 3**).

Table 3: Summary of included studies with key findings

Author and year	Country	Design & Population	Key findings	Testing modality: diagnostic test type/delivery mode
Amoo et al., 2020	Nigeria	Mixed-method: 27 in-depth interviews with healthcare workers and 1030 participants in COVID-19 testing survey	Testing participation was based on understanding of COVID-19. Nasal swabbing, was unsettling for participants; travel expenses limited participation.	Facility-based testing using a drive-through sampling modality (nasal and oropharyngeal) targeting COVID-19 suspects invited via social media platforms and the Nigeria Centre for Disease Control website.
Oleribe et al., 2021	Nigeria	Qualitative: online semi-structured interviews with 495 respondents	Expanding testing was hampered by a shortage of test kits and competent medical personnel. Politicising COVID-19 also negatively affected public behaviours regarding the health measures.	Facility-provided molecular and community-delivered rapid diagnostic testing
Nxumalo et al., 2021	South Africa	Qualitative: 15 semi-structured interviews with primary healthcare practitioners	Caretakers were uncomfortable due to lack of PPE and fear of contracting infection, which affected quality of services offered. Denial and othering led some to believe that testing wasn't necessary.	Facility-based provider-initiated symptomatic screening based on high body temperature. Details of diagnostic test used not described
Lewis et al., 2021	South Africa	Qualitative: online open-ended questionnaire with 60 diagnostic radiographers	Radiographers felt physical and mental pressure due to sample backlogs and limited testing capacity. This led to delays in providing test results and care. Radiographers felt overwhelmed and helpless in witnessing patient deaths while waiting for test results.	COVID-19 imaging (computed tomography) on referred patients
Rispel et al., 2021	South Africa	Qualitative: 36 interviews with key informants (incl. policy makers, healthcare workers, advocacy	Limited human and material resources impacted laboratory testing capacity. Lack of clarity on testing or screening guidelines caused confusion between testing teams. Poor working conditions impacted providers' willingness to perform.	Facility-provided testing using random community-based sampling strategy

		groups), and document analysis		
Schmidt et al., 2020	South Africa	Qualitative: 60 interviews with community members and key informants (civil society, private sector representatives)	Rumours on social media concerning faulty test kits led to misunderstandings about COVID-19 and bred public mistrust of the testing suspecting it was being used to infect people with COVID-19, which made people reluctant to test.	Door-to-door symptomatic screening and rapid diagnostic testing
Brumwell et al., 2022	South Africa	Qualitative: 52 semi-structured interviews with COVID-19 self-testing decision makers (health workers, civil society representatives, self-testing implementers)	Access to facility services was hindered by long distances and high transportation expenses. Self-testing was viewed as private, allowing the freedom of testing at own convenience, preventing long waiting times for test results and social stigma associated with facility-based testing.	Facility-provided PCR tests, and rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen self-testing intended for a prospective national mass testing campaign
Asare et al., 2023	Ghana	Qualitative: 6 focus group discussions with 39 COVID-19 contact tracers	Inadequate testing capacity resulting in sample backlogs and processing delays impacted case management. Clients requesting the medical teams conducting the screening to disclose their political affiliation before they could take the services since they mistrusted the government with COVID-19.	Facility-initiated screening and testing of index patients and community-level screening and sampling of contacts using RDTs
Ha et al., 2022	Ghana	Qualitative: 20 semi-structured interviews with testing key informants incl. policymakers, implementers, frontline health workers, and community members	People did not accept the test because of low-risk perceptions equating COVID-19 with common flu.	Mass testing through self-tests (using self-procured kits) and facility-provided tests (following a prescription or personal choice)
Asiimwe et al., 2021	Ghana	Qualitative: 27 semi-structured interviews	Processing test results took longer than expected due to insufficient testing capacity and laboratory	Facility-initiated community-level screening and sampling

		with COVID-19 contact tracers, supervisors, and case contacts	supply shortage. Few people underwent testing due to stigma.	involving facility-based testing as part of a national surveillance campaign.
Carlitz et al., 2021	Tanzania	Qualitative: 40 in-depth interviews with public healthcare workers, social welfare organisations, village leaders	People did not accept testing because the country's president said there was no COVID-19 or it was not serious, test kits had been tampered with and were unreliable, laboratories were fabricating positive test results.	Method of testing not confirmed.
Yamanis et al., 2023	Tanzania	Qualitative: 56 in-depth interviews with healthcare workers, social welfare organisations, village leaders	No testing facilities were available. Healthcare workers just screened suspects based on body temperature, heart rate, and blood pressure.	Facility-delivered screening: body temperature, heart rate, blood pressure
Mohammed et al., 2021	Ethiopia	Qualitative: Semi-structured interviews with COVID-19 prevention task force members, healthcare workers, community members	People disputed the validity of COVID-19. Belief that politicians were exploiting COVID-19 to distract the public from national political issues. Rumours that laboratory staff members were paid by politicians and fabricated test results to boost the number of cases and support the political narrative that COVID-19 was present. Because test kits weren't easily accessible, prospective testing clients went longer without being tested.	Door-to-door symptomatic sampling and screening implemented as part of the national community-based surveillance programme
Chabeda et al., 2022	Kenya	Qualitative: semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with 50 self-testing stakeholders (providers, implementers, and advocacy groups)	Public facilities frequently ran out of test kits, whereas commercial test centres had better equipment but were more expensive. Because self-testing is private and could reduce demand on public healthcare facilities, informants believed that it would be well-accepted by the public.	Self-testing (using self-procured rapid SARS-CoV-2 antigen-detection kits accessed through private distributors)

193 COVID-19 diagnostic uptake in SSA was problematic across many settings and
194 influenced by political, institutional/structural, social, and informational factors.

195

196 **Facilitators of COVID-19 Testing**

197 ***Effective political leadership***

198 Strong political leadership was critical in determining the direction of the national
199 COVID-19 response. Ha et al., 2022 and Yamanis et al., 2023³³ described that in areas
200 where government officials viewed COVID-19 as a threat to public health, there was a
201 strong political commitment to develop and implement disease containment measures
202 including diagnostics. For example, in Ghana, the government gathered financial and
203 material support to increase its diagnostic capacity through multisectoral partnerships
204 with development partners. This allowed the country's health system to expand the
205 number of COVID-19 testing facilities nationwide, improving access and coverage of
206 testing services, according to one of the nation's laboratory managers:

207

208 *“We did not have enough testing centres and PPE at the beginning of the pandemic.*
209 *But, now, we have enough facilities, adequate PPE, and other consumables supported*
210 *by the Ghana government, international organizations, and other donors for COVID-*
211 *19 testing.” [9]*

212

213 Yamanis et al., 2023 described Tanzania making a similar commitment to
214 empowering the health system and acknowledging the existence of COVID-19 after a
215 period of denial when the new president, Hassan, acknowledged COVID-19 as a
216 public health emergency relying on collaboration with local and international partners
217 to improve control measures, including promoting testing uptake.

218

219 Both Ha et al., 2022 and Yamanis et al., 2023 described the influence of government
220 in public responses to COVID-19 services. Political leaders not only made
221 investments in health system capacity for COVID-19 monitoring activities, but took
222 on a pro-public health advocacy role, urging people to get tested as well as follow the
223 rest of the controls set in place. Some government representatives underwent COVID-
224 19 testing or vaccination in public to legitimize and encourage improved public
225 response, motivating testing:

226

227 *We received lots of hope from the government and the president. Our president was*
228 *really keen on tackling the pandemic [...] We were highly encouraged to get tested by*
229 *the president, and his leadership uplifted the motivation of getting tested.” [9].*

230

231 ***Public confidence in organizations providing testing***

232 Public perceptions of the organizations tasked with carrying out testing activities were
233 central to participation. In South Africa, Brumwell et al., found that people were more
234 inclined to test for COVID-19 if they knew and trusted the providers:

235

236 *“I think people do trust their pastors, their healthcare workers, nurses and general*
237 *practitioners, pharmacists, principles... They generally don't trust politicians. So, I*
238 *wouldn't include them there. But, generally, the community leaders, non-politically*
239 *aligned, I think would be people that would be trustworthy.” [17].*

240 C-19 was more acceptable when spearheaded by people that community members
241 were used to and had some form of prior association or interaction.

242

243 ***Novel COVID-19 testing modalities.***

244 Perspectives on self-testing were discussed in two studies by Brumwell et al., 2022
245 and Chabeda et al., 2022, and participants expressed a preference for self-testing over
246 facility-based testing in both cases. Brumwell et al., 2022 claimed that this was due to
247 testing flexibility, privacy, and confidentiality for socially excluded groups such as the
248 homeless and drug users, whereas facility-based testing was felt to exacerbate stigma.
249 Participants in Kenya in Chabeda et al., 2022 study described decision-makers
250 perspectives that self-testing was crucial for physically vulnerable populations such as
251 the elderly, the sick, those with impairments, and people living in isolated locations.
252 However, they did not interview end users of self-testing.

253

254 . Knowledge of COVID-19 and its risks preceded the public adoption of testing. Eight
255 of the studies reflected the usefulness of public health communication in generating
256 demand for testing [9,16–18,20,23,25,27]. The studies frequently ascribed the uptake
257 of testing to ongoing public health communication, which participants said was
258 helpful in dispelling initial pandemic myths in the communities. Asare et al., 2023
259 mentioned that in Ghana finding contacts to test early in the pandemic was difficult,
260 and awareness campaigns were seen to help communities respond more effectively.

261

262 **Barriers to COVID-19 Testing**

263 ***Health system capacity***

264 Nine of the studies identified that healthcare systems in SSA lacked the diagnostic
265 tools and equipment necessary to identify COVID-19 patients, which impacted testing
266 availability [9,17,18,20–23,25,26]. There was common recognition that systemic
267 underfunding of healthcare systems, pre-existent to the pandemic, translated to a lack
268 of preparedness for COVID-19. Problems included the paucity of test kits,
269 disinfectants, and safety equipment in laboratories. Some hospitals lacked laboratory
270 facilities altogether. For instance, in Tanzania Yamanis et al., 2023 revealed there
271 was no laboratory to conduct testing, medical professionals merely checked suspects'
272 body temperatures, blood pressure, and heart rates. Inadequate laboratory readiness
273 led to frequent backlogs in testing COVID-19 samples. Five of the studies reported
274 protracted processing times ranging from several days [17,21,25,27] to more than a
275 month [20] from sample collection, affecting COVID-19 public health response such
276 as contact tracing.

277

278 ***Human Resource constraints***

279 The availability of human capital also affected the availability of COVID-19
280 diagnostic testing in SSA. Four of the studies ([9,19,21,22] discussed the lack of
281 skilled medical personnel to support testing and surveillance interventions. For
282 example, a laboratory manager in Ghana described increased work burden due to staff
283 shortages:

284

285 “We have only one person at the lab who runs the test. Despite our support, he ran
286 samples until late. I also feel too exhausted [...] when testing many people. The
287 human personnel is fewer [...].” [9].
288

289 This shortage was also reported in South Africa and Nigeria [19,22]. Solutions
290 suggested included retraining HIV service providers to reduce the supply-demand gap
291 for COVID-19 testing.
292

293 Mental exhaustion and distress impacted staff capacity to respond to testing demands.
294 Fears expressed included contracting COVID-19 through interaction with positive
295 patients, where lack of access to personal protective equipment (PPE) and antiseptics
296 for sanitizing surfaces was sub-optimal. Participants also felt underappreciated
297 without support to address these issues. Fears were exacerbated when colleagues died
298 of COVID-19. These factors all contributed to mental exhaustion.
299

300 ***Supply-Chain Issues***

301 Five of the studies identified supply problems that impacted the availability and
302 distribution of COVID-19 diagnostic services [9,17,20,21,23]. Mohammed et al. 2021
303 drew attention to budgetary constraints that impacted the purchase of medical
304 necessities in Ethiopia, leading to inconsistent supply and frequent stockouts of test
305 kits. Ha et al., 2022 described similar supply challenges such as irregular provision of
306 personal protective equipment (PPE), making it difficult for surveillance teams to
307 effectively conduct contact tracing:
308

309 “When COVID-19 [] came, we [the Ghana Health Service] were not prepared, which
310 is why we faced a lot of challenges with contact tracing in the beginning. The PPEs
311 were not there, yet we had to work. So, if the authorities could learn their lessons, I
312 think we will be better prepared for the future.” [9]
313

314 ***Accessibility of testing***

315 Access to COVID-19 testing was geographically unevenly distributed across urban
316 and rural settings. In one study, supply was better in urban centres than in rural ones,
317 even when testing was supposedly available. Asare et al., 2023 in Ghana, for instance,
318 described participants feeling that metropolitan facilities had more resources than their
319 rural counterparts, making it simpler to receive services there. In this context,
320 Brumwell et al., 2022 and Chabeda et al., 2022 demonstrated that self-testing could
321 increase testing accessibility, helping to solve the issue of people failing to test
322 because of large distances to facilities, which had an impact on both supply and
323 demand. However, since patients had to travel to pick up the test kits, the supply was
324 constrained by the central distribution of test kits through healthcare facilities.
325 Participants in Brumwell et al., 2022 and Chabeda et al., 2022 believed that this posed
326 the same challenges as facility-based testing.
327

329 ***Psycho-social and economic obstacles***

330 Testing decisions were also shaped by risk perceptions and the economic and
331 psychosocial ramifications of undergoing a test and being diagnosed with the disease.
332 Seven studies [9,16–18,21,24,25] reported prevalent pandemic-related dread among

333 community members, worrying about contracting and developing problems. Both
334 Asiiimwe et al., 2021 and Nxumalo et al., 2021 described these worries as stemming
335 from social media rumours claiming that foreign locations had a high death rate.
336 Carlitz et al., 2021 described that COVID-19 fatalities were being buried as Ebola
337 victims, stories that increased fears of the pandemic and the social repercussions of
338 receiving a COVID-19-positive diagnosis. In Brumwell et al., 2022 South African
339 study, participants claimed that clients who tested positive experienced stigma
340 because neighbours thought they were spreading the disease and held them
341 responsible for new infections or fatalities.

342
343 Relating to economic costs, the two self-testing studies by Brumwell et al., 2022 and
344 Chabeda et al., 2022 demonstrated that testing uptake was discouraged by the negative
345 financial consequences of being diagnosed with COVID-19 and disclosure
346 requirements. For the majority of those who tested positive, isolation requirements
347 meant missing work. Failure to report for duty would also result in pay loss for jobs
348 without sick days and participants believed that people's fear of losing their income
349 prevented them from testing and disclosing their status to prevent isolation. As
350 mentioned earlier, transport costs incurred when accessing self-testing centrally
351 distributed through facilities also dissuaded uptake [15,17].

352

353 ***False claims and beliefs***

354 Nine studies reported how misinformation fuelled through social media encouraged
355 negative perceptions of COVID-19, with a detrimental impact on demand for testing
356 (Amoo et al., 2020; Asare et al., 2023; Brumwell et al., 2022; Carlitz et al., 2021;
357 Ekohm et al., 2021; Ha et al., 2022; Mohammed et al., 2021; Nxumalo et al., 2021 and
358 Schmidt et al., 2020). Mohammed et al., 2021 described a prevalent false claim that
359 hospitals fabricated test results to increase the number of verified cases to demonstrate
360 the reality of COVID-19.

361

362 Following the introduction of vaccination, rumours related to vaccines also impacted
363 C-19 testing uptake. For example, Schmidt et al., 2020 highlighted refusal to uptake
364 door-to-door screening and testing by medical personnel due to beliefs around
365 vaccination in South Africa: “*Like as clinic staff we go in door-to-door, there are*
366 *incidences where a house owner would refuse for us to go in, saying we don't want*
367 *your vaccines because they have Corona. Then we had to explain that we are not*
368 *injecting people, we are just screening and asking questions. People are really scared,*
369 *because of what they heard. . .*” [16]

370

371 Carlitz et al., 2021; Chabeda et al., 2022 and Schmidt et al., 2020 all described
372 spiritual beliefs and religious beliefs that prevented the public from using tests and
373 other interventions, compounding misconceptions spreading through social media.
374 Chabeda et al., 2022 described belief in COVID-19 as a sign of devil worship in
375 Kenya. Schmidt et al., 2020 described how COVID-19 was seen as testament that God
376 was angry with humanity in South Africa.

377

378 ***Political exploitation of COVID-19 in SSA***

379 Seven studies demonstrated how COVID-19 testing was highly politicized (Asare et
380 al., 2023; Asiiimwe et al., 2021; Carlitz et al., 2021; Mohammed et al., 2021; Oleribe

381 et al., 2021; Yamanis et al., 2023). Studies in Tanzania by both Carlitz et al., 2021 and
382 Yamanis et al., 2023 described political figures explicitly denouncing the pandemic's
383 existence, encouraging the public to seek herbal remedies. This, alongside the
384 Tanzanian government's decision to remove the country's laboratory manager and end
385 its monitoring program influenced willingness to adopt public health strategies
386 including testing (Carlitz et al 2021).

387

388 The strength of perceived association between political agendas and C-19, fuelled
389 through social media contributed to public mistrust of organizations providing health
390 responses. In Ghana, Asare et al., 2023 highlighted the relationship between political
391 affiliation and testing engagement where the public 'screened' providers of testing
392 according to political views: "*Politicising the disease is a challenge to us [contact*
393 *tracers]. This is because you will get to a contact's home, and they start to politicise*
394 *the entire process [of contact tracing] and they begin to ask you which party you*
395 *belong to.*"

396

397 **Discussion**

398 The findings of this review point to several structural, political, informational,
399 economic, testing modality, and psychosocial elements that impacted directly on both
400 provision and uptake of COVID-19 testing across SSA. Countries were unable to
401 increase COVID-19 screening and testing because public healthcare systems lacked
402 adequate laboratory and diagnostic equipment. The delivery of screening and testing
403 was also influenced by safety worries and low morale among healthcare professionals
404 because of a lack of protective equipment and compensation for additional work
405 burdens. Demand and supply were both heavily impacted by political leadership.
406 When effective this promoted resource mobilization, cultivated public trust, and
407 encouraged participation in health interventions. In contrast, when government
408 officials made COVID-19 a political issue, this bred mistrust and discouraged
409 engagement. Willingness to test was influenced by perceptions of the professionalism
410 of providers. Misinformation spread through social media related to vaccinations,
411 politics, and testing outcomes, coupled with a lack of awareness about COVID-19 in
412 general and the belief that this was a disease from elsewhere, were factors that tended
413 to negatively influence views toward control measures.

414

415 Public testing choices were also affected by the nature of the test, the health dangers it
416 posed, as well as its economic and psychosocial ramifications. For instance, people
417 favoured self-testing over facility-based testing because the former required less travel
418 time, offered testing liberty, ensured privacy, and lessened social stigma. The latter
419 was unaffordable due to the great distance, expensive cost, and risk of disease
420 transmission from traffic. Healthcare workers also preferred the self-testing modality
421 because it helped to relieve health system burdens. However, COVID-19 self-testing
422 was not key in most of the studies as only two examined perspectives on its
423 acceptability.

424

425 Our findings are consistent with previous research, particularly relating to the factors
426 that promote or impede the implementation and uptake of point-of-care diagnostic
427 interventions for pandemics in SSA, including for HIV and Ebola. For instance,

428 several studies have demonstrated limited public engagement with facility-based HIV
429 testing because people felt the model involved long travels and was inconvenient,
430 lacked privacy, caused stigma and discrimination, and limited their autonomy [28,29].
431 Relating to supply chain issues, a systematic study on HIV diagnostics in low-and
432 middle-income settings including SSA identified the lack of laboratory equipment as
433 one of the key factors undermining HIV testing programmes [30]. Similarly, shortages
434 of medical equipment and resources hampered public health efforts during the 2014
435 Ebola outbreak in West Africa to identify those who were infected with the virus
436 [31,32]. Agreeing with our results, a review of HIV testing enablers and barriers in
437 Africa showed that self-care options such as HIV self-testing granted users the
438 freedom and convenience of testing at the place and time of choice, reduced the
439 stigma and discrimination associated with facility-based testing, and boosted HIV
440 testing uptake [30].

441
442 The laboratory and diagnostic challenges highlighted by this research have significant
443 effects on country-level ability to control infectious disease outbreaks.
444 Epidemiological surveillance is also challenged when affected individuals go
445 undetected, raising the risk of transmission, and making it more difficult to implement
446 interventions in response to epidemics [33]. Governments may become more self-
447 sufficient and better equipped for upcoming pandemics if domestic resource revenue
448 is maximized under strong political leadership [31].

449

450 **Strengths and limitations**

451 The study was enhanced by the systematic searching of several databases to find all
452 relevant studies that satisfied the predefined inclusion criteria. Understanding of the
453 variables influencing COVID-19 testing uptake was enriched through the inclusion of
454 papers employing a variety of methodological techniques, including mixed-methods
455 studies. Regarding limitations, restricting the inclusion of studies only to those
456 published in English due to language barriers entailed a possibility of missing other
457 relevant studies. The reviewed papers were written at specific time points, raising the
458 possibility of the findings not reflecting the rapid changes in pandemic responses and
459 how people reacted to them overtime. Primary studies addressing the research
460 question were also scarce at the time of the review, and the few that we analysed
461 examined COVID-19 testing largely from the viewpoints of decision-makers as
462 opposed to actual testers. This remains a knowledge gap regarding the actual testing
463 experiences, which would have deepened the analysis of the demand-side facilitators
464 and barriers. To better understand uptake drivers and match testing outcomes with
465 social contextual needs, future pandemic diagnostic testing research should prioritize
466 end users.

467

468

469 **Conclusion**

470 The COVID-19 pandemic response in SSA was dynamic and testing provision and
471 uptake changed over time. Initially, many SSA countries lacked the resources to
472 identify all COVID-19 cases [32] and it may be likely that cases were consequently
473 underreported [33]. Healthcare systems had received little funding and lacked the
474 equipment and personnel needed to efficiently prepare for and conduct testing. This

475 emphasizes the necessity of a strong political commitment to enhancing health
476 systems for pandemic preparedness in the future. Future pandemic response plans
477 should consider contextual elements that affect how people react to interventions and
478 perceive health emergencies. Self-testing solutions that are distributed by the
479 community could remove socioeconomic constraints frequently associated with
480 facility-delivered testing and increase access to pandemic diagnostic services. To
481 ensure proper lay use of these self-care devices and linkage to care, user-friendly
482 instructions and community-based psychosocial support networks are crucial factors.
483

484 **Ethics**

485 This investigation did not seek specific ethics approval because it analysed secondary
486 data without involving primary data collection with human subjects. However, all the
487 country-specific projects that it was part of received individual ethical approvals from
488 in-country, the London School of Tropical Hygiene and Medicine, the Liverpool
489 School of Tropical Medicine, and the WHO (S1).
490

491 **Acknowledgments**

492 The authors would like to thank the entire 3ACP research group for supporting this
493 work.
494

495 **Funding**

496 Funding for this study was received under the STAR COVID-19 grant by UNITAID
497 through Population Services International (grant ref/code: 2017-16-PSI-STAR).
498

499 **Competing interests**

500 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

501 **References**

- 502 1. Lenharo M. WHO declares end to COVID-19's emergency phase. *Nature*.
503 2023;882.
- 504 2. WHO. COVID-19 Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC)
505 Global research and innovation forum [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Jun 14]. Available
506 from: [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
507 [international-concern-\(pheic\)-global-research-and-innovation-forum](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/covid-19-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern-(pheic)-global-research-and-innovation-forum)
- 508 3. AACC. A Peek Inside the SARS-CoV-2 Diagnostic Pipeline | AACC.org [Internet].
509 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 15]. Available from: [https://www.aacc.org/cln/cln-](https://www.aacc.org/cln/cln-stat/2020/november/5/a-peek-inside-the-sars-cov-2-diagnostic-pipeline)
510 [stat/2020/november/5/a-peek-inside-the-sars-cov-2-diagnostic-pipeline](https://www.aacc.org/cln/cln-stat/2020/november/5/a-peek-inside-the-sars-cov-2-diagnostic-pipeline)
- 511 4. Rong G, Zheng Y, Chen Y, Zhang Y, Zhu P, Sawan M. COVID-19 diagnostic
512 methods and detection techniques. *Encyclopedia of sensors and biosensors*. 2023;17.
- 513 5. Harvie A. Barriers to mass testing for COVID-19 in Africa [Internet]. Atlantic
514 Council. 2020 [cited 2023 Aug 12]. Available from:
515 [https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/africasource/barriers-to-mass-testing-for-covid-](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/africasource/barriers-to-mass-testing-for-covid-19-in-africa/)
516 [19-in-africa/](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/africasource/barriers-to-mass-testing-for-covid-19-in-africa/)
- 517 6. Mulu A, Bekele A, Abdissa A, Balcha TT, Habtamu M, Mihret A, et al. The
518 challenges of COVID-19 testing in Africa: the Ethiopian experience. *The Pan African*
519 *Medical Journal*. 2021;38.
- 520 7. Yangchen S, Ha S, Assan A, Tobgay T. Factors influencing COVID-19 testing: a
521 qualitative study in Bhutan. *Global Health Research and Policy*. 2022;7:10.
- 522 8. Africa CDC. Africa CDC, FIND partner to build capacity for COVID-19 rapid
523 diagnostic tests in Africa [Internet]. 2022 Nov. Available from:
524 [https://africacdc.org/news-item/africa-cdc-find-partner-to-build-capacity-for-covid-](https://africacdc.org/news-item/africa-cdc-find-partner-to-build-capacity-for-covid-19-rapid-diagnostic-tests-in-africa/)
525 [19-rapid-diagnostic-tests-in-africa/](https://africacdc.org/news-item/africa-cdc-find-partner-to-build-capacity-for-covid-19-rapid-diagnostic-tests-in-africa/)
- 526 9. Ha S, Yangchen S, Assan A. COVID-19 Testing: A Qualitative Study Exploring
527 Enablers and Barriers in the Greater Accra Region, Ghana. *Frontiers in Public Health*
528 [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 19];10. Available from:
529 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2022.908410>
- 530 10. Nwagbara UI, Osual EC, Chireshe R, Bolarinwa OA, Saeed BQ, Khuzwayo N, et
531 al. Knowledge, attitude, perception, and preventative practices towards COVID-19 in
532 sub-Saharan Africa: A scoping review. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16:e0249853.
- 533 11. Jacobs J, Kühne V, Lunguya O, Affolabi D, Hardy L, Vandenberg O.
534 Implementing COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) Rapid Diagnostic Tests in Sub-Saharan
535 Africa: A Review. *Frontiers in Medicine* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Dec 8];7.
536 Available from: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2020.557797>

- 537 12. Arksey H. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International*
538 *journal of social research methodology*. 2005;8:19–32.
- 539 13. Moher D. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses:
540 The PRISMA Statement. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151:264.
- 541 14. Hawker S, Payne S, Kerr C, Hardey M, Powell J. Appraising the Evidence:
542 Reviewing Disparate Data Systematically. *Qual Health Res*. 2002;12:1284–99.
- 543 15. Chabeda S, Shilton S, Manguro G, Omenda S, Owira P, Martínez-Pérez, et al.
544 Decision-takers’ Attitudes Towards SARS-CoV-2 Self-Testing in Kenya: A
545 Qualitative Inquiry. 2022;
- 546 16. Schmidt T, Cloete A, Davids A, Makola L, Zondi N, Jantjies M. Myths,
547 misconceptions, othering and stigmatizing responses to Covid-19 in South Africa: A
548 rapid qualitative assessment. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15:e0244420.
- 549 17. Brumwell AN, Babatunde GB, Shilton S, Tso J, Wilson MW, Xulu N, et al. Self-
550 testing for COVID-19 in Durban and Eastern Cape, South Africa: a qualitative inquiry
551 targeting decision-takers. *Contemporary Social Science*. 2022;17:450–67.
- 552 18. Nxumalo CT. A qualitative study to explore primary health care practitioners’
553 perceptions and understanding regarding the COVID-19 pandemic in KwaZulu-Natal,
554 South Africa. *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine*. 2021;13.
- 555 19. Rispel LC, Marshall C, Matiwane B, Tenza IS. Innovations, contestations and
556 fragilities of the health system response to COVID-19 in the Gauteng Province of
557 South Africa. *Plos one*. 2021;16:e0261339.
- 558 20. Asare IT, Douglas M, Kye-Duodu G, Manu E. Challenges and opportunities for
559 improved contact tracing in Ghana: experiences from Coronavirus disease-2019-
560 related contact tracing in the Bono region. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2023;23:335.
- 561 21. Asiiimwe N, Tabong PT-N, Iro SA, Noora CL, Opoku-Mensah K, Asampong E.
562 Stakeholders perspective of, and experience with contact tracing for COVID-19 in
563 Ghana: A qualitative study among contact tracers, supervisors, and contacts. *PLOS*
564 *ONE*. 2021;16:e0247038.
- 565 22. Oleribe OO, Idigbe IE, Osita-Oleribe P, Olawepo O, Musa ZA, Aikhuomogbe S,
566 et al. Perceptions and opinions of Nigerians to the management and response to
567 COVID-19 in Nigeria. *Pan African Medical Journal*. 2021;40.
- 568 23. Mohammed AA. Preparedness and response to covid-19 in Woreta Town, North
569 West Ethiopia. *Scientific African*. 2021;14:e01037.
- 570 24. Lewis S. Diagnostic radiographers’ experience of COVID-19, gauteng south
571 africa. *Radiography*. 2021;27:346–51.

- 572 25. Carlitz R, Yamanis T, Mollel H. Coping with denialism: how street-level
573 bureaucrats adapted and responded to COVID-19 in Tanzania. *Journal of Health*
574 *Politics, Policy and Law*. 2021;46:989–1017.
- 575 26. Yamanis T, Carlitz R, Gonyea O, Skaff S, Kisanga N, Mollel H. Confronting
576 ‘chaos’: a qualitative study assessing public health officials’ perceptions of the factors
577 affecting Tanzania’s COVID-19 vaccine rollout. *BMJ open*. 2023;13:e065081.
- 578 27. Amoo OS, Ohihoin AG, Musa AZ, Idighe I, Ige F, Giwa-Tubosun T, et al.
579 Implementation of a modified drive-through sampling strategy for SARS-CoV-2-the
580 Nigerian experience. *The Pan African Medical Journal*. 2020;35.
- 581 28. Bogart LM, Kgotlaetsile K, Phaladze N, Mosepele M. HIV self-testing may
582 overcome stigma and other barriers to HIV testing among higher-socioeconomic
583 status men in Botswana: A qualitative study. *African Journal of AIDS Research*.
584 2021;20:297–306.
- 585 29. Musheke M, Ntalasha H, Gari S, Mckenzie O, Bond V, Martin-Hilber A, et al. A
586 systematic review of qualitative findings on factors enabling and deterring uptake of
587 HIV testing in Sub-Saharan Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13:220.
- 588 30. Njau B, Covin C, Lisasi E, Damian D, Mushi D, Boule A, et al. A systematic
589 review of qualitative evidence on factors enabling and deterring uptake of HIV self-
590 testing in Africa. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19:1289.
- 591 31. Yamashiro T. Recovering from COVID-19: How to enhance domestic revenue
592 mobilisation in small island developing states. OECD [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Mar
593 5]; Available from: [https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/recovering-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/recovering-from-covid-19-how-to-enhance-domestic-revenue-mobilisation-in-small-island-developing-states-45f29680/)
594 [from-covid-19-how-to-enhance-domestic-revenue-mobilisation-in-small-island-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/recovering-from-covid-19-how-to-enhance-domestic-revenue-mobilisation-in-small-island-developing-states-45f29680/)
595 [developing-states-45f29680/](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/recovering-from-covid-19-how-to-enhance-domestic-revenue-mobilisation-in-small-island-developing-states-45f29680/)
- 596 32. Kavanagh MM, Erundu NA, Tomori O, Dzau VJ, Okiro EA, Maleche A, et al.
597 Access to lifesaving medical resources for African countries: COVID-19 testing and
598 response, ethics, and politics. *The Lancet*. 2020;395:1735–8.
- 599 33. Jambo K, Swarhout T, M’baya B, Heyderman R, Jere K, French N, et al.
600 Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in Malawi blood donors. 2020 [cited 2024
601 Mar 5]; Available from: <http://rscarchive.kuhes.ac.mw/handle/20.500.12988/320>

602

603 **Supporting Information**

604 **S1.** Ethical approval numbers for in country 3ACP studies, informed through this
605 scoping review.

606 **S2.** Completed study quality and relevance form.

607 **S3:** Completed data charting form

Identification

All studies retrieved from
searching databases
(n=2994)

Studies excluded (n=2870):
duplicates (n=20); not
addressing topic of interest
(n=2850)

Screening

Studies after title screening and
duplicate removal
(n=124)

Studies screened for abstract
evaluation
(n=124)

Studies excluded (n=104)

Eligibility

Articles included for full-text
screening (n=20)

Studies excluded with reasons (n=6)

- 1 conducted outside SSA
- 1 focused on COVID-19 vaccine
- 2 did not involve qualitative methods
- 2 not primary studies

Inclusion

Articles included for full-text
screening (n=14)




Figure 2: Graphical display of COVID-19 testing enablers and hinderers in sub-Saharan Africa

Figure