

1                   **Correlates of Self-Sampling Willingness for HPV-DNA Testing among Medically**  
2                   **Underserved Rural Kenyan Women: A Mixed Methods Study**

3  
4 Joyline Chepkorir,<sup>1,2</sup> Nancy Perrin,<sup>1</sup> Lucy Kivuti-Bitok,<sup>3</sup> Joseph J Gallo,<sup>4</sup> Deborah Gross,<sup>2</sup> Jean  
5 Anderson,<sup>5</sup> Nancy R Reynolds,<sup>2</sup> Susan Wyche,<sup>6</sup> Hillary Kibet,<sup>7</sup> Vincent Kipkuri,<sup>8</sup> Anastacia  
6 Cherotich,<sup>8</sup> Hae-Ra Han.<sup>2,9</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Clinical and Translational Research, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,  
9 Maryland, 21202, USA

10 <sup>2</sup> School of Nursing, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 21205, USA

11 <sup>3</sup> Department of Nursing Sciences, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, 00100, Kenya

12 <sup>4</sup> Department of Mental Health, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health,  
13 Baltimore, Maryland, 21205, USA

14 <sup>5</sup> Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine,  
15 Baltimore, Maryland, 21287, USA

16 <sup>6</sup> Department of Media and Information, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan,  
17 48824, USA

18 <sup>7</sup> Department of Public Health, Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology,  
19 Kakamega, 50100, Kenya

20 <sup>8</sup> Department of Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, GoldStar Kenya, Nairobi,  
21 00208, Kenya

22 <sup>9</sup> Department of Health, Behavior, and Society, Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of  
23 Public Health, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA

24  
25 **Corresponding author:** Joyline Chepkorir; [jchepko1@jh.edu](mailto:jchepko1@jh.edu); +14434475277

48 **Correlates of Self-Sampling Willingness for HPV-DNA Testing among Medically**  
49 **Underserved Rural Kenyan Women: Mixed Methods Study**

50 **Abstract**

51 **Introduction:** Cervical cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related deaths among Sub-Saharan  
52 African women, particularly in rural areas where screening rates are lower due to limited access  
53 to highly sensitive tests. This study aimed to investigate factors that might influence rural  
54 Kenyan women's willingness to self-collect samples for HPV-DNA testing.

55 **Methods:** This study utilized data from a mixed-methods study in Bomet and Kericho Counties,  
56 including survey responses from 174 women and semi-structured interviews with a subset of 21  
57 participants. Logistic regression was used to analyze quantitative data and theoretical thematic  
58 analysis for qualitative data.

59 **Results:** The surveyed women had a mean age of 45.2 years, were mainly uninsured (76%) and  
60 from low-income households (88.4%). Most participants had heard of cervical cancer (83.2%),  
61 yet only 6.4% had ever been screened. However, 76.9% expressed willingness to self-collect  
62 samples for HPV-DNA testing. Factors significantly associated with increased self-sampling  
63 willingness were cervical cancer awareness (OR=3.49, 95% CI=1.50-8.11), having health  
64 workers (OR=1.88, CI=1.23-2.86) and the news media (radio and television) (OR=2.63,  
65 CI=1.27-5.48) as primary sources of health information, and ever hearing about cervical cancer  
66 from the news media (OR=2.43, CI=1.07-5.51). Conversely, high cervical cancer stigma  
67 (OR=0.71, CI=0.57-0.88) and longer travel time of 30 to 120 minutes to the nearest health  
68 facility (OR=0.44, CI=0.20-0.93) were associated with decreased willingness. Interview data  
69 corroborated these findings.

70 **Conclusions:** Cervical cancer screening uptake is notably low among rural Kenyan women in  
71 Bomet and Kericho Counties. Sample self-collection for HPV-DNA testing appears widely

72 acceptable. A comprehensive approach involving educational outreach, health worker  
73 recommendation, and mass media campaigns could enhance cervical cancer screening via self-  
74 sampling, potentially reducing the burden of cervical cancer. Future research should employ  
75 implementation science methodologies to explore cervical cancer screening uptake via self-  
76 sampling, to inform population-based implementation strategies in Kenya.

## 77 Introduction

78  
79 Cervical cancer (CC) is the most common cancer among women in Sub-Saharan Africa,  
80 particularly among women aged 21 to 48 years.<sup>1,2</sup> In Kenya, CC is the leading cause of cancer-  
81 related deaths, with about 5,236 new cases diagnosed annually.<sup>3</sup> Over 90% of women are  
82 diagnosed at advanced stages despite prior contact with the healthcare system.<sup>4</sup> About 63% of  
83 invasive CC cases in the country are caused by high-risk human-papillomavirus (HPV) types 16  
84 and 18, which can be prevented through HPV vaccination.<sup>3</sup> A two-dose HPV vaccination  
85 program was introduced in 2019, targeting adolescent girls and young women in schools and  
86 health facilities.<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, the HPV vaccine coverage remains low as only 31% of the  
87 targeted group had received the two doses of HPV vaccine by 2021.<sup>5</sup>

88  
89 CC screening is a promising strategy to detect CC among an estimated 13 million Kenyan  
90 women aged 15 years and older, who are at risk for the disease.<sup>6</sup> Kenya's National Cervical  
91 Cancer Screening Guidelines have been implemented for over a decade and currently  
92 recommend screening of all eligible women aged 30 to 49 years old.<sup>7</sup> As part of the 2030 global  
93 cancer elimination strategy, the World Health Organization (WHO) recommends a target  
94 screening of 70% of eligible women and treatment of 90% of those diagnosed with CC in each  
95 country.<sup>8</sup> However, the screening uptake rate is approximately 16 to 18% in screening-eligible

96 Kenyan women aged 18 to 69 years and the rates are notably lower in rural areas.<sup>4</sup> The WHO  
97 and Kenyan cancer screening guidelines recommend HPV-DNA testing as the primary screening  
98 method since it has a high sensitivity to detect high-risk HPV sub-types.<sup>9,10</sup>

99

100 In Kenya, over 90% of health facilities use visual inspection methods and a few of them use Pap  
101 smear and HPV testing, which are often constrained by sociocultural beliefs, limited availability  
102 of skilled workforce, and essential infrastructure.<sup>11</sup> Self-sampling approach for HPV-DNA  
103 testing offers an opportunity to circumvent these barriers by paving the way for community-  
104 based screening, increased reach and empowerment of women to collect specimen in private  
105 spaces at their convenient place and time; without fear of pain associated with pelvic  
106 examinations used in other procedures.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, the success of self-sampling depends on  
107 the target women's acceptability.<sup>12</sup> Although studies in Sub-Saharan Africa have affirmed a high  
108 acceptability of self-sampling in diverse settings, few studies have investigated the acceptability  
109 of this procedure in rural community settings.

110

111 Empirical studies on the use of self-sampling in rural communities in Kenya are rare. In a  
112 qualitative study conducted among rural Kenyan women (N=120), women reported generally  
113 positive experiences with HPV self-sampling. In an urban sample (N=409), more than 80% of  
114 women reported that they would be comfortable using a self-sampling device and 84% would  
115 prefer at-home sample collection.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, another study among rural Kenyan women (N=97)  
116 found that 90% of them were willing to collect their samples in private places.<sup>6</sup> As HPV testing  
117 and self-collection kits gradually become available in Kenya's health care system, it is critical to

118 understand factors that may impact women’s willingness to self-collect samples for HPV-DNA  
119 testing.<sup>9</sup>

120

## 121 **Purpose**

122

123 This study’s purpose was to identify potential barriers and facilitators to self-sampling, to  
124 inform the design and implementation of interventions aimed at promoting women’s adoption of  
125 self- sample for HPV-DNA testing. To the best of our knowledge, factors associated with HPV-  
126 DNA self-sampling willingness have not been investigated in rural, community-based contexts in  
127 Kenya and other parts of SSA.

128

## 129 **Methods**

130

### 131 **Theoretical Framework**

132

133 This study was guided by the socio-ecological framework, which proposes that an individual’s  
134 behavior affects and is affected by the social environment.<sup>13</sup> It emphasizes the need for health  
135 interventions to target changes at the individual/intrapersonal, interpersonal,  
136 organizational/institutional, community, and policy levels to support and maintain healthy  
137 behavior.<sup>13</sup> We presupposed that at the individual level, an individual’s willingness to screen  
138 might be influenced by their capacity to make health care decisions, and access to resources (i.e.  
139 health insurance), their knowledge and awareness of cervical cancer (i.e. need for screening),  
140 health literacy.<sup>14</sup> At the interpersonal level, we theorized that an individual’s self-sampling  
141 willingness could be influenced by interactions with their peers and household dynamics (i.e.  
142 spouse’s involvement in a woman’s healthcare decision-making).<sup>15</sup> At the organization level, we

143 presumed that health workers and the health facility level could potentially impact a woman's  
144 willingness to self-collect samples for HPV testing.<sup>16</sup> At the community level, we hypothesized  
145 that factors such as beliefs and CC stigma might influence self-sampling willingness.<sup>17</sup> Lastly,  
146 certain health system and policy-level factors such as the geographical location of health  
147 facilities have the potential influence successful self-sampling.<sup>15,16</sup>

148  
149

### 150 **Study design and setting**

151  
152 This study was a secondary analysis of data from a parent convergent mixed-method study,  
153 which explored the interplay of health information, health literacy, and cervical cancer screening  
154 uptake. The study used interviewer-administered surveys and semi-structured interviews, to  
155 collect data between August and September 2023 in rural Bomet and Kericho Counties, Kenya.  
156 Kenya is subdivided into 47 Counties. Bomet and Kericho Counties, located in Kenya's South  
157 Rift of the Great Rift Valley, consist of pre-dominantly rural populations, 96.8% and 89.6%,  
158 respectively.<sup>18</sup> These Counties are adjacent and consist primarily of Kipsigis communities that  
159 have comparable cultural and economic practices.

160

### 161 **Study Sample**

162  
163 Women were recruited from community settings. Convenience sampling was used to select  
164 voluntary participants for the quantitative arm, who were available and met the inclusion criteria.  
165 Eligibility criteria were 1) residing in rural Kericho or Bomet County, 2) female aged 18 to 65  
166 years (age range for CC screening based on Kenya's guidelines), 3) proficient in Kipsigis  
167 language, 4), had educational attainment of grade 8 or lower. Participants were excluded if they  
168 were either 1) acutely/terminally ill, or 2) were cognitively impaired, limiting participation in

169 study activities. A total of 174 eligible women participated in the survey study. Purposive  
170 maximum variation sampling was used to select a sub-sample of participants (n=21) with varied  
171 characteristics for semi-structured interviews.<sup>19</sup> Specifically, CC screening status (ever versus  
172 never screened) 45 years), and anticipated CC stigma (none versus at least one) were used as the  
173 basis for selection for qualitative interviews.

174

## 175 **Procedures**

176

177 The survey, interview guide, and consent form were originally developed in English, translated  
178 to Kipsigis, and then back translated by experts to ascertain the accuracy of the translation.<sup>20</sup>

179 Two bilingual registered nurses from each County and one medical doctor specializing in

180 obstetrics and gynecology reviewed the survey and interview guide for face validity and

181 contextual relevance. Based on their feedback, we removed some questions that were not

182 contextually relevant and added questions assessing risk factors for CC. The survey was pre-

183 tested among the first 24 women while the interview guide was pilot tested among 10 women.

184 Amendments to the survey and interview guide were minor and mainly involved the re-phrasing

185 of questions for contextual aptness.

186

187 Five trained research staff residing in the two Counties recruited study participants, using study

188 flyers and word of mouth, from participants' homes, local health centers, shopping centers, and

189 churches. The interviewer-administered survey and interviews were offered in convenient private

190 spaces of the participants' choosing (e.g. inside or outside their house). The survey was

191 administered on RedCap software offline mode due to limited access to the Internet and

192 immediately transferred to the web after data collection. All interviews were audio-recorded to

193 facilitate verbatim transcription and analysis. To maintain participants' confidentiality, all audio  
194 recordings were exported to a secure platform before deleting from the original devices. Each  
195 survey and interview took approximately 30 to 45 minutes. Participants were incentivized with  
196 Ksh.330 (approximately \$2.37) for responding to the survey and additional Ksh.330 for those  
197 who were selected for interviews. Upon completion of data collection, transcripts and survey  
198 data were checked for accuracy and completeness and cleaned as needed.

199

## 200 **Ethics**

201

202 Study procedures were approved by (**blinded for review**) Institutional Review Board (**# blinded**  
203 **for review**). Additionally, in line with the local requirements for conducting human subjects  
204 research, study procedures were reviewed (**blinded for review**) and licensed (**license No.**  
205 **Blinded for review**) by the Kenya National Commission for Science, Technology and  
206 Innovation. The research staff obtained verbal consent in Kipsigis language from each participant  
207 before the study activities. The consent document detailed information about the study's purpose,  
208 risks, and benefits of participating. Each participant could ask questions about the study  
209 procedures before consenting.

210

## 211 **Measures**

212

### 213 **Independent variables**

214 Factors at the individual level assessed were demographics including age (in years), marital status  
215 (single, married, separated, divorced), education (no formal education, between grade 1 and 3,  
216 between grade 4 and 8), employment (self-employed, unemployed, employed in private sector),  
217 health literacy level, perceived health status (poor, fair, good, very good), and CC awareness



218 (ever/never heard about CC). Additionally, resources considered were household monthly income  
219 \$(less or equal to 35, 36-70, 71-106, 107-142, 143-178, 179-214, 215-251, 252-322), income  
220 comfortability (comfortable, or not comfortable), and health insurance status (insured or  
221 uninsured), primary sources of health information (news media, social network and community  
222 leaders, health workers, teachers and herbalists), and estimated travel time to the nearest health  
223 facility (in minutes). Each of these variables were included in the study questionnaire as  
224 individual items except for health literacy which used a validated instrument.

225

226 The Health Literacy Test for Limited Literacy (HELT-LL) was used to assess participants'  
227 health literacy skills.<sup>21</sup> The tool, consisting of 12 items, was developed, and tested in a sample of  
228 South African women (with high school levels or lower education), who were recruited from  
229 primary health clinics in two semi-rural towns.<sup>21</sup> The internal consistency reliability of the  
230 HELT-LL, measured using Cronbach's alpha, was 0.6.<sup>21</sup> In our study sample, the internal  
231 consistency reliability assessed using Cronbach's alpha was 0.49. To improve the reliability of  
232 the scale, we removed 4 items with item-total correlations less than 0.49. Items removed were  
233 questions assessing three dimensions 1) numeracy skills (prescription medication schedule and  
234 blood pressure reading), 2) communicative/interactive skills (one's frequency of asking  
235 questions from a nurse/doctor/pharmacist), and 3) electronic health literacy skills (one's capacity  
236 to use of cellphone or computer to answer health-related questions). The items left on the final  
237 instrument used for this sample assessed numeracy-, print-, critical-, and oral/communicative  
238 health literacy skills. The reliability of these items was 0.57, which is within the satisfactory  
239 range.<sup>22</sup> Items were scored on a scale of 0 to 1; with possible total scores ranging from 0 to 8.  
240 Participants in this study with scores less than the mean (4.2) were deemed to have inadequate

241 health literacy and those with scores greater or equal to the mean were regarded as having  
242 inadequate health literacy levels.  
243  
244 Factors considered at the interpersonal level in this study were: healthcare-decision making (self,  
245 self and spouse, spouse only, or mother]), interpersonal sources of CC information (social  
246 networks, community leaders, health workers, teachers), and interpersonal sources of general  
247 health information (health workers and social networks). Participants could select more than one  
248 response. At the organizational level, factors examined were the reliance on health care workers  
249 as primary sources of health information (doctors, nurses and community health workers),  
250 receiving CC-related information health care workers (whether they had ever heard about  
251 cervical cancer from health workers) and prior CC screening (ever screened, or never screened).  
252 Factors assessed at the community level were the reliance on the news media (TV and radio) as  
253 primary sources of health information, having heard about CC information from the news media  
254 and anticipated CC stigma. The 8-item CC stigma scale was used to determine anticipated CC  
255 stigma.<sup>17</sup> Lastly, at the health system and health policy levels the ranking of the nearest health  
256 facility (level 1 to 4) and travel time to the nearest health facility (in minutes) were evaluated.  
257

### 258 **Dependent variable: Self-sampling willingness**

259  
260 Willingness to self-collect samples for HPV-DNA testing was assessed using a two-part  
261 question. The first part of the question explained what the self-sampling procedure is, “HPV self-  
262 sampling allows women to collect their own samples for cervical cancer screening using a swab  
263 or a brush”. The second part assessed willingness to accept self-collection. “Would you be

264 willing to self-collect a sample for testing if this screening is suitable for you?”. Responses were  
265 binary (yes/no).

266  
267

## 268 **Data analysis**

269

270 The analytical sample consisted of participants (n=24) who were involved in the pre-testing of  
271 the survey and 150 women who completed the study survey. Analysis of quantitative data used  
272 descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, medians, range, frequencies, and percent) to  
273 summarize the sample characteristics. Also, we used binary logistic regression to assess the  
274 correlates of self-sampling willingness. We excluded one survey participant with a missing  
275 response on self-sampling willingness; hence the logistic regression output is based on 173  
276 respondents. Quantitative data analysis was conducted in STATA/BE version 17 software.  
277 Qualitative data were analyzed using Dedoose software, in Kipsigis language, by four bilingual  
278 coders. We used theoretical thematic analysis to identify codes and generate themes relating to  
279 study objective.<sup>23</sup> Additionally, we employed inductive analysis by allowing the research  
280 objective to evolve through the coding process.<sup>23</sup> Specifically, each transcript was coded by two  
281 coders independently and all coders met regularly to resolve any discrepancies and discuss  
282 emerging codes. Coded files were exported in Word format. Themes, sub-themes, and  
283 accompanying quotes were organized in an Excel spreadsheet before being translated to English  
284 by two of the coders. Thereafter, results from each study arm were merged and juxtaposed using  
285 a joint display.<sup>24</sup>

## 286 **Results**

287

288 Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the survey sample. The mean age of the survey sample  
289 was 45.2 (SD=13.2) years. The majority were from Bomet County (64.4%). More than half  
290 (81.5%) of the sample had attained formal education between grades four and eight and the  
291 majority were married (83.8%). About 78% of the women were self-employed. Most participants  
292 (88.4%) earned \$35 or less per month in their households. The sample was predominantly  
293 uninsured (76%), and the majority (63%) rated their health status as either good or very good.

294

295 **Table 1: Sample characteristics (n=174)**

Characteristic	n (%) / mean (sd) / median (range)
Age (Mean (SD))	45.3 (13.2)
Marital status	
Married	145 (83.3%)
Unmarried	29 (16.7%)
County of residence	
Bomet	112 (64.4%)
Kericho	62 (35.6%)
Education	
No formal education	32 (18.4%)
Grade 1-3	52 (29.9%)
Grade 4-8	90 (51.7%)
Employment status	
Self employed	134 (77%)
Unemployed	34 (19.5%)
Employed in private/public sector	5 (2.9%)
Missing	1 (0.6%)
Household monthly income	
≤ (35 USD)	154 (88.5%)
36 -142 USD	20 (11.5%)
Insurance status	
Insured	41 (23.6%)
Uninsured	131 (75.3%)
Missing	2 (1.1%)
Health status	

Poor/Fair	65 (37.4%)
Good /Very good	109 (62.6%)
Health literacy	
Adequate	64 (36.8%)
Inadequate	110 (63.2%)
Nearest Health Facility	
Level 2 (dispensary/clinic)	132 (75.9%)
Level 3 (health center)	23 (13.2%)
Level 4 and 5 (county hospital/referral)	19 (10.9%)
Transportation to nearest health facility	
Walk	136 (78.2%)
Motorcycle	35 (20.1%)
Public vehicle	2 (1.2%)
Missing	1 (0.6%)
Travel time to nearest health facility	
<30 mins (reference)	76 (45%)
30-120 mins	93 (55%)
Missing	4 (2.3%)
Health care decision-making	
Self	139 (79.9%)
Self and Spouse	12 (6.9%)
Mother or spouse	7 (4%)
Missing	16 (9.2)
Primary sources of health information*	
News media (tv and radio)	120 (69%)
Social networks and community	64 (36.8%)
Health workers	121 (69.5%)
Other (herbalist, teachers)	2 (1.1%)
Sources of CC information*	
News media (tv & radio)	64 (37%)
Social networks	36 (20.8%)
Healthcare workers	42 (24.3%)
Other (teachers, religious leaders)	3 (1.7%)
CC awareness	
Ever heard of CC	144 (82.8%)
Never heard of CC	29 (16.7%)
Missing	1 (0.6%)
CC screening status	
Never screened	163 (93.7)
Ever screened	11 (6.3%)

Anticipated CC stigma

Yes	101 (58.1%)
No	73 (42%)

Willingness to self-sample for HR-HPV DNA testing

Yes	133 (76.4%)
No	40 (23%)
Missing	1 (0.6%)

---

296 Key: sd – standard deviation \* Select all that apply responses

297

298 Most participants had inadequate health literacy levels (63%). The nearest health facilities  
299 accessed and used by most participants (75.7%) were level 2 (dispensary/clinic) and most of  
300 them walked (78.5%). Travel time to the nearest health facilities was between half an hour to two  
301 hours for many (45%) of them. Approximately 80% of participants made their own healthcare  
302 decisions.

303

304 Regarding health information access, about 69.4% and 70% of participants reported that they  
305 primarily accessed health information from health workers and the news media, respectively.

306 Most participants (83.2%) had heard about CC from the news media (37%), their social networks  
307 (20.8%), health workers (24.3%), and/or other sources (1.7%). Only 6.4% of the sample had ever  
308 been screened for the disease.

309

310 The CC stigma scale showed that half of the participants endorsed between one and eight  
311 potential drivers of stigma. Only 1.7% of participants perceived they were at risk for cervical  
312 cancer. Most participants, 76.9%, reported that they would be willing to self-collect samples for  
313 HPV-DNA testing if offered. Among women (n=40) who were unwilling to self-collect samples,  
314 the majority (72.5%) indicated that they lacked the confidence to collect samples, while others

315 reported that they were not interested (4%), and afraid of either the procedure (3.5%) or the  
316 results (0.6%). Sample characteristics for the sub-sample of participants interviewed are  
317 summarized in Appendix A.

318

### 319 **Factors associated with self-sampling willingness**

320 Bivariate logistic regression outputs of sample characteristics on self-sampling willingness are  
321 summarized in Table 2.

322

323 Table 2: Bivariate analysis of sociodemographic characteristics on self-sampling willingness  
324 (n=173)

Characteristic	OR	P-Value	CI
Age (Mean (SD))	0.98	0.14	0.95-1.01
Marital status	0.68	0.47	0.24-1.93
Education	1.06	0.78	0.68-1.68
Employment Status	1.04	0.91	0.49-2.24
Income	0.94	0.67	0.71-1.24
Comfortability with income	0.57	0.33	0.18-1.78
Insurance status	1.35	0.50	0.56-3.21
Health status	1.71	0.06	0.98-3.00
Healthcare decisions	1.07	0.84	0.51-2.27
Cervical cancer awareness	3.49	0.004**	1.50-8.11
Health literacy	0.99	0.99	0.80-1.24
Prior cervical cancer screening	1.38	0.69	0.29-6.66
Cervical cancer stigma	0.71	0.001**	0.57-0.88
Nearest health facility	0.96	0.86	0.58-0.59
Distance to nearest health facility			
<30 mins (ref)			
30-120 mins	0.44	0.032*	0.20-0.93
Transportation to nearest health facility	0.64	0.24	0.31-1.34

Sources of cervical cancer Information			
News media (tv & radio)	2.43	0.03*	1.07-5.51
Social networks	0.61	0.24	0.27-1.38
Healthcare workers	1.48	0.41	0.59-3.7
Primary sources of health information			
News media (tv & radio)	2.63	0.01**	1.27-5.48
Social networks and community	1.06	0.77	0.72-1.55
Health workers	1.88	0.003**	1.23-2.86

OR - odds ratio, CI – confidence interval, SD – standard deviation, ref - reference  
\*- p-value<0.05, \*\* - p value ≤0.01

325  
326  
327 Results indicated that those who had heard about CC were 3.49 times more willing to self-collect  
328 samples than those who had not (odds ratio [OR]=3.49, 95% confidence interval [CI]=1.50-  
329 8.11). Respondents whose sources of cervical cancer information were the news media (radio  
330 and television) were 143% more likely to accept self-sampling if offered (OR=2.43, 95%  
331 CI=1.07-5.51). Using the news media and health workers as primary sources of health  
332 information was associated with 163% (OR=2.63, 95% CI=1.27-5.48) and 88% (OR=1.88, 95%  
333 CI=1.23-2.86) higher odds of self-sampling willingness.

334  
335 On the other hand, cervical cancer stigma was associated with 30% lower odds (OR=0.71, 95%  
336 CI=0.57-0.88) of self-sampling willingness. Traveling for half an hour to two hours, compared to  
337 less than half an hour, to the nearest health facility was associated with 56% lower odds  
338 (OR=0.44, CI=0.20-0.93) of self-sampling willingness. Appendix B summarizes the socio-  
339 ecological barriers to self-sampling willingness based on the results.

340



341 **Qualitative findings**

342 Qualitative findings were mainly congruent with quantitative results. Nonetheless, we identified  
343 some discrepancies in qualitative results; some participants who had heard about CC from the  
344 news media were unwilling to self-collect samples for HPV testing. Additionally, while most  
345 participants anticipated CC from their community, some participants reported that stigmatizing  
346 attitudes from people may be buffered by Christian religious beliefs. Below are the key themes  
347 and exemplar quotes:

348

349 *Cervical cancer awareness*

350 Women who were agreeable to self-sampling demonstrated that their willingness was potentially  
351 influenced by their understanding of the significance of screening for CC. Some participants who  
352 expressed interest in self-sampling desired more education on the procedure prior to collecting  
353 the sample. One respondent in her 60s mentioned that she had heard that it is important to detect  
354 the disease at its early stages as it allows for early treatment.

355 *“I will agree (to self-collect a sample for screening). It was said that it is good to screen so that it*  
356 *(cervical cancer) can be prevented before it gets worse.”*

357

358 *Acquisition of health information from health workers*

359 Respondents whose primary sources of health information were health workers (doctors, nurses  
360 and community health workers) highlighted the significant role of health workers in promoting  
361 knowledge on screening. Also, among some participants trust in health care providers, in addition  
362 to health care provider recommendation were facilitators to self-sampling. One participant in her  
363 40s affirmed her willingness to self-collect a sample for HPV-DNA testing:

364 *“I will not refuse especially when a healthcare provider advises, because I also want to know my*  
365 *health status.”*

366

367 *The role of the news media sources.*

368 Qualitative data showed that the news media promote CC knowledge and could influence self-  
369 sampling willingness. One participant in her 30s who had heard about CC mentioned that she  
370 became aware of the need for women getting screened through an educational program on the  
371 radio, where she primarily accessed health information.

372 *“I heard a talk on cervical cancer on the radio. Otherwise, I have not seen (the disease); I only*  
373 *hear.”*

374 However, there were some women who were unwilling to self-collect samples for screening  
375 despite demonstrating good knowledge and awareness of screening through the news media. A  
376 participant in her 40s mentioned that she had learned the need for women to screen for CC, but  
377 she was unwilling to self-collect a sample.

378 *“I have heard (about cervical cancer) from an educational program on the radio. They made an*  
379 *announcement that women should go to the hospital for screening. The radio is where I primarily*  
380 *get (cervical cancer information) .... they always teach, emphasizing that one should go for*  
381 *screening.”*

382

383 *Anticipated cervical cancer stigma*

384 Several women from both counties anticipated CC stigma in their community, mainly attributed  
385 to the symptoms of the diseases. However, some women indicated that religion might reduce  
386 instances of CC stigma. For instance, a participant in her 50s divulged that CC symptoms might  
387 drive a woman’s spouse to infidelity, leading to distress and self-blame on the woman.

388 “... *Cervical cancer might cause a woman to produce discharge with a foul odor. Her husband*  
389 *might reject her and go find another woman. This would cause distress to the woman because she*  
390 *sees that the disease led to infidelity... Some men would reject their wives when they are*  
391 *diagnosed with this disease because of lack of sexual intimacy.*”

392

393 Contrary to some observations of stigma, some women revealed that individuals with religious  
394 beliefs might not stigmatize a woman diagnosed with cervical cancer. A participant in her 50s  
395 stated that a woman with cervical cancer might be stigmatized by some of her friends who are  
396 non-believers.

397 “*Friends...who are religious will give her hope. Those who have secular beliefs might say she got*  
398 *the disease because of infidelity.*”

399 *Longer travel time to the nearest health facility*

400 Several participants reported that they had not been screened due to their inability to cover  
401 transportation costs to the health facilities and lack of screening equipment in accessible health  
402 facilities. Others reported that accessible health facilities did not have the necessary screening  
403 equipment.

404 “*Nothing prevented me from (going for screening) except for transportation costs. (There was) a*  
405 *free mass screening campaign, but it was announced a day before the screening date....*”

406 Some participants disclosed that their nearest health facilities were not well equipped to conduct  
407 cervical cancer screening.

408 “*It (the health facility) is poorly equipped, there is no screening equipment. There are no*  
409 *machines to be used in screening.*”

410

411 **Integration**

412

413 Table 3 below is a joint display illustrating the integration of mixed methods results. For each  
414 measure, we provide recommendations for successful adoption of self-sampling for HPV-DNA  
415 testing, based on the merged findings. These recommendations accentuate the need to 1) address  
416 the significance of CC screening during CC awareness campaigns, 2) optimize patient-provider  
417 interactions to promote HPV testing via self-sampling, 3) promote health worker-led CC  
418 information dissemination, 4) leverage mass media to boost CC education and screening efforts,  
419 5) complement radio broadcasts of CC education and screening, with health worker-led  
420 interventions, 6) encourage discussions about CC in communities to debunk stigma, 7) explore  
421 the potential mediating role of religious leaders in reducing CC stigma, 8) increase awareness of  
422 CC symptoms and the availability of treatment, 9) create support groups for CC patients, and 10)  
423 provide HPV testing kits in community settings to promote access and increase screening uptake  
424 among eligible women.

425

426 **Table 3: A joint display of qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods meta-inferences of**  
427 **self-sampling willingness**

	<b>Quantitative Findings</b>	<b>Qualitative Findings</b>	<b>Mixed Methods Meta-Inferences</b>
<b>Measure</b>	<b>OR (95% C.I.)</b>	<b>(Themes and Quotes)</b>	<b>Recommendations for enhancing self-sampling for HPV-DNA testing</b>

Cervical cancer awareness	3.49 (1.50-8.11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge about the significance of screening: <i>"I had heard the health care workers saying that it is necessary for women to get screened so it can be known if we have disease in our bodies, to get regular screening."</i> (between 20 and 25 years, willing to self-collect a sample).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address the significance of screening in CC awareness campaigns, to promote screening through sample self-collection for HPV-DNA testing.</li> </ul>
Acquisition of health information primarily from health workers	1.88 (1.23-2.86)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust in health care providers: <i>"I trust a doctor or a nurse. you know, they trained in the health care field and they explain things about health and wellbeing very well, based on what you tell them. When you discuss your health issue with them, they would give you a detailed explanation about it."</i> (between 46 and 50 years, willing to self-collect a sample, primarily accesses health information from a doctor or a nurse)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Optimize provider-patient interactions to educate patients on the importance of CC screening and offer sample self-collection kits to women who are eligible and willing to screen.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cervical cancer information acquisition from health workers: <i>"I have come to know that it (screening) is important because cervical cancer has caused the death of so many women. When health workers came (to our community) to educate people (about cervical cancer screening), I understood that it is important for one to go for screening, so that if you have it (cervical cancer), you can be treated when curative treatment is still possible."</i> (heard of CC, between 51 and 55 years old, willing to self-collect sample, primarily accesses health information from a doctor or a nurse).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote health worker-led CC information dissemination to ensure provision of accurate CC information and sample self-collection for HPV-DNA testing, among eligible women.</li> </ul>
News media sources of cervical cancer information	2.63 (1.27-5.48)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Television and radio sources: <i>"I have heard (cervical cancer information) over the radio... and watched on the television."</i> (between 61 and 65 years, willing to self-collect a sample)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximize the potential for these mass media to facilitate CC information dissemination and screening uptake.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Radio-based educational programs and announcements: <i>"I have heard from the radio...It was said that it affects women, particularly the cervix...It was announced that screening was being done for free at the hospital."</i> (between 56 and 60 years, unwilling to self-collect a sample, primarily obtains health information from the radio, heard of CC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complement radio-based CC information dissemination in local dialects with education and support from health workers.</li> </ul>

Anticipated cervical cancer stigma	0.71 (0.55-0.88)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community: <i>"you know if someone has cervical cancer, when they have reached the late stages, there is nothing to hide. It can be concealed when they are still alive but when they die, they you will hear that they had this type of cancer."</i> (between 36 and 40 years, willing to self-collect a sample)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage discussions about CC as a disease to normalize the topic and enhance screening uptake.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stigma and potential mediating role of religion: <i>"If it is a Christian family her spouse might not stigmatize her. He will take care of her. But if it is a place where there is no salvation, it is possible that he might stigmatize her and even send her away because there is nothing else going on."</i> (between 30 and 35 years, willing to self-collect a sample)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore the potential role of religious leaders to lead open dialogue about CC and reduce stigma associated with CC.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community stigma: (a woman with cervical may be stigmatized in the community) <i>"...because cervical cancer is a bad disease, and it was said that it causes one to have a foul odor."</i> (between 45 and 50 years, willing to self-collect a sample)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase awareness of CC symptoms and treatment, and create support groups for those affected by CC.</li> </ul>
Longer travel time to the nearest health facility	0.44 (0.20-0.93)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel distance barriers: (I have never gone for screening because the health facility). <i>"...where screening is being conducted is far."</i> (between 51 and 55 years, willing to self-collect a sample)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide self-sampling kits in community-based settings to ensure easy access ad screening uptake</li> </ul>

428

429 Discussion

430

431 We sought to investigate barriers and facilitators of rural Kenyan women’s willingness to adopt  
432 self-sampling for HPV-DNA testing. The sample predominantly consisted of women with low  
433 CC screening uptake, most of whom expressed willingness to self-collect samples for CC  
434 screening if offered. Among the factors investigated, CC awareness, acquisition of health  
435 information primarily from health care providers and the news media and having heard about  
436 cervical cancer from the news media were positively associated with self-sampling willingness.  
437 In contrast, CC stigma, and traveling for 30 minutes or more to the nearest health facility were  
438 negatively associated with self-sampling willingness. Of the total sample, 76.9% stated that they  
439 would self-collect samples for CC screening if offered. This is consistent with findings from a  
440 longitudinal study that sampled rural Malawian women (N=122); 66% of them expressed  
441 willingness to self-collect samples for HPV testing.<sup>25</sup> This study, however, found differences  
442 between hypothetical willingness to self-collect samples and uptake of self-sampling. Only 53%  
443 and 47% of those who were either willing or unwilling to self-collect samples for HPV testing at  
444 baseline, respectively, self-collected samples 12 to 18 months later.<sup>25</sup> While findings from both  
445 studies illustrate generally high proportion of women willing to self-collect samples for HPV  
446 testing, they accentuate the need to understand the factors that influence uptake of sample self-  
447 collection for HPV testing.

448 CC awareness and women’s willingness to screen for CC are key in the prevention of HPV and  
449 CC.<sup>26</sup> In this study sample, 83.2% of women had heard of CC, but only 6.4% had ever been  
450 screened for the disease in their lifetime. These findings closely align with results from a  
451 different rural sample in Uganda, which found that a high proportion of women (82%) had heard



452 about CC awareness yet only 6% had ever been screened for pre-cancerous lesions. CC  
453 awareness was significantly associated with 249% increased likelihood of self-sampling  
454 willingness. These findings emphasize the need to provide information on CC and self-sampling.  
455 Prior studies have established that awareness of screening methods and place of screening are  
456 critical in women's use and access to CC screening services.<sup>20,27</sup> Qualitative findings  
457 demonstrated that primary prevention through education on the importance of CC screening and  
458 a demonstration of self-sampling are key facilitators to self-sampling willingness. Comparably,  
459 researchers investigating a sample of Ugandan women found that self-sampling acceptability  
460 was higher when providers educated women and allowed them to examine the brush before self-  
461 collection.<sup>28</sup> Prior research has shown that compared to urban women, rural women in SSA have  
462 considerably lower CC awareness and knowledge, mainly due to constrained access to CC  
463 information.<sup>20,29</sup> To encourage sample self-collection for HPV-DNA testing among women, CC  
464 education including practical instructions on self-collection will be essential.

465

466 Our findings highlight the potential instrumental role of the traditional news media, mainly the  
467 radio, in enhancing HPV-DNA testing. Women whose primary source of health information, and  
468 those who had heard about CC from the news media were more willing to self-collect samples.  
469 Our results are consistent with prior research findings which reported that women in SSA often  
470 learn about CC from televisions, radios.<sup>30-33</sup> Among rural Tanzanian women, the odds of  
471 screening were increased by about 25% among those who regularly listened to the radio.<sup>34</sup> While  
472 the news media play a critical role in CC information dissemination, qualitative findings showed  
473 a lack of self-efficacy to self-collect samples for screening might be a hindrance to women who

474 are willing to screen. Stakeholders should ascertain the level of understanding of self-sampling  
475 procedure among women who are willing to screen.  
476  
477 Healthcare workers (HCWs) are critical players in the dissemination of information on CC and  
478 CC screening. Women who primarily acquired health information from HCWs had 88%  
479 likelihood of self-sampling willingness. Qualitative findings indicated that many women learned  
480 about CC from HCWs, and some reported that they would most likely accept self-sampling if  
481 recommended by a healthcare provider. Although we did not find any significant association  
482 between having heard about CC from HCWs and self-sampling willingness, previous research  
483 findings showed that receiving information from healthcare providers on CC and CC screening  
484 were significantly associated with higher odds of screening uptake.<sup>32,35</sup> Health care providers,  
485 particularly nurses who mainly run rural-based health clinics that were used by the majority of  
486 the study sample, should not only offer CC education in health facilities but also conduct  
487 community outreach in rural regions that are farther away from these facilities. CC education  
488 should be culturally sensitive, elaborate on CC screening procedures, and emphasize the  
489 significance of screening, to promote screening uptake.<sup>29</sup>  
490  
491 Prior research findings have established that cervical cancer stigma is a key barrier to disclosure  
492 of symptoms, seeking services for CC screening, and treatment of CC, in many Sub-Saharan  
493 African communities.<sup>12,36-38</sup> In this study sample anticipated cervical cancer stigma was high,  
494 with 57.8% of the sample endorsing at least one anticipated cervical cancer stigma. This is  
495 higher than was found in another Kenyan rural sample of women (n=419) in which only 20.3%  
496 anticipated cervical cancer stigma.<sup>36</sup> The difference might be attributed to sample characteristics

497 as the study recruited women from health facilities; 55.6% of whom were HIV positive, while  
498 this study recruited women predominantly from community settings and only 2.5% were HIV  
499 positive. HIV positive women possibly have more opportunities to interact with healthcare  
500 providers who may provide support and information on CC, ultimately reducing stigma. To  
501 promote cervical cancer screening in rural communities, it would be important to destigmatize  
502 CC in both community settings and health facilities.

503

504 Longer travel time to the nearest health facility was significantly associated with a 56% decrease  
505 in the odds of willingness to accept self-sampling in this study sample. Indeed, previous research  
506 studies conducted in various countries in SSA indicate that perceived problems with long travel  
507 time and high costs associated with long distances to health facilities are barriers to CC  
508 knowledge and screening.<sup>38-40</sup> In a pooled sample of women (n= 40,555) included in the  
509 Demographic and Health Surveys conducted between 2013 to 2021 in Benin, Cote d'Ivoire,  
510 Cameroon, Kenya and Namibia, 62.4% of women who reported that distance to health facilities  
511 was a big problem were rural residents.<sup>40</sup> About 8% (n=12,899) of all women who indicated that  
512 distance to health facilities was a big problem in the study had been tested for cervical cancer  
513 compared to 13.5% of women who did not have a problem.<sup>40</sup> Expanding the quantitative  
514 findings, qualitative findings showed that the high cost of transportation to more equipped health  
515 facilities was the main reason why women were concerned with travel time and distance, which  
516 correspond to results from other studies in Kenya and other parts of SSA.<sup>12,20,38</sup> Level II health  
517 facilities were the most accessible to our study sample. These facilities are financed by the  
518 County governments and even though they usually offer free CC screening, conducted by nurses,  
519 using VIA/VILI techniques, supplies may be out of stock and participants who are willing to

520 screen may need to seek CC screening services at more advanced health facilities.<sup>36</sup> To promote  
521 self-collection of samples for HPV testing, ministries of health in Kenya and other parts of SSA  
522 should ensure that self-sampling kits are readily accessible and available in rural health facilities.

523

## 524 **Limitations**

525

526 This study has some limitations. First, convenience sampling was used to select participants.

527 This type of sampling is prone to selection bias. Second, data collection was limited to rural-

528 based women from two Counties and findings may not be generalizable to other settings. Third,

529 data were self-reported; it is possible that recall bias may have led to participants under-reporting

530 or over-reporting on some variables. Lastly, we found some discrepant results from qualitative

531 interviews, hence further studies are needed to support our findings. Nonetheless, a key strength

532 of this study is the availability of both qualitative and quantitative data, which facilitated

533 integration and an in-depth understanding of the sociodemographic factors that could impact

534 women's self-sampling willingness.

## 535 **Conclusions**

536 In summary, self-sampling for HPV-DNA testing is a promising approach to screening and early

537 detection of CC among rural Kenyan women. To enhance successful adoption by women,

538 targeted CC education, leveraging the news media and health workers will be instrumental in the

539 improvement of CC knowledge and debunking of stigma among women and consequently their

540 willingness to self-collect samples for HPV-DNA testing. Besides, the implementation of

541 strategies to promote access to screening among medically underserved rural Kenyan women

542 will be of the essence.

543

544 **Author contributions:** Conceptualization, J.C., N.P., and H.-R.H.; quantitative data analysis,  
545 J.C., and N.P. Qualitative data analysis, J.C., A.C., H.K., and V.K. Writing original draft, J.C.,  
546 and H.-R.H. Abstract and full article review, J.C., N.P., L.K.-B, D.G., J.J.-G., J.A., N.R.-R.,  
547 S.W., A.C., H.K, V.K., and H.-R.H. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of  
548 the manuscript.

549  
550 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to extend our gratitude to all the participants who  
551 contributed their time and insights to this research study.

552  
553  
554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

## References:

576

- 577 1. Fall NS, Tamalet C, Diagne N, et al. Feasibility, Acceptability, and Accuracy of Vaginal  
578 Self-Sampling for Screening Human Papillomavirus Types in Women from Rural Areas  
579 in Senegal. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2019;100(6):1552-1555. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.19-0045  
580
- 581 2. Dzinamarira T, Moyo E, Dzobo M, Mbunge E, Murewanhema G. Cervical cancer in sub-  
582 Saharan Africa: an urgent call for improving accessibility and use of preventive services.  
583 *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2023;33(4):592. doi:10.1136/ijgc-2022-003957  
584
- 585 3. Cancer TCI of O and the IA for R on. Kenya: Human Papillomavirus and Related  
586 Cancers, Fact Sheet 2023.; 2023. [https://hpcvcentre.net/statistics/reports/KEN\\_FS.pdf](https://hpcvcentre.net/statistics/reports/KEN_FS.pdf)  
587
- 588 4. Mwaliko E, Itsura P, Keter A, et al. Survival of cervical cancer patients at Moi teaching  
589 and Referral Hospital, Eldoret in western Kenya. *BMC Cancer.* 2023;23(1):1104.  
590 doi:10.1186/s12885-023-11506-w  
591
- 592 5. Umutesi G, Oluoch L, Weiner BJ, et al. HPV vaccination in Kenya: a study protocol to  
593 assess stakeholders' perspectives on implementation drivers of HPV vaccination and the  
594 acceptability of the reduced dose strategy among providers. *Frontiers in Health Services.*  
595 2023;3. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frhs.2023.1233923>  
596
- 597 6. Podolak I, Kisia C, Omosa-Manyonyi G, Cosby J. Using a multimethod approach to  
598 develop implementation strategies for a cervical self-sampling program in Kenya. *BMC*  
599 *Health Serv Res.* 2017;17(1):222. doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2160-0  
600
- 601 7. Mwenda V, Mburu W, Bor JP, et al. Cervical cancer programme, Kenya, 2011-2020:  
602 lessons to guide elimination as a public health problem. *Ecancermedicalsecience.*  
603 2022;16:1442. doi:10.3332/ecancer.2022.1442  
604
- 605 8. Mabachi NM, Wexler C, Acharya H, et al. Piloting a systems level intervention to  
606 improve cervical cancer screening, treatment and follow up in Kenya. *Front Med*  
607 *(Lausanne).* 2022;9:930462. doi:10.3389/fmed.2022.930462  
608
- 609 9. Mwenda V, Bor JP, Nyangasi M, et al. Integrating human papillomavirus testing as a  
610 point-of care service using GeneXpert platforms: Findings and lessons from a Kenyan  
611 pilot study (2019-2020). *PLoS One.* 2023;18(5):e0286202.  
612 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0286202

- 613  
614 10. Organization WH. WHO recommends DNA testing as a first-choice screening method for  
615 cervical cancer prevention . <https://www.who.int/europe/home?v=welcome>. Published  
616 2021. <https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/11-09-2021-who-recommends-dna-testing-as-a-first-choice-screening-method-for-cervical-cancer-prevention#:~:text=For%20the%20general%20population%20of%20women%2C%20HPV-DNA%20detection,25%20years%2C%20with%20regular%20screening%20every%203-5%20years.>  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622
- 623 11. Organization WH. On the path to expanding cervical cancer screening in Kenya.  
624 <https://www.afro.who.int>. Published 2023.  
625 <https://www.afro.who.int/countries/kenya/news/path-expanding-cervical-cancer-screening-kenya>  
626  
627
- 628 12. Oketch SY, Kwena Z, Choi Y, et al. Perspectives of women participating in a cervical  
629 cancer screening campaign with community-based HPV self-sampling in rural western  
630 Kenya: a qualitative study. *BMC Womens Health*. 2019;19(1):75. doi:10.1186/s12905-019-0778-2  
631  
632
- 633 13. McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An ecological perspective on health  
634 promotion programs. *Health Educ Q*. 1988;15(4):351-377.  
635 doi:10.1177/109019818801500401  
636
- 637 14. Squiers L, Peinado S, Berkman N, Boudewyns V, McCormack L. The Health Literacy  
638 Skills Framework. *J Health Commun*. 2012;17:30-54.  
639 doi:10.1080/10810730.2012.713442  
640
- 641 15. Atnafu DD, Khatri R, Assefa Y. Drivers of cervical cancer prevention and management in  
642 sub-Saharan Africa: a qualitative synthesis of mixed studies. *Health Res Policy Syst*.  
643 2024;22(1):21. doi:10.1186/s12961-023-01094-3  
644
- 645 16. Vega Crespo B, Neira VA, Ortíz Segarra J, et al. Barriers and facilitators to cervical  
646 cancer screening among under-screened women in Cuenca, Ecuador: the perspectives of  
647 women and health professionals. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22(1):2144.  
648 doi:10.1186/s12889-022-14601-y  
649
- 650 17. Rosser JI, Njoroge B, Huchko MJ. Cervical Cancer Stigma in Rural Kenya: What Does  
651 HIV Have to Do with It? *J Cancer Educ*. 2016;31(2):413-418. doi:10.1007/s13187-015-0843-y  
652  
653
- 654 18. Brinkhoff T. City Population. <http://www.citypopulation.de>. Published 2023.  
655 [https://www.citypopulation.de/en/kenya/admin/rift\\_valley/35\\_\\_kericho/](https://www.citypopulation.de/en/kenya/admin/rift_valley/35__kericho/)  
656
- 657 19. Palinkas LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, Hoagwood K. Purposeful  
658 Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation



- 659 Research. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services  
660 Research. 2015;42(5):533-544. doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y  
661
- 662 20. Endalew DA, Moti D, Mohammed N, Redi S, Wassihun Alemu B. Knowledge and  
663 practice of cervical cancer screening and associated factors among reproductive age group  
664 women in districts of Gurage zone, Southern Ethiopia. A cross-sectional study. PLoS One.  
665 2020;15(9):e0238869. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0238869  
666
- 667 21. Marimwe C, Dowse R. Health literacy test for limited literacy populations (HELT-LL):  
668 Validation in South Africa. Mo P, ed. Cogent Med. 2019;6(1):1650417.  
669 doi:10.1080/2331205X.2019.1650417  
670
- 671 22. Taber KS. The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research  
672 Instruments in Science Education. Res Sci Educ. 2018;48(6):1273-1296.  
673 doi:10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2  
674
- 675 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res Psychol.  
676 2006;3(2):77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa  
677
- 678 24. Creswell WJ, Clark PV I. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research . 3rd ed.  
679 SAGE Publications.; 2017.  
680
- 681 25. Hood RB, Turner AN, Huber-Krum S, et al. For Human Papillomavirus Self-Sampling,  
682 Stated Willingness Does Not Correspond With Subsequent Uptake by Rural Malawian  
683 Women. Sex Transm Dis. 2020;47(4).  
684 [https://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/fulltext/2020/04000/for\\_human\\_papillomavirus\\_self\\_](https://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/fulltext/2020/04000/for_human_papillomavirus_self_sampling,_stated.12.aspx)  
685 [sampling,\\_stated.12.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/stdjournal/fulltext/2020/04000/for_human_papillomavirus_self_sampling,_stated.12.aspx)  
686
- 687 26. Cunningham MS, Skrastins E, Fitzpatrick R, et al. Cervical cancer screening and HPV  
688 vaccine acceptability among rural and urban women in Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania.  
689 BMJ Open. 2015;5(3):e005828-005828. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005828  
690
- 691 27. Ndejjo R, Mukama T, Musabyimana A, Musoke D. Uptake of Cervical Cancer Screening  
692 and Associated Factors among Women in Rural Uganda: A Cross Sectional Study. PLoS  
693 One. 2016;11(2):e0149696. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0149696  
694
- 695 28. Bansil P, Wittet S, Lim JL, Winkler JL, Paul P, Jeronimo J. Acceptability of self-  
696 collection sampling for HPV-DNA testing in low-resource settings: a mixed methods  
697 approach. BMC Public Health. 2014;14(1):596. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-596  
698
- 699 29. Pierz AJ, Randall TC, Castle PE, et al. A scoping review: Facilitators and barriers of  
700 cervical cancer screening and early diagnosis of breast cancer in Sub-Saharan African  
701 health settings. Gynecol Oncol Rep. 2020;33:100605. doi:10.1016/j.gore.2020.100605  
702
- 703 30. Chepkorir J, Guillaume D, Lee J, et al. The Role of Health Information Sources on  
704 Cervical Cancer Literacy, Knowledge, Attitudes and Screening Practices in Sub-Saharan



- 705 African Women: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2024;21(7):872.  
706 doi: 10.3390/ijerph21070872. doi:10.3390/ijerph21070872  
707
- 708 31. Dozie UW, Elebari BL, Nwaokoro CJ, et al. Knowledge, attitude and perception on  
709 cervical cancer screening among women attending ante-natal clinic in Owerri west L.G.A,  
710 South-Eastern Nigeria: A cross-sectional study. *Cancer Treat Res Commun*.  
711 2021;28:100392. doi:10.1016/j.ctarc.2021.100392  
712
- 713 32. Ruddies F, Gizaw M, Teka B, et al. Cervical cancer screening in rural Ethiopia: a cross-  
714 sectional knowledge, attitude and practice study. *BMC Cancer*. 2020;20(1):563.  
715 doi:10.1186/s12885-020-07060-4  
716
- 717 33. Gatumo M, Gacheri S, Sayed AR, Scheibe A. Women's knowledge and attitudes related  
718 to cervical cancer and cervical cancer screening in Isiolo and Tharaka Nithi counties,  
719 Kenya: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Cancer*. 2018;18(1):745. doi:10.1186/s12885-018-  
720 4642-9  
721
- 722 34. Perng P, Perng W, Ngoma T, et al. Promoters of and barriers to cervical cancer screening  
723 in a rural setting in Tanzania. *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*.  
724 2013;123(3):221-225. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2013.05.026  
725
- 726 35. Mwantake MR, Kajoka HD, Kimondo FC, Amour C, Mboya IB. Factors associated with  
727 cervical cancer screening among women living with HIV in the Kilimanjaro region,  
728 northern Tanzania: A cross-sectional study. *Prev Med Rep*. 2022;30:101985.  
729 doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2022.101985  
730
- 731 36. Rosser JI, Hamisi S, Njoroge B, Huchko MJ. Barriers to Cervical Cancer Screening in  
732 Rural Kenya: Perspectives from a Provider Survey. *J Community Health*. 2015;40(4):756-  
733 761. doi:10.1007/s10900-015-9996-1  
734
- 735 37. Burrowes S, Holcombe SJ, Leshargie CT, et al. Perceptions of cervical cancer care among  
736 Ethiopian women and their providers: a qualitative study. *Reprod Health*. 2022;19(1):2.  
737 doi:10.1186/s12978-021-01316-3  
738
- 739 38. Lim JNW, Ojo AA. Barriers to utilisation of cervical cancer screening in Sub Sahara  
740 Africa: a systematic review. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)*. 2017;26(1):e12444.  
741 doi:10.1111/ecc.12444  
742
- 743 39. Ngune I, Kalembo F, Loessl B, Kivuti-Bitok LW. Biopsychosocial risk factors and  
744 knowledge of cervical cancer among young women: A case study from Kenya to inform  
745 HPV prevention in Sub-Saharan Africa. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(8):e0237745.  
746 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0237745  
747
- 748 40. Dickson KS, Boateng ENK, Acquah E, Ayebeng C, Addo IY. Screening for cervical  
749 cancer among women in five countries in sub-saharan Africa: analysis of the role played

750 by distance to health facility and socio-demographic factors. BMC Health Serv Res.  
751 2023;23(1):61. doi:10.1186/s12913-023-09055-w  
752